

Appendix A: Joint assessment and commitment to proceed – Group report

Working first in small groups and then together, the table assessed the IOAC mandate, structure and proposed process; listing items that required clarification or more discussion. Rebecca Reid responded to the points raised.

- Lack of clarity around speaking rules (members, alternates) (1. if the member is here and the issue on the table is something the alternate has experience with, the member defers to alternate) (2. if we know agenda in advance, member may choose to bring different alternate to the meeting) (3. alternates in the dialogue as we have been here today – is the requirement to speak through the member?) (4. if member absent from meeting – assume alternate there with authority as de facto member)
 - PO/SC need to get together to consider the Terms of Reference and provide some clarity – will come back to IOAC with a proposed approach in advance of the next meeting
 - Yes to #4
- Presentation of different interests and points of IOAC members around the table (as a learning exercise, perspective on peoples' issues)
 - Agree – need to think through how to do that
- Potential lack of symmetry between PNCIMA and local sub-plans. Highlight regional ocean planning exercises (Haida, CC FNs) – desire to coordinate timelines and ensure compatibility
 - Planning Office to do some more work on and come back with clarity
- What are specific objectives and initiatives beyond PNCIMA Vision
 - We will generate that through our work. Agree it needs to be more specific – it will come
 - More specificity comes through planning exercise
- Importance of science group – how it's defined – existence beyond info directly available to DFO (including commercial science, TK and socio-economic considerations)
 - We will take this into consideration as we construct Science Advisory Group
- Mandate is fine but needs to be more specific – how do you operationalize it?
 - This is the intent of the issues briefs document
- Structure – acknowledge disagreement on structure. Leave that for resolution.
 - We'll discuss this when we review next steps

- Process – concern that some sectors are either very diverse or very diffuse – difficult to communicate with whole sector and get opinion on issues, and make information available to people. We can make best efforts.
 - Agree you are in a challenging position. We are not asking you to participate as representatives in a traditional/ratification way. You are here in wise person model and may need to respond by qualifying your input.
 - Looking for member to identify a way to address the gap.
 - Communications Strategy should address this

- Note also communications with other agencies re. what's being done within PNCIMA is also important.
 - Responsibility of Planning Office, federal and federal/provincial coordinating bodies.

- Process – make sure that minutes/outcomes have a summary and that they are structured in a way that makes it easy to report out to our sector.
 - No problem.

- Mandate – this mandate is longer than the 2-year planning process. Consider management model (including evaluation, adaptive management).
 - Yes – how do we create an enduring governance approach to reflect that timeframe
 - We haven't framed this beyond 2013 because it gets fuzzy
 - Advice to Planning Office is to consider entire planning cycle
 - Kim will send a model for consideration

- When we say that this body advises governments, what do we mean by governments and/or decision-makers? Articulate more clearly
 - We mean: recommendations to those with jurisdictional authority to carry them out

- Mandate: Problemsolving between sectors and not within sectors (for which existing processes/structures exist)
 - Yes

- Structure: alternates have a voice but not party to consensus
 - SC/PO to discuss further

- Specialists can be brought to meetings who are not necessarily the alternate – but we need a process for how that would happen (ie. a proposal from sector to IOAC at meeting before).
 - No objection but would like to frame in conversation about members and alternates. SC/PO to come forward with proposed approach.

- We'd like that person to be funded

- This is a level of detail we can't agree to
- Question of who we invite to the table and for what reason needs to be discussed further
- Membership: Steering Committee and Planning Office should work with sectors having difficulties and make sure that conversation happens offline and doesn't take up more time of this table. Acknowledge that these are important conversations that need to be had.
 - We'll discuss this when we review next steps
- Province must be ex-officio at the table if we are discussing items that affect provincial jurisdiction.
 - We can't force province to table but can encourage. Agree that we can't talk about something we don't have jurisdiction to speak to.
- Process: one forum that brings all regions together towards end of planning process when we have a draft plan to make public. Then plan submitted to government following that forum. Could be one day only.
 - We will consider this.
- Transparency at meetings – minutes made public; meetings open to public; discomfort around videotaping of meetings as it may limit peoples' ability to speak freely.
 - Agree. If we make summary notes public and make meetings open to public, we don't need to videotape.
- First Nations participation at IOAC is important – they have an ex officio place and should attend
 - Agree. Will follow up with my colleagues. Don't forget Steve.
- Mandate: fairly clear but role of the members at the table is more advisory in nature and heavy lifting proposed for Planning Office.
 - Agreed. That is appropriate. IOAC here on a voluntary basis
- Process: working groups – understanding their role and makeup – would be helpful to have some more clarity around the topics.
 - Interaction between WGs and this table – Planning Office will provide more clarity in issues briefs document (including proposing structures we need to put in place to do the work).
- Multiple planning processes outside PNCIMA work. Table needs to discuss further. Anything government departments can do to clarify their activities and mandates and bring to IOAC for their information
 - Yes – we need to discuss further. We can raise suggestion that governments clarify mandates at our fed-fed, fed-prov meetings

- There is information that exists that describes mandates of different agencies on marine planning and we can provide that to you
- Membership – consider 2 or 3 additional participants
 - We'll discuss this when we review next steps
- Alternates – more clearly define their role – when do they speak – how do they interact with full member
 - Yes
- Funding for alternates – more conversation about possibilities around that
 - When we review role of alternates, we will consider this
- Province – important to discuss how we might include them
 - Yes
- Scale – issues outside of PNCIMA boundaries (coast wide and smaller scale) – we would like to discuss them at this table in some way. More dialogue and clarification on how PNCIMA as a regional process considers criteria to include or exclude certain issues (small scale or large scale – ie. climate change, migratory stocks, shipping)
 - Agree that criteria to assess that are a good idea and we'll have further discussion
 - Smaller scale issues – we will seek existing plans, direction, policy or regulation that exists and seek ways to be consistent
 - Larger scale issues – may be about asking what we do to respond or adapt