

**PNCIMA Integrated Oceans Advisory Committee – Meeting Notes
June 28-29, 2010 | Painter’s Lodge, Campbell River**

The purpose of these notes is to summarize the consensus advice and recommendations from the IOAC to the Steering Committee.
--

Participants:

Stephen Brown	Shipping and Transportation
Evan Loveless	Tourism
Kaity Stein	Shipping and Transportation
Alan Thomson	Outdoor Recreation
Nick Heath	Outdoor Recreation
Urs Thomas	Recreational Fishing
Rupert Gale (day 1)	Recreational Fishing
Richard Opala	Aquaculture
Matt Burns	Renewable energy
Jim Abram	Local Communities
Arnie Nagy	Commercial Fishing
Dan Edwards	Commercial Fishing
Christina Burrige	Commercial Fishing
Kim Wright	Marine Conservation
Kim Johnson	Non-renewable energy
Jim McIsaac	Commercial Fishing
Bill Wareham	Marine Conservation
Evan Putterille (day 2)	Local Communities
David Minato (day 2)	Aquaculture

Facilitator:

Craig Darling	
---------------	--

Observers and Ex Officio:

Dallas Smith (day 1)	Nanwakolas Council
Alex Chartrand (day 1)	Coastal First Nations – Great Bear Initiative / PNCIMA Steering Committee
Rebecca Reid	DFO / PNCIMA Steering Committee
Neil Davis	DFO / PNCIMA Planning Office
Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations – Great Bear Initiative / PNCIMA Planning Office
Patrick Marshall	Support of 4 RD chairs
Bruce Reid	DFO
John Bones	Nanwakolas Council / PNCIMA Planning Office
Greg Savard	DFO
Bud Ehler	UNESCO

1. **Welcome and introductions**

- Dallas Smith (on behalf of the Nanwakolas Council), Rebecca Reid (on behalf of DFO and the PNCIMA Steering Committee) and Alex Chartrand (on behalf of Coastal First Nations – Great Bear Initiative and the PNCIMA Steering Committee) offered opening remarks.
- Rebecca introduced Greg Savard who will be acting in her position for the next 7 months, and advised that the Province participates as an observer.

2. **Review and confirmation of agenda**

- agenda confirmed

3. **Integrated oceans management planning: what are we setting out to do?**

The PNCIMA Planning Process (Rebecca Reid, DFO)

- Please see presentation under separate cover
- The Steering Committee provided an introduction to the PNCIMA planning process, including mandate, process structure, framework and approach, role of science and knowledge, timelines and roadmap.
- In response to questions from IOAC members, clarification was provided that ecosystem-based management nests within government policy for sustainable development and includes human wellbeing as well as ecological interests; NRCan is a member of the Steering Committee and Planning Office, Transport Canada is a member of the Planning Office; Fisheries quotas and allocations will not be discussed at this table, although an ecosystem-based approach to the management of oceans should inform how individual activities are managed; and that PNCIMA will address federal government commitment to a coast-wide network of marine protected areas on a PNCIMA scale.

International Experience with Integrated Management and Marine Spatial Planning (Bud Ehler, UNESCO)

- Please see presentation under separate cover
- In response to questions:
 - o Although Australia, New Zealand and the US provide some examples of aboriginal peoples' involvement in marine spatial planning, Canada is unique in how integrated First Nations are in planning.
 - o Netherlands and Norwegian plan for Barents Sea cited as examples of marine spatial planning success stories, although there are few examples of plans that have been implemented long enough to see results.
 - o Examples of funding from other jurisdictions were cited. Massachusetts produced an integrated management plan with \$8M of third party funding from the Moore Foundation. China has imposed a system of user charges on activities in marine areas, collecting \$1.7 billion over 1 year, 70% of which goes back into developing and managing the plan. External funding for California's Marine Life Protection Act has been controversial, although funding stood up to a legal challenge by users about supplementing the state appropriation process.

4. The role of the IOAC

- The Steering Committee described the mandate for the group as laid out in draft terms of reference for IOAC - to act as a strategic level advisory body that provides advice for the development of an integrated management plan for PNCIMA.
- The following clarifications of the mandate were provided:
 - o Advice is provided to government via the Steering Committee.
 - o The IOAC is seen as a leadership group with broad experience, expertise and linkages into various parts of sector in order to provide advice and guidance and point to where further input is necessary.
 - o Feedback from other parts of planning process will come to the IOAC, which acts as a sounding board to discuss how the feedback fits into the broader process and the whole of the plan.

5. Membership

- The Steering Committee provided an introduction to how membership of the IOAC was conceived through broad consultations on several iterations of PNCIMA Engagement Strategy. Broad feedback led to the conclusion that the table needs to be small enough to enable good discussion. Expanding the group will lead to difficulty, and greatly increase the time needed to reach consensus and have meaningful discussions.
- Changes to engagement approach developed in response to interest for broader involvement expressed throughout community consultations. Sub-regional advisory forums designed to obtain local feedback/perspective/knowledge, and 4 local community seats added to IOAC to increase local knowledge and input into the process.
- Local communities, recreational fishing and marine transportation expressed a desire for additional seats at the IOAC.
- The Steering Committee stressed that the IOAC is not the only place for input to the planning process and that members are not expected to represent all perspectives and views of their sector. Process costs and effectiveness are also important considerations in determining membership.

Action: Planning Office and Steering Committee to do some more thinking around the role of alternates.
--

- Steering Committee conclusion around membership: Given cost and effectiveness considerations, and that there was no consensus around the table as to whether membership should be increased or remain the same, size of IOAC will be maintained at 14 members. An increased role for alternates will be discussed. If this size is found to be unworkable after several meetings, Steering Committee indicated a willingness to reopen the discussion.

6. Process: How are we going to do this?

- The Steering Committee reviewed IOAC Terms of Reference, with particular emphasis on the concept of cooperative problem-solving process, which means IOAC members are not being asked to come to the table with a mandate from their group, but rather to bring a “wise person’s” perspective on their sector for others to hear and understand. Attention drawn to code of conduct which outlines a focused method for problem solving.
- The IOAC’s role is strictly advisory. Advice and recommendations are expected to be at a strategic level and the IOAC is expected to provide leadership to the process.
- Planning Office agreed to provide as much lead time as possible on agenda items, while recognizing that the timelines for the process are very tight and there is much to be accomplished. The work plan will provide guidance as to what IOAC may expect.
- Maintaining public transparency of this process is extremely important, balanced with the need to be able to have good conversations.
- Discussion around “best available information” occurred. It was noted that differences of opinion exist on what constitutes best available information and good science, and that an arrangement around confidentiality of information may be necessary

Action: Amend description of ex officio participation in paragraph 7 of Terms of Reference to remove the term “members”.
Action: Planning Office to amend terms of reference from 48 hour turnaround for notes to 5 business days’ turnaround for notes.
Action: Planning Office to amend terms of reference to be explicit around what is covered for travel expenses.
Action: Planning Office to revise terms of reference to reflect what will be done with evaluations.

Agreement: Public participation at meetings is appropriate, with the option to close meetings available with clear criteria to do so. Public will be required to register in advance or record their participation when they arrive.
--

Case Study – Marine Spatial Planning In Massachusetts (Bud Ehler)

- Massachusetts had clear authority to build a plan through state legislation. The Act set a short timeline for the plan’s completion, established a citizens’ advisory commission and a science advisory council and specified membership to those bodies. The process was led by the Massachusetts Department of Energy and Environmental Affairs.
- Broader stakeholder engagement and some science and technical support was organized through the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership, an independent body that received funding from the Moore Foundation.

- Issue-specific working groups were established to collect spatial and temporal information, characterize baseline conditions and identify priority areas. Working group information went back to government, the citizens' advisory committee and the science advisory council.
- The Ocean Advisory Commission was responsible for translating legislated goals into specific objectives. It operated on a consensus basis and was a group of wise people expected to have connections with their sectors (not formal representatives). It had 17 members – half private representatives (renewable energy, navigation, commercial and recreational fishing industry) and half public representatives (state and local officials).
- The Science Advisory Body was composed entirely of academics appointed by legislation and reported directly to the agency.

7. Getting started

Scoping Issues

- Please see presentation under separate cover
- The Planning Office described the proposed approach to planning, beginning with developing a framework for ecosystem based management that outlines objectives that speak to important cultural, socio-economic, ecological values. An “issues briefs” document will provide more detailed scope for the various issue topics a plan may consider, as well as a methodology for prioritizing those issues.
- The IOAC provided advice on the issues brief concept, suggesting that it would be helpful to understand more clearly what is meant by “intended scope of IM planning on a regional scale” and that it would be helpful to line decision criteria up with goals for the initiative.
- The IOAC advised that there was a need for a source of credible, sound science advice for the process. Science external to the process may occur (ie. with environmental assessments) and it will be useful to ensure the process has access to the most up to date work. It was also noted that some baseline science and knowledge work has already begun, including the PNCIMA Atlas. A concept for how science will be dealt with will be drafted by the Planning Office over the summer and presented to the IOAC at the September meeting.

Action: Issues briefs will be circulated to IOAC in early August with a 4 week turnaround for comments, which will allow for discussion at the September IOAC meeting.
--

Action: Richard Opala, Kaity Stein, Steven Brown, Kim Wright and Nick Heath volunteered to act as a sounding board, provide feedback and input to discussions about science to take place over the summer.
--

PNCIMA Workplan

- Please see work plan and presentation under separate cover
- Thresholds and targets were identified as likely requiring more work than can be achieved in the two year timeframe.

- It was noted that the concept of one large scale public forum per year has been replaced with sub-regional community forums, which will allow for better local-level input and be more cost effective.
- It is anticipated that integration of First Nations plans will occur through the Steering Committee and Planning Office, although this will be dependent on the community and some may wish to present at sub-regional forums.
- Next steps for the work plan are to further refine it and identify key milestones throughout the process.

Action: IOAC members to provide any comments on the work plan to the Planning Office (via Neil) by July 20.

Resourcing and Funding

- Please see presentation under separate cover
- The Steering Committee presented a nominal budget for the PNCIMA initiative, discussing funds that are currently available through DFO budget, gaps and a proposal to fill those gaps. It was noted that interim funding has been provided by the Moore Foundation to cover items like costs for this meeting and short term staffing for the Planning Office.
- Support from other government departments to the initiative is generally in kind through staff time spent on the initiative. First Nations also bring resources to the table through in kind contributions of staff time. The budget presented does not include these in kind contributions.
- External funding for the initiative is intended to fund PNCIMA activities that fall within 3 specific criteria. Without funding support from Moore Foundation, an integrated management plan will still be delivered, but it may take longer and be less comprehensive.
- Concern was expressed by individual members that Moore Foundation is affiliated with environmental organizations and specific agendas; that accepting funding from a US organization is a sovereignty issue; and that inadequate funding from the federal government speaks to a lack of commitment to the project.
- It was noted that all work planned for PNCIMA aligns with the *Oceans Act*, and the work plan, vision, objectives and intentions speak to that. In order for Moore Foundation to be comfortable in offering support, they look for indication that plan is comprehensive, takes a spatial approach and engages all sectors. These interests are compatible with *Oceans Act* guidance for integrated oceans management.
- Support expressed for external funding if work plan supported by broad based group, opportunity to review budget, transparency in process, alignment with PNCIMA vision, objectives, funding criteria.

Action: Bill Wareham, Matt Burns and a commercial fishing representative volunteered to act as a sounding board, provide feedback and input to discussions about external funding to take place over the summer, including discussion of work plan and notional budget for the initiative, criteria for accepting external funding, structure and criteria for

an IOAC capacity fund.

Action: IOAC to consider funding criteria and provide feedback to the Planning Office (via Neil) by July 20.

8. Linking to other advisory and planning processes

- Discussion abbreviated due to time constraints, but acknowledgment provided that many other marine planning processes are under way that have links with PNCIMA. Federal agencies recognize the importance of coordination, streamlining, efficiency and are working on a proposal for improved coordination.
- Next steps: proposal will be provided to IOAC for feedback.

9. Joint assessment and commitment to proceed

- 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 (see Appendix A).
- Subject to resolution or clarification of the outstanding structural and process issues highlighted in Appendix A, the table acknowledged its general mandate and agreed to proceed to the next meeting of the IOAC.

10. Next steps

1. Membership

- DFO to follow up with Regional Districts and Shipping Industry if required, to further discuss their participation in the committee

2. Terms of Reference

- Planning Office to revise and finalize, including:
 - o defining key terms
 - o considering time frame of plan and how to be future oriented
 - o identifying training needs
 - o also see appendix A for further updates

3. Science

- members of IOAC identified (Richard O., Kaity S., Steven B., Kim W., Nick H.) for small working group to consider science structure over the summer

4. Issues briefs document

- IOAC members to review and provide feedback over the summer (provided to IOAC in early August, members to review with sectors and provide initial comments to Planning Office within 3 or 4 weeks)

5. Resourcing and funding

- members of IOAC (commercial fishing industry, Bill W., Matt B.) identified for small working group to consider resourcing/funding over the summer, including:
 - o criteria for accepting funds

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ work plan and budget○ capacity funds- all IOAC members invited to provide general input to criteria and work plan by July 20 |
|--|

11. Next meeting dates

- September 20-21, 2010 Prince Rupert, Crest Hotel – meeting will starting at noon on the 20th and adjourn later in the evening to accommodate travel
- November 24-25, 2010
- February 22 23, 2011
- April 20-21, 2011 (note Easter)
- June 8-9, 2011

Action: All to notify Planning Office (via Neil) of significant conflicts with proposed dates by July 7.
--

Action: All to send a brief bio and photo to the Planning Office (via Neil)

Action: All to email Craig Darling with suggestions for facilitation
--