

**PNCIMA Integrated Oceans Advisory Committee**

**Summary Meeting Notes**

Meeting 2 — September 20-21, 2010 | The Crest Hotel, Prince Rupert

These notes summarize discussion items, advice given, actions, and next steps from the meeting of the IOAC on September 20-21 in Prince Rupert, BC. The notes are subject to review and comment by IOAC members before being posted to the PNCIMA website.

**Members and Alternates**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Alternates Present</b>
Aquaculture	Richard Opala	
Commercial Fisheries	Jim McIsaac (interim)	Arnie Nagy (interim)
Commercial Fisheries	Lorena Hamer (interim)	Dan Edwards (interim)
Local Communities (Skeena Queen Charlotte)	Des Nobels	
Local Communities (Mount Waddington)	Al Huddleston	
Local Communities (Strathcona)	Jim Abram	
Marine Conservation	Kim Wright	Bill Wareham
Marine Transportation	Kaity Stein	
Marine Transportation	Stephen Brown	Ross Cameron
Recreation	Nick Heath	
Recreational Fisheries	Urs Thomas	
Renewable Energy	Matt Burns	
Tourism	Evan Loveless	

**Facilitator**

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

**Observers and Ex Officio:**

Amy Wakelin (Day 2)	DFO / PNCIMA Planning Office
Bruce Reid	DFO
Bruce Watkinson	NCSFNSS / PNCIMA Steering Committee
Charlie Short	Province of British Columbia
Gary Coons	MLA North Coast
George Baker (Day 2)	Muskeg News
Greg Savard	DFO / PNCIMA Steering Committee

Jim Irvine (Day 2)	DFO Science
John Bones	Nanwakolas Council / PNCIMA Planning Office
Joy Thorkelson	UFAWU-CAW / City of Prince Rupert
Lesley MacDougall	DFO
Maya Paul	NCSFNSS / PNCIMA Planning Office
Mel Kotyk (Day 2)	DFO
Neil Davis	DFO / PNCIMA Planning Office
Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations – Great Bear Initiative / PNCIMA Planning Office

### **Meeting Purpose**

- a. To review overarching goals for the PNCIMA initiative
- b. To confirm funding arrangements for the initiative
- c. To scope the issues and outputs of the planning process
- d. To review the structure and role for scientific advice to the initiative, and to initiate a scientific advisor nomination process.

### **Day 1**

#### **1. Welcome and introductions**

Bruce Watkinson welcomed participants on behalf of the NCSFNSS and the PNCIMA Steering Committee.

#### **2. Confirming the agenda**

The members confirmed the proposed agenda with the addition of a PNCIMA governance update (see item 4).

#### **3. Reviewing action items (from June 28-29 meeting)**

Action items carried over to November meeting:

- a. Define key terms – list not finalized yet
- b. Timeframe of the plan – seeking to confirm
- c. Identify training needs – some currently identified and process in ongoing

#### **4. PNCIMA governance update**

BC will participate in a tripartite approach to PNCIMA governance (Canada, First Nations, BC), subject to approval of a proposal for an external funding grant from the Moore Foundation. The PNCIMA boundaries will not change as a result of BC's participation.

#### **5. Establishing a process for concluding discussions on agenda items**

The members and the facilitator discussed how to more effectively achieve closure on agenda items. Suggestions for achieving greater clarity and shared understanding included: 1) more regular intervention by the facilitator to summarize discussion and check-in for understanding; 2) members assisting by signalling a lack of clarity; 3)

---

<sup>1</sup> The Meeting Agenda for the end of Day 1 and Day 2 was amended to accommodate extended discussion on external funding. These notes reflect the changes.

greater use of visual aids to confirm consensus; 4) more detail in the description of agenda items (making clear what is information only and not open to discussion); 5) Steering Committee/Planning Office caucusing during meetings to address uncertainty among members; 6) generally, all participants sharing responsibility to ensure effective closure.

## 6. Affirming modifications to the IOAC TOR

### a. Wording Changes:

#### **Actions:**

1. *The Planning Office will endeavour to circulate the meeting agenda and supporting materials as early as possible. Planning Office will revise IOAC ToR to clarify that it shall seek to circulate meeting materials that require review 2 weeks in advance of meetings.*
2. *Planning Office to amend section 23 for clarity to read '5 business days' (rather than 1 week) for member review and comment.*
3. *The Planning Office will advise members in advance if claimable travel expenses become limited.*
4. *The Planning Office will confirm timeframe for submitting expense claims and receiving payment.*

### b. IOAC Membership update:

The Planning Office advised that IOAC membership had been amended to include one additional member for Local Communities and one additional member for Shipping and Transportation.

#### **Actions:**

5. *Planning Office will amend Section 5 of the ToR to reflect membership changes.*

## 7. Re-affirming overall goals and objectives

Goals and objectives for the initiative were summarized from the "Context for the PNCIMA initiative planning process" document available at the PNCIMA website.

## 8. Discussing the Marine Technical Advisory Team (MTAT) TOR and nomination process [see summary document and draft ToR circulated with meeting materials]

- a. The Planning Office provided an overview of the draft ToR confirming the document is a 'work-in-progress' and invited comment. Discussion focused on time and resource commitment; group size; criteria used for selection, composition, & qualifications of members; dispute resolution process.
- b. Planning office confirmed that IOAC ToR provide scope for IOAC sectors to identify sectoral experts that could contribute input to scientific and technical discussions involving the MTAT.

#### **Actions:**

6. *The Planning Office will revise the MTAT TOR to: clarify a small core group of generalists in biological sciences, physical sciences, socio-economics, and TEK/LEK that*

- plays an ongoing role of the MTAT; add marine economy to the list in section 5 that will form the larger pool of expertise that will be drawn on as needed;*
7. *Planning Office will circulate the revision for review by members in advance of November IOAC meeting. Planning office will convene a subcommittee meeting only if significant issues arise from IOAC review of revisions.*

## 9. External funding

- a. Confirming progress on funding proposal [see capacity fund overview and external funding support arrangements documents circulated with meeting materials]

The Planning Office described the external funding arrangement, prompting extended discussion on the principle of external funding for governments. Members are concerned that 1) it is the federal governments responsibility to fund the entire initiative 2) the integrity of the planning process might be compromised by external funding; and, 3) the PNCIMA process proceed with sufficient resources, and in particular adequate funding for meaningful stakeholder participation.

The Ex Officio participants advised that the participating First Nations, DFO, and BC have considered the implications and are willing to move forward with external funding arrangements, with the appropriate checks and balances in place to preserve existing decision making arrangements, transparency, fairness etc..

## Day 2

### External funding (continued)

The members discussed the external funding issue, acknowledged the need to accommodate the interests of all members, expressed a reluctant willingness to move forward, and agreed to communicate the IOAC's concerns to the federal government as well as the Steering Committee. Some members indicated they would need to go back to their sectors to ensure that this approach is consistent with their sector's views on external funding.

### **Decision:**

*The IOAC agreed to articulate its concerns related to the external funding arrangement in two letters – one to the federal government (specifically, to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans with copies to the Prime Minister and PNCIMA MPs) and one to the PNCIMA Steering Committee.*

*The letter to Minister will be constructive and emphasize the importance of PNCIMA and long-term integrated oceans management planning, and the importance of sufficient funding to support this. All IOAC members will sign this letter.*

*The letter to PNCIMA Steering Committee will be in the form of a memo formalizing the IOAC's interest in ensuring that external funding does not threaten the integrity of the process.*

### **Actions:**

8. *Ross Cameron and Stephen Brown will draft the letter to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in the next week [September 22-29]. Des Nobels, Kim Wright, and Dan Edwards*

*will review and edit. The revised draft will be circulated to all IOAC members for review and signature.*

**9. [Question to Members: Who is drafting the memo to the Steering Committee?]**

**10. Discussing the Issue Outputs and Tasks (IOT) document**

The Planning Office introduced the IOT document and invited the IOAC to pose questions and share initial thoughts, acknowledging that a process and timeline for detailed review and comment is required. During the course of discussion the Planning Office noted that:

- a. The Steering Committee will respond to advice given in the manner described in section 145 of the IOAC ToR. Options coming out of working groups would come to IOAC; leadership of process has role to play in taking what they have heard and moving forward, providing rationale.
- b. Proprietary information will be respected; perhaps through data sharing agreements.
- c. There will be time at end of process for IOAC to review the complete plan.

Points made by members included:

- a. The need to address compensation for lost economic opportunities and ensure that those who are being impacted by decisions are respected.
- b. Recognition of competition for marine space by different interests with growing use of ocean space. There are more interests than there were in the past – we need to work together to figure out how to develop a plan that will accommodate all of the interests.
- c. There needs to be room for discussions on impacts.
- d. Principles of EBM dictate that you cannot take issues (i.e. compensation) off the table at the beginning of the discussion – this needs to be recognized.

***Actions:***

*10. The Planning Office will email the IOT Presentation (a Power Point file) to IOAC members.*

*11. Members will review the IOT document and submit comments to the Planning Office by Oct 19. The Planning Office will revise the document taking IOAC comments into account. The revised document will be reviewed at the November IOAC meeting.*

**11. Recapping the PNCIMA work plan**

Points of discussion include:

- a. Planning office clarified that the fund manager described would liaise with Tides to report on budget, expenditures etc
- b. BC clarified that employees within BC government would be paid directly by Tides as term employees.
- c. Planning Office confirmed that Tides and Moore Foundation are aware that the work plan has expanded and know the approximate dollar figure
- d. Planning Office confirmed that the budget presented is for the two year term, it is not expressed in annual terms

## 12. Capacity Fund Proposal

[see Capacity Fund and External Funding Support Arrangements documents]

The Planning Office described the Capacity Fund and responded to questions, indicating that:

- a. Dec 2010 is the earliest for external funding and the budget covers a 2-year timeframe.
- b. Costs to date are being covered by the DFO budget and funds within Tides.
- c. The Steering Committee chose not to increase the capacity fund budget to ensure a balanced proposal.
- d. A line item for contingencies was not included in the funding proposal but the Planning Office tried to incorporate additional meetings, etc.
- e. The percentages noted in the budget proposal are intended to highlight the proportion of the total allocated to each element.
- f. The capacity fund includes regional governments.

**Actions:**

12. Planning Office will ask Steering Committee if they are willing to provide their meeting minutes to the IOAC.

### *IOAC Subcommittee Report*

The subcommittee identified to explore options for sector access to the capacity fund reported that:

- a. The capacity fund is designed to help IOAC members communicate with their sectors (e.g., meetings with sector, coordination within sector, prepping background materials, costs of communication).
- b. The budget for supporting stakeholder capacity has been increased from \$500K to \$750K. Capacity funds are additional to support provided for travel, accommodation, etc.

The subcommittee recommended that each sector be allowed to choose either:

- a. not to access the capacity fund
- b. access the fund without a formal proposal if the amount required was under \$5 or 10K (\$ amount to be confirmed)
- c. complete a full proposal if larger amounts were required.

**Actions:**

13. Each sector agreed to review the options for accessing the capacity fund and indicate its choice to the Planning Office at the next IOAC meeting.

14. Post meeting note – sectors are also requested to identify the approximate \$ amount they are likely to require from the capacity fund by the next IOAC meeting.

- a. One member queried the need for an independent ombudsperson, suggesting that there may be some comfort with a senior person from DFO outside of the steering committee (for example, perhaps someone from DFO finance).
- b. IOAC undertook a preliminary estimate of requirements from each sector. Based on the very approximate estimates, it appears that the uneven distribution based

on needs (which vary among sectors) may leave enough \$ for the needs of all sectors.

**Actions:**

15. Planning Office will follow up with the Steering Committee regarding the suggestions about the need for Ombudsperson vs a senior DFO staff member.

**Decision:**

The IOAC indicated its support for the 3-tiered approach recommended by the subcommittee.

**13. DFO State of the Ocean Report – Jim Irvine**

- e. The IOAC was asked if there was interest in meeting a few times to provide input on how the state of the ocean report could inform the PNCIMA planning process i.e. appropriate indicators, etc.

**Actions:**

16. Sectors interested in contributing will contact Jim Irvine or Neil Davis to provide names of those who may be able to participate as soon as possible.

**14. Easy Projects intro – data/doc storage, timeline and meeting info**

The Planning Office announced it will be adopting Easy Projects (a web-based project management software) to facilitate PNCIMA document sharing.

**Actions:**

17. Planning office will send members login information for easy projects, and post IOAC member contact information at the site.

**15. Confirming the facilitator**

The members confirmed the selection of the facilitator.

**16. Action item summary**

**17. Next meeting dates**

The Planning Office proposed Nov 24/25 in Port Hardy. The Local Communities members indicated a scheduling conflict and proposed Nov 23/24. The Recreational Fisheries member also noted a conflict.

**Actions:**

18. The Planning Office will send out meeting dates to members and alternates.  
 19. The Planning Office will poll members and confirm next meeting dates.  
 20. IOAC members will forward a photo and brief bio note to the Planning Office for use on the PNCIMA website as soon as possible.

**18. Adjourn**