

**PNCIMA Integrated Oceans Advisory Committee Meeting Notes
November 29-30, 2011 - Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel, Richmond, BC**

**Meeting Participants:
Members and Alternates:**

Sector	Member	Alternates Present
Commercial Fisheries	Jim McIsaac Lorena Hamer	
Local Communities (Mount Waddington Regional District)	Al Huddleston	
Local Communities (Strathcona Regional District)	Jim Abram	
Local Communities (Central Coast Regional District)	Brian Lande	
Marine Conservation	Kim Wright	Bill Wareham
Marine Transportation	Stephen Brown	Ross Cameron Phillip Nelson
Recreation	Nick Heath	Alan Thompson
Recreational Fisheries	Urs Thomas	Rupert Gale
Non-renewable Energy	Kim Johnson	Ken MacDonald
Renewable Energy	Matt Burns	
Tourism	Evan Loveless	
Aquaculture	Richard Opala	

Facilitator:

Craig Darling

Observers and Ex Officio:

Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations
Keeva Kehler	Province of British Columbia
Allan Lidstone	Province of British Columbia
Angela Stadel	Environment Canada
Panos Grames	David Suzuki Foundation
Sabine Jessen	Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society
Neil Davis	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bonnie Antcliffe	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bruce Reid	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Sheila Creighton	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Rebecca Martone	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Patrick Marshall	Coastal Community Network, Ocean Industries BC

OPENING

Welcome/Introductions

Agenda Review

- agenda confirmed

1. ACTION ITEM REVIEW

Action Item	Status	Follow Up Actions
DFO to post power point presentations into dropbox	Complete	DFO to set up new dropbox system
IOAC to craft letter to Steering Committee	Complete. Letter received and responded to by DFO in mid October	
DFO to organize IOAC meeting to address letter and discuss next steps in moving forward	Complete	

2. PLANNING PROCESS UPDATE

Status of Collaborative Governance

- Bonnie Antcliffe reported that DFO has held discussions with collaborative governance partners and remains interested in moving forward collaboratively. Federal partners have indicated support for a more focused, revised plan.
- Allan Lidstone advised that the Province of BC will continue to work with the federal government and will wait to hear from First Nations. The Province is seeking to understand how a new Steering Committee will be shaped.
- Steve Diggon advised that Coastal First Nations have been re-evaluating the nature of their participation in PNCIMA since DFO's decision to withdraw from the support MOU. First Nations have expressed concerns to stakeholders and to DFO directly. They have provided a list of requirements to DFO that will determine the nature of their engagement. In the meantime, First Nations continue to work in marine planning and are working with Province to explore the extent of shared interests with province. For this meeting, First Nations will participate as an observer.

The following points of clarification on collaborative governance were made through a Q&A session:

- Other federal departments are contributing to PNCIMA through in-kind contributions

- DFO is committed to complete the revised plan. They have met with all sectors to determine needs for travel support. DFO will leverage additional resources, if needed, to complete plan on time and on budget.
- The Province is continuing to participate in PNCIMA primarily with their own funding. They will continue to work with external funders for marine planning with First Nations, and will use that funding to support their work.

DFO Report Out on Bilateral Meetings with IOAC sectors

Bonnie Antcliffe reported that DFO has held meetings with each IOAC sector over the past month. Discussions covered issues relating to process, the revised plan, issues or concerns about moving forward, and funding support needs.

Themes that emerged from the bilateral meetings include:

- Collective interest in moving past discussions about process, and moving towards a focus on products and the plan;
- Shared recognition of need to do the work within the time and resources available;
- A desire to use examples of how the plan will move forward to help to build understanding. DFO has tried to build examples into presentations for this meeting;
- Overall agreement that a risk based approach is a sensible approach and that the challenge will be to address uncertainty;
- Importance of diverse and credible scientific expertise and adopting a science based approach
- Importance of linking to related planning processes more effectively, and streamlining the PNCIMA process with them;
- Importance of laying out key places and junctures where IOAC will have input;
- Importance of identifying the linkage between objectives and outcomes of risk assessment.

3. A REVISED WORKPLAN FOR PNCIMA

Neil Davis presented the revised approach to planning for PNCIMA and summarized the major tasks, associated timelines, upcoming meetings and opportunities for continued engagement of the IOAC and public interests.

In response to questions from IOAC members on the revised workplan, clarification was provided on the following issues:

- The implementation/adaptive management part of the revised workplan is part of the national approach to marine planning. DFO expects that there will be some “local twists” to ensure the plan is relevant in the north coast context.
- DFO has 3 strategic outcomes (sustainable ecosystems, economically prosperous fisheries, and safe and secure waters). All policy documents try to align with

these strategic outcomes. The concept of “supporting opportunities to generate wealth” is taken from Canada’s Oceans Strategy.

- Sub-regional forums will be a part of the revised workplan and process.
- Under the revised workplan, there is no capacity to support working groups. DFO will look at their underlying function (i.e. bringing people together to provide feedback on key pieces), and seek to achieve this in other ways.

Clarification was also provided around various aspects of VECs:

- Need to be aware of the changing nature of VECs over time when they are characterized, and recognize that there are limitations in terms of what we can do with these tools.
- It will be important to maintain a balance between ecological and socio-economic VECs, bearing in mind that many economic and cultural values are derived from ecological resources.
- The first step in identifying VECs will be information gathering. Consideration of conflicts between VECs is a more detailed step that comes later.
- Experts will be brought in to inform how particular activities and components interact, and the levels of risk associated with interactions. Who these experts are will vary depending on the specific risks and VECs in question.

4. A REVISED ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR PNCIMA

Neil Davis presented a revised PNCIMA planning process and recommendations for working together in a new context.

Requirements from engagement to ensure better informed planning products:

1. provide opportunity for stakeholder dialogue and exchange;
2. provide opportunity for broader public communication and comment; and
3. provide opportunity for expert scientific and technical input

The following questions emerged from a Q&A session that followed the presentation:

- The new planning process speaks only to DFO “in-house” capacity; not that of other collaborative governance partners.
- The *Oceans Act* mandates DFO to lead in moving the plan forward. DFO is trying to be flexible while moving forward on a tight timeline. As further input on process is received, DFO will try to incorporate it. (e.g. provisional objectives may need to be adapted as collaborative governance framework evolves, and other parties become more formally engaged).
- A sub-regional advisory forum is planned for the fall of 2012, recognizing that the plan may not be sufficiently developed to share with the public in the spring, and summer is not a good time for most people. Members expressed concern that the timing of fall forums may be a little late. DFO acknowledged the concern and agreed to explore options to accommodate.

- Regional Districts indicated a willingness to work with DFO to explore ways of supplementing sub-regional forums with earlier public input opportunities (e.g, feedback opportunities on the website)

IOAC discussion: Optimising Stakeholder and Public Engagement:

Members explored ideas for optimising stakeholder and public engagement to accommodate the changes in the PNCIMA workplan.

Highlights of the discussion included:

- There is interest in using online tools between meetings to help advance work provided it is possible (simple, efficient and workable given varying levels of expertise and internet infrastructure).
- Most sectors have tools available to work together online, but there is a need to be aware of the limitations of technology, and that not everyone is comfortable working online.
- Many members have participated in web conferences/webinars and most agreed that they are effective, especially in revising documents and saving on travel costs.
- Questionnaires may be helpful between meetings to consolidate information and narrow the scope of issues, allowing face-to-face sessions meetings to focus on problem solving.
- Web-based versions of questionnaires are recommended.
- The PNCIMA website is still a valuable tool for public outreach and collecting ongoing input and feedback. (e.g. could be used to collect feedback on draft plan prior to sub-regional forum in fall 2012)
- The website may also be a means of inviting the interested “national public” to have a voice on PNCIMA products.
- Newsletters can also used to inform people about key junctures in the planning process. They are sent out to all on the PNCIMA list serve.
- More consideration is needed for developing tools that are suitable for gathering input between meetings to prepare for in person meetings, or collecting feedback on specific products and potentially to resolve issues
- It is critical to ensure that DFO has the resources to support whatever tools are being proposed

Action Items

- DFO to follow up with Local Government and Recreational Fishing to explore options for virtual communications
- DFO to identify priority needs for website and update it
- DFO to explore other online engagement options
- DFO to research and identify options for completing interactive forms online

5. REVIEWING EBM WORK TO DATE

Neil Davis reviewed the context for EBM, steps, terminology, and the framework (assumptions, principles, definition, and categories) as well as the IOAC consensus recommendations on EBM goals.

The following questions and comments around EBM goals emerged from a Q&A session that followed the presentation:

- The sub-group that worked on IOAC goals missed addressing the “spiritual” component of Goal 2. There was no disagreement voiced with the inclusion of “spiritual”.
- One member suggested there was greater understanding around the term “healthy ecosystems” rather than “ecosystem integrity”.
- One member expressed concern that the IOAC invested time in refining goal statements and they have since been changed again by the Steering Committee. DFO responded that the IOAC process worked as anticipated, providing consensus advice that strongly informed the draft outcome.
- One member suggested that the IOAC had been looking for goal 4 to include both information gathering and adaptive management. DFO clarified that goals are intended to be an end-state, and as such the concepts of an implementation plan and adaptive management were determined to fit better as objectives.
- Keeping in mind that goals are intended to be end-states, verbs don’t appear in the statements.
- The goals will remain draft until the whole plan comes together, at which point there will be opportunity for further comment.

6. PNCIMA ECOSYSTEM BASED MANAGEMENT: PROVISIONAL OBJECTIVES

Neil Davis that introduced provisional EBM objectives for PNCVIMA, explained how they were developed, and reviewed the criteria for assessing the provisional objectives.

The following questions and comments around provisional objectives emerged from a Q&A session that followed the presentation:

- Objectives are the things we do to move towards end states (i.e. goals); they are not intended to be end states.
- Objectives will be clarified further through more specific strategies and actions that will also appear in the plan. Goals, objectives, strategies and actions are a “nested” set of concepts.
- A review of the verbs at the beginning of objective statements is required (e.g. minimize/maximize, promote/encourage)
- Terminology in some objective statements needs to be clarified (e.g. certainty, resiliency)

A plenary discussion on criteria also took place, with the following points highlighting the discussion:

- The IOAC is only being asked to consider some of the criteria, recognizing that the application of other criteria may be better suited to the work of scientists/experts (e.g. measurability). Input on these other criteria is welcome from the IOAC, but is not the focus of our discussion here.
- Some members noted that some objectives haven't been worded in a measurable way (e.g. hard to measure respect)
- The provisional objectives have been reviewed by the Province and other federal agencies, but not by First Nations. DFO will continue to provide opportunities for ongoing input, as the collaborative governance arrangement continues to evolve.

7. GROUP WORK ON PROVISIONAL EBM OBJECTIVES:

Three breakout groups were formed and participants were asked to review and assess provisional objectives against criteria, guided by a questionnaire that was circulated. The objective of the exercise was to “test the water”, and identify initial reactions to the objectives. The questionnaire was used as a “vehicle” for input.

Highlights from the group work included the following comments:

Group 1 (Facilitated by Neil Davis)

- Overall, the language in most objectives is “ok”, with most needing some work.
- Applying the criteria was somewhat clunky. Some criteria may not be appropriate for this level of objectives, or DFO needs to clarify how the criteria can be more appropriately applied to objectives like these.
- Several terms need to be defined.
- The verbs at the beginning of objective statements need particular attention

Group 2 (Facilitated by Bruce Reid)

- Some objectives need more work
- Most objectives were “OK” – with the need for some fine tuning of the wording
- Goal 4 objectives were “mostly ok” or “sounds good”
- Some terms need to be added to the glossary
- Modify language based on verbs at the beginning of objectives statements
- Criteria are “clunky” – they overlap.
- Hard to know how to appropriately apply the criteria – need to be modified.

Group 3: (Facilitated by Sheila Creighton)

- Goals are often clearer than objectives. Need to carry the goal language forward into objectives to strengthen them and create a clearer linkage between the two.

- One way of clarifying objectives under Goal 1 would be to split them up into more objectives (seems like more than one objective is in some statements)
- Concern over how to handle cumulative effects – Is it a principle? An objective?
- Check to ensure that glossary is comprehensive and complete

Next steps/Action Items:

DFO will:

- 1) provide a written summary of what was heard from IOAC members on objectives and criteria;
- 2) develop a set of revised objectives based on feedback; and
- 3) Develop a backgrounder that lays out the broader context behind the objectives. It should be a narrative of “how we got here”, within the context of the EBM framework;
- 4) Develop a mechanism or tool for gathering feedback in the next round – possibly a questionnaire.

Potential Dates for Socio-Economic Workshop:

Feb 6, 8 or 13, 2012. DFO will follow up to confirm shortly.

Next IOAC Meeting:

Week of March 12, 2012 in the Lower Mainland. DFO will follow up to confirm shortly.