

**PNCIMA Integrated Oceans Advisory Committee – Summary Notes
Meeting #6 | September 14-15, 2011 | Prince Rupert, BC**

Members and Alternates:

Sector	Member	Alternates Present
Commercial Fisheries	Jim McIsaac	Dan Edwards, Arnie Nagy
Local Communities (Skeena Queen Charlotte Regional District)	Des Nobels	
Local Communities (Mount Waddington Regional District)	Al Huddlestan	
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	
Recreation	Nick Heath	
Recreational Fisheries	Urs Thomas	
Non-renewable Energy	Kim Johnson	Ken MacDonald
Renewable Energy	Matt Burns	

Facilitator:

Craig Darling

Observers and Ex Officio:

Steve Diggon	Coastal First Nations observer
Charlie Short	Province of British Columbia observer
Josie Byington	PNCIMA contractor
Susan Dean	PNCIMA contractor
Neil Davis	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bonnie Antcliffe	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bruce Reid	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Amy Wakelin	Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Denise Zinn	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Barb Faggetter	Observer
Kennard D Hall	Observer
Andrew Mayer	PNCIMA Steering Committee member
G. Les Clayton	Observer
Devlin Fernandes	Observer
Criag Outhet	Observer
Mike Ambach	Observer
Bruce Watkinson	Observer
Erica Olson	Observer

Item	Discussion Summary	Recommendations	Action Items/ Next Steps
Day 1			
Opening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome/Introductions Announcements/Housekeeping matters addressed Agenda review 	No Recommendations.	No Action Items.
DFO Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on plan changes and proposed path forward with respect to plan and process 	No Recommendations.	Action Item: DFO to post its PowerPoint presentations in Dropbox.
Roundtable Thoughts on Changes within PNCIMA	<p>Discussion Point: The following feedback on the recent changes within PNCIMA was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Province, Coastal First Nations, Local Government, and Commercial Fisheries expressed disappointment with DFO's decision to withdraw from PNCIMA's support MOU and are now evaluating their next steps. The Prince Rupert Port Authority would like to continue to participate in the PNCIMA process. Renewable Energy is disappointed that the scope of the process has been reduced but is committed to moving 	No Recommendations.	No Action Items.

	<p>forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Renewable Energy and Marine Transportation support DFO's choice to withdraw from the support MOU and plan to continue their participation in PNCIMA. • Marine Conservation and Recreational Fisheries plan to gather information on what the new planning process will look like and to then assess whether and how they will participate moving forward. 		
<p>DFO Update on the Planning Process</p>	<p>Discussion Point: IOAC members asked several questions following DFO's presentation on their proposed revisions to the planning process. The following bullet points summarize the information provided by DFO in response to the IOAC's questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk analysis, if used as a tool within the new planning process, would be conducted with input from experts (e.g., science experts, policy experts, etc.) and stakeholders most relevant to the types of risk being assessed. • DFO will revisit how it will bring technical advice to the planning process, and will draw on its own capacity for science and research as well as explore other options for obtaining additional information (e.g., workshops, synergies with other federal processes). • An ecosystem-based approach will continue to be used. • The IOAC is intended to be maintained for stakeholder engagement and sub-regional forums will continue to be held in PNCIMA communities. The scope and frequency of IOAC and sub-regional forum meetings will be revisited in light of recent developments. • DFO will identify what the integrated ocean management plan will look like and will then assess what process is needed to create that plan. The budget necessary to support that process will then be identified. • DFO recognizes that the process for creating the integrated ocean management plan is an important component of planning. 	<p>No Recommendations.</p>	<p>No Action Items.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no plan at this point to change the IOAC’s working arrangement as a group seeking to develop consensus advice and recommendations. • In its new form, PNCIMA will continue to serve as an umbrella initiative that connects other initiatives from the local, regional, provincial and national levels. • The new planning process will be streamlined and refocused relative to how it was in the past. • DFO is committed to completing a plan for PNCIMA by our pre-existing timeline of December 2012. <p>Discussion Point: Marine Conservation noted that members of the IOAC agreed to support the PNCIMA process when they joined the IOAC and that Stephen Brown, on behalf of Marine Transportation, has actively lobbied that recommendations put forth by the IOAC do not impact his industry. Marine Conservation questioned whether individuals, such as Stephen Brown, have a place at the IOAC table. Stephen Brown had no response. The Prince Rupert Port Authority responded that many of the IOAC members have dual interests and that having various interests does not compromise their ability to contribute to the planning process.</p> <p>Discussion Point: Many members of the IOAC are concerned about funding and resources for the new planning process, particularly funding to support credible science (e.g., the MTAT) and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Discussion Point: Numerous IOAC members questioned the level of trust within the current planning process.</p> <p>Discussion Point: Local Government asked whether the support MOU can continue without the federal government. DFO responded that it is moving forward using government resources and that it can’t speak on behalf of the Province</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>and First Nations regarding how they may move forward with external funding. DFO reiterated that it prefers to have one planning process with all parties involved.</p> <p>Discussion Point: The Province and First Nations expressed uncertainty regarding when they would have a plan for how they intend to participate moving forward, but speculated that things may become clearer in the next several weeks. DFO suggested it would like to meet with the Province and First Nations to discuss moving forward.</p>		
Day 2			
IOAC Member/Alternate Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IOAC members and alternates held a closed meeting to discuss their next steps. DFO and observers were asked to leave the meeting room for this discussion. 	No Recommendations.	No Action Items.
IOAC Member/Alternate Check-in with DFO	<p>Discussion Point: The IOAC informed DFO that it is in the process of creating a letter outlining how the IOAC would like to see DFO's planning process move forward. The IOAC asked that the table reconvene in a face-to-face meeting in October 2011 to establish the next steps forward. DFO responded that it would also like to reconvene in the fall and that it will seek to set a date for an IOAC meeting with DFO in late October or November to address the IOAC's letter as well as to discuss a revised plan.</p>	No Recommendations.	<p>Action Item: IOAC to craft and send a letter outlining how it would like to see DFO's planning process move forward.</p> <p>Action Item: DFO to organize an IOAC meeting in late October or November 2011 to address the IOAC's letter and discuss next steps.</p>