
PNCIMA Forum March 26th and 27th 2009

Summary Overview

Prepared By:



Education

Gordon Sloan

Andrew Fulton

For:

**Coastal First Nations
Turning point Initiative**

Canada 

**North Coast – Skeena
First Nations Stewardship Society**



April 17, 2009

Comment from the Authors

This report is prepared by ADR Education, a B.C. firm which has a national practice in conflict resolution and facilitation. We are engaged in myriad contexts to assist in discussions about multiple (and sometimes conflicting) uses, interests and values. Our work is always facilitative; that is, we do not engage in a decision-making role or in adjudication. Much of our work concentrates on resource and ecology issues and is multi-party in nature. Inevitably, we work with parties interested in questions of public policy.

Our role in assisting in the PNCIMA Forum was to help capture the values and ideas presented by participants. These have been summarized in this report. We do that as neutral parties, hoping to provide an accurate synopsis of the many themes and options advanced during the Forum. Our experience has been that when all interested parties, First Nations and governments design and build an integrated plan, it is irresistible to those who will be affected by its terms. We think the PNCIMA Initiative has the opportunity to enjoy this sort of participation.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
1 Context.....	4
2 Vision.....	6
2.1 Community Based.....	6
2.2 Healthy Oceans	6
2.3 Role of First Nations	6
2.4 Integration	7
2.5 Wealth of knowledge	7
2.6 Timeline: Urgency	7
2.7 Capacity	8
2.8 Implementable/Enforceable	8
2.9 Monitoring/Evaluation.....	8
2.10 Principles of the Vision:.....	8
3 Engagement Strategy	10
3.1 Relationships/Trust/Accountability	10
3.2 Complexity – Scale and Issues	10
3.3 Representation.....	11
3.4 Roles and Responsibilities	12
3.5 Capacity	13
3.6 Timeline	13
3.7 Communication.....	14
3.8 Stakeholder Organization.....	14
3.9 Principles of Engagement	15
4 Challenges.....	17
5 Messages and Next Steps.....	19
5.1 Messages	19
5.2 Next Steps	20
5.3 Commitment	21
6 Conclusion	23

1 Context

The Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area (PNCIMA) Initiative held its inaugural Forum March 26-27, 2009 in Richmond British Columbia. Attended by over 300 people, in addition to approximately 80 more people through webcasting, the Forum was a long awaited start to creating an integrated management planning process for the Pacific North Coast as well as an opportunity to learn and give input into what that process may become.

The Forum was preceded by five one day preparatory meetings in the PNCIMA region in the communities of Skidegate, Masset, Prince Rupert, Kitimat and Port Hardy. These preparatory meetings gave the Forum organizers and PNCIMA Steering Committee an understanding of stakeholder expectations, created an opportunity for local input from those who could not attend the Forum, allowed for a refinement of the Forum agenda and advertised the Forum in general. An overview and the notes from these meetings may be found on the PNCIMA website.

From these preparatory meetings and other discussions with stakeholders there were a number of messages the participants were interested in seeing delivered. Of these messages three were consistently identified as priorities;

- Understanding DFO's commitment to the PNCIMA Initiative,
- Building a common vision for what a plan may encompass,
- Understanding stakeholder involvement in the process.

There was some criticism of the Richmond location for being out of the PNCIMA region. However, there were compelling reasons to attend the Forum, coupled with incentives of travel funding and webcasting to make it accessible to those in the PNCIMA region.

The format of the Forum was designed to provide an initial introduction to the PNCIMA Initiative, its context, current governance framework and the Federal Government's commitment. Participants were encouraged to participate in breakout sessions, supported by plenary speakers' case studies and examples, to provide the raw material for a vision of PNCIMA and the associated stakeholder engagement strategy. Based on the discussions in the breakouts and comments and questions in plenary sessions, the PNCIMA Steering Committee responded with "next steps" in the progression of the Initiative.

This overview is a summary of the PNCIMA Forum and identifies and reports on themes that emerged from the Forum. We have focused on common subject matter from the breakout sessions, plenary sessions and questions and responses throughout the two days, with the goal to capture the consistent messages expressed by both participants and organizers. Other documentation may give a more detailed and comprehensive account of the proceedings such as the Forum Agenda, breakout notes, plenary notes and speakers notes. (**Note:** A video of the proceedings is available at PNCIMA.org)

The structure of this report to some extent mirrors the Forum. The first two Chapters reflect the messages heard and information generated primarily from the Forum breakout sessions around *Visions* for the PNCIMA Initiative and *Stakeholder Engagement*. These sessions were contemplated to inform the creation of a Vision Statement for the Initiative and the development of a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy. These two outcomes have many common concepts and themes expressed. However, the differences make reporting the content of each separately important for noting how they may be individually utilized going forward and truly reflect the input of the participants. The final chapter reflects the final plenary of the Forum, noting the messages heard by the Steering Committee and the “next steps” going forward.

2 Vision

“... we need to start with a common vision of where we want to go.”

(Preparatory Meeting Participant)

Based on the results of the breakout sessions and comments in the plenary, there were an array of ideas about how the PNCIMA Initiative should evolve that emerged as fairly consistent themes. These were expressed as values, principles, interests and outputs. Some ideas were concrete and implementable while others were conceptual with illustrative narratives or analogies.

2.1 Community Based

One of the most often referenced visions was for the process to be borne from the people, communities and regions that make up PNCIMA. Ownership and control of the process early on by those living and working in the PNCIMA was seen as necessary to ensure meaningful influence of the decisions and activities that would makeup and arise from the plan. Ultimately, many see this vision as a shared responsibility. People need to be accountable for the actions happening in and around their region and be conscious of respecting the environment they rely upon.

2.2 Healthy Oceans

Recognition of the marine environment as the basic resource and focus was expressed in different ways. Some expressed that care of the oceans should be the primary objective of the PNCIMA Initiative from which the cultural and economic factors could emerge. Others felt the role of the PNCIMA Initiative was to emphasize sustainability in the balance of the environmental, social and economic impacts. There was general consensus that the health of the oceans was essential for everyone and that human stewardship of the ocean and its ecosystems extends to the rivers and terrestrial activities that influence the marine environment.

2.3 Role of First Nations

The role of First Nations is an essential component in the PNCIMA process and First Nations' participation was seen as key to successful marine use planning in the region. In particular, it is important that all First Nations that fall within the PNCIMA boundary be engaged in the process. Although the rights of First Nations have been enshrined in the Constitution, how those rights are to be played out in the PNCIMA process is still undefined for some. Many First Nations and non First Nations people see embracing the lessons and history of First Nations people as an essential component to any successful process and plan. The traditional knowledge held by First Nations was seen to be an important source of information and should be considered an equal complement to scientific data sources, especially in the context of local or coastal management area

planning. Many people referenced the coexistence of First Nations and healthy marine ecosystems over millennia, emphasizing that the marine environment continues to sustain First Nations cultures and communities throughout PNCIMA.

2.4 Integration

The title of the PNCIMA Initiative includes reference to integration. Participants were very supportive of the vision of an integrated process and plan for the region. Concurrent with the suggestion that planning should be community based there was also recognition for the need to integrate plans, processes, information and activities to ensure that resulting impacts may be understood and managed. This was often expressed as the need to plan concurrently and not for single systems or species. Similarly, there was a call to respect other planning activities that may already be in place. It is important that planning at different scales, from local to regional, be integrated to ensure that planning objectives and outcomes are consistent.

2.5 Wealth of knowledge

Participants understood that a key function of the PNCIMA Initiative is to act as a manager of information. Ideally the plan will assist the diversity of interests and stakeholders who inform the process to share and learn from each other. Participants stressed the need to acknowledge all types of information and knowledge; this included local, traditional and scientific knowledge and lessons learned from other areas and existing processes. Processes that are developed or in place, and the information, knowledge, science, data and results which radiate from them must be accessible and comprehensible. Many participants pointed to the sharing of information and knowledge among processes as fundamental to education and increased awareness of PNCIMA, and a catalyst to progress. This vision is linked to the need for open and transparent communication where the interests and knowledge of others is acknowledged and respected to create an atmosphere of “working together”.

2.6 Timeline: Urgency

The vision for PNCIMA was often associated with a time dimension. Many felt the process was overdue and must be driven by a sense of urgency to ensure acting now, not later. This suggestion was responsive to a fear for the state of health of the marine environment and the communities and peoples who rely on the ocean. There was also a concern about a process being developed that is slowed by bureaucratic requirements and red tape. Similarly, participants felt that there is a need to be flexible and adaptable to changing interests, values and activities which arise. People acknowledged the need for good information and science but recognized that some pragmatic decisions may be needed as a matter of priority before complete data sets are available. Although the process and development of the PNCIMA plan is desired to have a deadline, participants for the most part saw the plan as a “living plan”, capable of being adaptable and responsive to change.

2.7 Capacity

Participants expressed desire for a process that will be appropriately funded and resourced to allow for the potential to be realized. Related to local knowledge, capacity was also seen to encompass the capability and competence already at work in the region. There needs to be recognition of efficient and successful processes and activities currently in use. For instance, building on existing First Nations' capacity and increasing it where necessary. Regional capacity can also be expanded through training and sharing. Ensuring that all participants have the capacity to participate in the process was seen as essential to achieve consistent and equitable representation among sectors.

2.8 Implementable/Enforceable

The participants envisaged an initiative that would result in tangible and measurable outcomes. There was recognition that some implementation may need to occur even as aspects of the plan were evolving. A plan that is "implementable" was seen to include being efficient and effective, not unwieldy or impractical to manage or enforce. Similarly, enforcement must be achievable and performable, with real consequences and defined mechanisms to punish offenders. Some expressed the desire to be able to legally enforce planning decisions locally, particularly First Nations with respect to traditional territories.

2.9 Monitoring/Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation were seen by participants to be required to ensure that actions taken meet the objectives for which they were intended. Monitoring and evaluation was described as creating a feedback mechanism which allows the Initiative to continually inform itself and be adaptable to new information, enabling the plan to become durable and effective in the future. For process purposes the monitoring and evaluation was seen to allow for tracking of commitments and enhancing transparency.

2.10 Principles of the Vision:

Other than the themes which described the vision for PNCIMA, a number of principles were put forward by participants that described how the vision may be guided.

Commitment: Commitment was stressed as a necessary principle in both the preparatory meetings and the Forum. There is an expectation for DFO to demonstrate this commitment through allocation of appropriate resources including: funds, information, training and time to enhance capacity for all sectors to participate consistently in the PNCIMA Initiative. In addition, it was expressed that other government agencies, the Provincial government, First Nations and stakeholders will also have to show commitment.

Inclusive: Many participants suggested that the process should be inclusive of varied interests and those who are impacted by the activities in the PNCIMA region. However,

there were also those who questioned the equal application of this principle. A number of participants felt there were some whose interests in the process should be weighted over others. Ultimately, there was not unanimity on this principle. Rather it led to further questions: who belongs at the table? What about those who should be there but are not?

Responsive: This principle was expressed in a number of ways. For some it had connotations of urgency and immediacy, with “responsiveness” analogous to those leading the process being accessible to respond to information and inputs in an efficient and effective manner. Others spoke about adaptability and flexibility of the plan as circumstances and priorities of the stakeholders change.

Collaborative: This word, which means “working together”, was often used to describe a number of dimensions of the process, including communication, decision making and aspects of opportunities for participation. It also referenced the need for balance, suggesting a collaborative process would be able to accommodate varied interests in an appropriate manner.

Interest Based: An interest based process is described as a process that focuses on the motivating factors of the stakeholders including; values, beliefs, needs and concerns. Rather than negotiating positions which draw lines in the sand or result in compromise, an interest based approach is seen to reinforce the collaborative principle by dovetailing interests to build a mutually beneficial outcome. This was often referred to as a procedural means to bring divergent views together and produce a common plan. It was emphasized that in an interest based process, all input would be valued and recognized while striving for one’s own cause and issues.

Accountable: There were a number of other principles that fit within the principle of accountability. Prominent among these was commitment to the process. Participants are interested in seeing follow through and outcomes that reflect their input. Commitment to the process and accountability should be modelled by DFO but should also include the representatives of other agencies and entities that will need to follow through with their constituents’ objectives. Words such as ethical and honest were also included descriptively and synonymously with the accountability principle.

Transparent: For many the concept of transparency is described as making sure that decision making and other processes and procedures are well publicized and understood. The data and decision trail for such processes should be clear and easily traceable. Like accountability, there are close associations to trust, ethics and commitment. Participants want to be clear on expectations and limits of engagement and capacity.

3 Engagement Strategy

“.....an engagement strategy is about building effective relationships not just engagement.”
(PNCIMA Forum breakout participant)

Generating input for a “stakeholder” engagement strategy was a central objective for the PNCIMA Forum, with breakout sessions dedicated to documenting contributions from participants. This topic led to passionate discussions as participants recognized that “how” their voices were represented, acknowledged and accounted for throughout the PNCIMA Initiative would be fundamental to resulting outputs and recommendations. As with the visioning breakout and discussions, a number of themes emerged that should inform the development of the PNCIMA stakeholder engagement strategy as well as principles for guiding the process. Not surprisingly, many of these principles paralleled the principles for the overall vision for PNCIMA. Although it may be repetitive, many of these principles are reiterated here to stress the relevance participants expressed in their relation to a stakeholder engagement strategy.

3.1 Relationships/Trust/Accountability

The engagement strategy was seen as significant in shaping the atmosphere and ultimately buy-in by sectors to any outcomes of the Initiative. Therefore, the degree to which the engagement strategy can develop relationships and especially trust, will influence the success of the PNCIMA Initiative.

Some described engagement in their region not as an act of *engaging* but of talking with neighbours, understanding needs, listening and building relationships. Others spoke of accountability and trust as being the cornerstones on which to build an engagement strategy. When trust is evident between individuals, communities, and regions, the creation of opportunities and possibilities can be explored and will hopefully lead to actions of mutual support.

Some participants saw the engagement strategy as an *opportunity* of the Initiative. The strategy may be a catalyst for community building and expansion of social capital. If successful and informed by principles such as collaboration, transparency, accountability and capacity development, the strategy was seen as an opportunity to reinvigorate coastal communities’ sense of involvement and inclusion.

3.2 Complexity – Scale and Issues

There was some critique of why, for ecosystem or oceanographic reasons, the geographic area of PNCIMA is as vast as it is. For most engagement purposes, participants suggested the complexity associated with such a large area be addressed by dividing the area into smaller pieces. Suggestions were made that the area be broken into 3 or 4 sub-regions and from there further refinement be made to match issues with appropriate scale.

This scale of engagement was an important factor for most participants. It speaks to ownership, accountability and influence over the issues most relevant to their area and the decisions which result. Although the PNCIMA process is at the Large Ocean Management Area (LOMA) scale, most participants at the Forum wanted to see engagement start at the smallest appropriate scale and expand or integrate outward rather than start at the largest and adapt inward. This sentiment was echoed throughout the visioning breakout at the Forum and the regional preparatory meetings that occurred prior.

As will be discussed further in this summary there are implications for the planning scale that is chosen which will affect the issues being discussed, how representation is arranged and where influence on decision making is organized and integrated. Furthermore, the scale of engagement will be affected by capacity (funding, information and resources) to participate.

Throughout the Forum there was general recognition that no one scale or method for stakeholder engagement which will cover all situations. There will be a need to have a multifaceted engagement strategy based on issues, geographical area, interests and within time and funding capacity constraints.

3.3 Representation

Representation was an issue at the very core of good engagement for many participants. Closely tied to participation, all the breakout sessions had intense discussion about what a *stakeholder* was, if this term should be used and who was or was not at the table.

For some participants, addressing the concept of representation was the first step in establishing trust and relationships. Many described representation as a responsibility suggesting there will be a need for some accountability, both in expressing the interests of stakeholders and in reporting back results. These representatives need to have real authority to negotiate, be provided the money and resources for engagement, and be willing to listen to their constituents.

One of the objectives and visions of the process was to make it inclusive. As some people speculated, inclusiveness may not always be possible or in some cases desired. Some participants thought that those who live in communities on the coast should be given primacy. Others expanded this to include those who live *and work* on the coast. Many other people at the Forum voiced the need for true inclusiveness, wondering at how effective and durable decisions can be without having everyone who feels an interest being given an opportunity to be included. These participants hypothesized that this inclusiveness may extend outside PNCIMA and even Canadian boundaries on some issues.

As mentioned earlier, the engagement strategy may need to be structured for inclusiveness, participation and representation at different levels appropriate for scale and issue. Having a tiered representative approach was suggested, meaning the possibility of

different representation at different levels may also assist with mitigating process burnout and accountability to the representatives. Following from the plenary speakers' comments, many participants suggested a process that allowed representation to be nominated and elected. This process was seen as a means to allow sectors to define who was trusted to speak on their behalf and be accountable to inform the sectors as activities were defined.

3.4 Roles and Responsibilities

Within the context of representation, the question arose about what roles different levels of government may have. With respect to the Federal Government, questions were raised about whether DFO will take on additional roles beyond their governance mandate, such as acting as a facilitator and/or participant in addition to their role as a coordinator. Ottawa is seen by some as too far removed, and too centralized an entity to make decisions regarding the Pacific Coast. While many participants understood the obligation of DFO to make decisions in the marine environment, they wanted to understand the limits of stakeholder influence in the engagement strategy.

Although there is a definition of the special relationship of First Nations with the Federal Government constitutionally, the *nature* of representation in this process by First Nations was a fundamental question raised across all the breakout groups and plenary sessions. Some First Nations expressed that government to government processes need to be kept separate from government to stakeholder discussions. The collaborative governance MOU signed by DFO, Coastal First Nations –Turning Point Initiative, and North Coast-Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society outlines how First Nations belonging to these organizations will be involved in the PNCIMA process. However, other coastal First Nations in the region have not entered into similar agreements and it is unclear for these First Nations how the obligation to consult and accommodate their interests will be accomplished. Several First Nations emphasized that the engagement strategy needs to start with visiting them and their people in their communities.

Others were concerned that without the Province of B.C. involved in a meaningful way much of the work being done may be stymied, as they see the Provincial role currently as being involved at a more stakeholder level rather than decision maker. The Province, in the Forum's opening remarks, indicated they welcome the relationship developed between the Government of Canada and First Nations for the PNCIMA Initiative and noted Provincial jurisdiction and interests in the area. They stated that their involvement in other processes related to the PNCIMA Initiative, such as past land use planning processes, information sharing and advice for policy, but were still uncertain when they may be involved with PNCIMA governance issues.

3.5 Capacity

Comments around engagement also focused in on the capacity of people to be engaged. There was concern that better funded sectors may be able to sway the process or influence decisions. However, funding was identified as only one component of capacity. There were also practical questions of staffing, access to information, interpretation of data, training, time and travel. All of these concerns were seen to influence how different sectors and groups may participate.

Some of the principles of the process that were identified are accessibility, inclusiveness and the opportunity to participate; similarly, many people viewed capacity to participate as an issue to address in the engagement strategy. The concept of capacity reinforced the need for engagement to be available at different levels and by different means. This may include:

- Providing and utilizing available technologies such as web-conferencing to link representatives;
- Funding skills training to utilize local people; and
- Recognition and utilization of existing capacity and expertise.

Capacity differentials were also described with respect to communication. Because First Nations have a fundamental and historical relationship with the PNCIMA, communication needs to be fashioned to reflect that relationship and has to be appropriate to the circumstances of Aboriginal Rights and Title.

Although it was generally seen as the responsibility of DFO to support development of capacity and to provide the leadership in ensuring an even table was available for engagement, many participants also indicated there was a collective responsibility among the stakeholders and sectors to get engaged and address capacity issues through sharing and collaboration.

Capacity was not only seen as something to be built but as something existing that should be valued. There was a desire by participants to recognize the existing capacity that is and has been evident in the area. First Nations and other traditional or local knowledge must be valued and accounted for when considering information and resources. Systems of engagement already at work that encourage similar principles of “cleaning your own house” while building trusting relationships with neighbours should be emphasized. Other existing processes such as councils, boards, citizen committees or community review should be integrated or expanded within the PNCIMA.

3.6 Timeline

Significant reference was made to time and a timeline for the Initiative that reflects the need for progress and the urgency to get started. There is a need for a “roadmap” that will assist participants to identify where they may access the process and be accessible to others, in addition to tracking where parallel processes and stakeholder engagement may be happening. On a more practical level the timeline should also address and be

responsive to local needs and conditions when determining meeting dates, times and public notices.

Participants also spoke of an engagement process that had clear targets for continuous engagement right up to implementation and that was ongoing between large meetings and forums. The need for a deadline was also suggested in a number of cases as a catalyst to action and a motivation for those who are burned out from process fatigue.

3.7 Communication

A satisfactory outcome will include feeling part of the process, being listened to and being respected. Participants understood that an effective strategy will need to be informed through effective communication. Some direction in how communication may be structured to allow for diversity, enhance dialogue and encourage honesty is required. Some suggested this may be accomplished through:

- Clear rules of order, an independent chair and independent note takers during all meetings.
- Facilitation of meetings and negotiation training for participants.
- Standards that recognize and define respectful contributions and honesty in communication.
- Collaborative communication that is not judgmental and provides a “safe place” to air fears and get responses.
- Recognition and acceptance of cultural differences.
- Ways of learning that extends beyond science from the federal authorities.

Again, web-based communication was discussed with many highlighting its benefits but also recognizing that for many PNCIMA residents access and comfort with these technologies may be limited. Similarly, participants emphasized the use of plain language to make the message clear for all stakeholders.

3.8 Stakeholder Organization

Within the breakout session and plenary there were several suggestions made by participants that described some specific outputs for what stakeholder organization and representation may include. Some of these suggestions were:

- Representation of some stakeholders by local and regional governments due to the fact that they are already established bodies.
- Oversight of the representation and engagement process by an independent body. This would allow a quasi-neutral entity to address process issues in the generation of recommendations for decision making.
- The creation of one over-arching plan for PNCIMA and several other specific sub-area and stakeholder plans that are consistent with the overarching vision. The sub-plans would be linked together through a central coordinating body – a

leadership council composed of appointees who are respected members of communities and regions, as well as a larger regionally based ecosystem board.

- The creation of innovative partnerships, rather than dividing along regional lines. This would be a networking type approach, where stakeholders would take ownership and connect with one another based on similar issues and interests and where they feel they can be of assistance to others. This was described by some as a “seamless borders” approach which would recognize cross-sectoral interests.
- The formation of a neutral citizens’ council as a body that would monitor the process and provide independent feedback to stakeholders regarding advice and/or options for stakeholder actions.
- The establishment of a management team who would develop Terms of Reference for a future technology team and for a stakeholders’ committee.
- The origination of stakeholder decisions from the “lowest” stakeholder or community level possible. This would reflect the view that this be a community based process, with influence on decision making and, where possible, decisions being as close to the communities affected as possible for appropriate issues.
- The development of “alternatives to consensus” in the decision making structure. Lack of consensus should not be a deterrent to the process, preferably the process should be consensus seeking rather than consensus based.

3.9 Principles of Engagement

Throughout the PNCIMA Forum a number of very specific principles emerged that participants suggested should guide the engagement strategy. As expected, these principles mirrored the principles discussed in the vision breakout session and several from that section (i.e. Commitment, Inclusive, Collaborative, Interest Based, and Monitoring/Evaluation) could also be reinserted here.

Transparency – All stakeholders’ positions and interests expressed as part of the PNCIMA process should be public and available to others. All engagements and discussions should be advertised (i.e. no “side tables”). Information should be attributed and made available. PNCIMA engagement will need to develop a feedback loop from decision makers to stakeholders. Suggested means of achieving this principle included circulating all information and results of processes through a central clearinghouse.

Access – For some, access will require that planning occur locally, meetings are hosted in the region, and that there are opportunities for face-to-face discussions with other stakeholders. Similar to transparency, participants suggested they need the opportunity to access information or participation as required. It was seen as important to know, at an early stage, at what points stakeholders have access to participation in the process so they can decide how they can most effectively engage. Where available, videoconferencing,

webcasts and an interactive website to enable participation are tools to encourage this principle.

Consistency – This was often expressed as *equality*, including equal treatment with respect to information demands, questions, protocols and transparency (see above). Participants recognized that different sectors' interests and issues may necessitate different types of engagement; however, different engagement strategies should not preclude consistent engagement across sectors.

Clarity – Participants expressed the need for clarity in the processes, models and information provided through the engagement strategy. This principle was noted with particular reference to the governance model. There should be an explanation of the MOUs and development of tools to help others understand how stakeholder engagement relates to the governance model. If this is made clear, stakeholders can decide where their knowledge is most needed, and how to include themselves in the process.

Sharing and Reciprocity – As an offshoot of transparency, accountability and trust, participants felt that there needs to be a commitment to sharing information and knowledge. This was also described as the feedback loop where information, expertise and knowledge may be injected into areas or activities with the expectation that results will be released back to further inform other people and activities in the PNCIMA region. This expands the concepts that quality information may be generated from science, professionals and local/traditional knowledge making the process one of education as well as action.

Accountability: Many participants made the connection between visions and engagement principles by noting accountability as critical for success. Accountability should be applied to DFO, First Nations and to the representatives of sectors and stakeholder groups. Outcomes of the strategy should be measured and evaluated against expected objectives of the process and the people.

4 Challenges

Although challenges are usually regarded as negative, they almost always present opportunities. Challenges in the PNCIMA Initiative will spur development of solutions, forge alliances and cause communities to see the need to work together to protect the marine ecosystem and encourage sustainable economies. The following list indicates, in no particular order, some of the key challenges heard or implied through the discussion at the PNCIMA Forum.

1. **Timing and Data:** Integrating science and other forms of knowledge will be a continuous task. The need to act boldly, sometimes without complete knowledge will be essential if environmental values are not to be compromised through the passage of time. This will be manifest as short terms need to act within longer term goals.
2. **Uneven Resources:** An ongoing obstacle may be the disproportionate resources various parties have. Funding can address some of this but equal access to information and expertise will also be challenging.
3. **Current and Future Regulation:** Most participants have unanswered questions about the connection between the planning initiative and enforcement and monitoring. Changes in the traditional roles of some parties, including DFO, with respect to the planning exercise may also bring challenges as parties in the region get used to new functions and tasks that the PNCIMA Initiative will doubtless require. How existing regulatory bodies, local actions and new systems are integrated remains a central question for the Initiative to address. In the meantime, how the values expressed in this Forum and throughout the development of the plan will be included in new projects and those already underway will also have to be addressed.
4. **Attitude and Responsibility:** Translating the vision and philosophy of PNCIMA into action and behaviour will also require an adjustment of attitude. Who will control the stewardship of the region and how cooperation among federal governments, First Nations and stakeholders will work will all need to be determined through the planning process. This challenge provides enhanced opportunity for all parties to execute their responsibility for consultation, contribution and negotiation.
5. **Primacy of Values:** The priority or primacy of various values will also be a challenge. The Initiative will have to consider whether *balance* is the prime objective or whether a specific value (e.g. the ecosystem, economic well-being, community cohesiveness) will trump others. The meaning of *integrated management* will have to be reconsidered in the context of this planning area to decide to what extent all values and objectives can be met simultaneously or whether trade-offs will have to be made.

6. **First Nations Engagement:** Many participants voiced that the Initiative's chances of success will be greater if all First Nations in the PNCIMA region are engaged. First Nations not yet a part of the PNCIMA Initiative through the MOU will need to have a real and effective voice if the Crown's obligations for consultation and cooperation are to be honoured. Since First Nations are not simply "interest groups" their fundamental role as stewards and residents will have to be recognized in practical ways. At the same time, municipal communities and other organized interests will have to be included. The question whether that happens at a common table or in other ways will have to be sorted out early in the process.

7. **Governance Framework:** There is a governance framework in place. However, the absence of several First Nations and the Province of British Columbia will have to be addressed and clarified as it relates to decision making and engagement issues. Reassessing roles for the Steering Committee and Secretariat may have to be addressed as the Initiative evolves. The location of decision making within the design hierarchy of the Initiative will have to be clearly defined. Stakeholder recommendations and how they impact decision making will also have to be clearly articulated. One of the early functions of any effective stakeholder engagement will be the settling of terms of reference with clearly delineated mandates. Perhaps more important will be clarity about limits to mandates and the limits to decision-making, recommendatory power and advisory power.

5 Messages and Next Steps

As the PNCIMA Forum concluded there was a final plenary session allowing the PNCIMA Steering Committee to respond to what they had heard contributed from the proceedings of the Forum and the earlier preparatory meetings held throughout communities within the PNCIMA. An account of those statements and *next steps* from Rebecca Reid, Regional Director of Oceans, Habitat and Enhancement Branch, DFO and Chair of the PNCIMA Steering Committee are presented here.

The aim of the Forum was to develop a common understanding of:

- The PNCIMA region
- Integrated management planning
- The PNCIMA planning process, including the Initiative's scope and issues of scale
- The roles and responsibilities of the key contributors to the planning process
- Stakeholder expectations of the PNCIMA planning process and outcomes

An additional goal of the Forum was to receive input from people who work and live in the PNCIMA region to inform the development of a vision and stakeholder engagement strategy for the PNCIMA Initiative. The Steering Committee was attentive to the messages received throughout the Forum in addition to other important ideas, values and contributions from the participants. In general these messages fell into themes of vision and engagement echoing the stakeholder input above.

5.1 Messages

Forum participants wanted a *collaborative* and *inclusive* process and engagement strategy which will bring all stakeholders together in a productive, cooperative and transparent manner. Participants identified a need for a *purposeful* process, one that has a common goal that recognizes the need for protection of the ocean to enhance the benefits for future generations and sustainability for coastal communities and Canadians in general. In describing the vision of the Initiative, participants used words such as *efficient* and *effective* for a timely process that utilizes existing and current processes and is not overly bureaucratic.

Participants expressed the desire for an *ecosystem based* initiative, recognizing that healthy communities and economies rely on a healthy environment and ecosystem. Scale is an important aspect of the process, meaning it needs to be applicable and relevant at the community level. Being *community based* translates to the next Forum being held in the region in a PNCIMA community. There are technologies available today to assist with engaging these communities that should be used while at the same time making input and information accessible and understandable by participants. Similarly, the process needs to embrace the array of *knowledge* available so that the best available

information, including science based and traditional/local knowledge is used and shared throughout the process for recommendations and decisions.

Participants expressed a need to understand their influence on decision making, and how recommendations out of the PNCIMA Initiative need to guide the decision making process. There needs to be clarity about governance and who and how decisions are made. This includes getting the right *representation* and involving the appropriate institutions to ensure inputs to decisions are meaningful and principled.

Participants were passionate about their beliefs and values regarding the ocean and the PNCIMA Initiative. Respect needs to be demonstrated for those varied interests. Discussions and methods of engaging between First Nations and non First Nations, stakeholders and citizens, and issues regarding Government to Government and Aboriginal Rights and Title need to be conducted in an honest, ethical and appropriate manner. First Nations not in the MOU need to be involved and DFO is working towards effective engagement mechanisms.

Participants expressed a need for DFO to demonstrate their leadership in this process and be committed to providing the appropriate resources to allow for the development and support required for the PNCIMA Initiative in a reasonable timeframe. The ability to deliver on the process will be linked to the ability to find funding to develop and support capacity. Commitment to this process needs to extend to other stakeholders and partners. To achieve the desired end product will require imaginative and creative means of creating partnerships while recognizing appropriate authority. DFO also needs to be *forward looking*; people need to see a roadmap for the PNCIMA process that identifies milestones and access points, as well as anticipated products resulting from the Initiative, which will move the process forward.

5.2 Next Steps

The PNCIMA Steering Committee felt it was important to identify how the messages they heard would be addressed and what new steps they will undertake and what activities currently underway will continue in the next year.

In correlation with the PNCIMA Secretariat the Steering Committee will:

1. Take steps to advance the stakeholder engagement strategy and consultations by:
 - Developing options for stakeholder engagement strategies. These options will:
 - Be based on input received from the Forum
 - Include communications protocols, suggested stakeholder bodies, etc.
 - Circulating and posting these options on the PNCIMA Initiative website;
 - Undertaking community based outreach processes to receive input on the options;
 - Continuing to consult and work with First Nations who are not part of the current MOU to develop appropriate engagement mechanisms; and

- Welcoming further input to the PNCIMA Initiative via the “comments” section of the website.
2. Develop and finalize a PNCIMA process Terms of Reference (by the end of 2009) based on the governance structure, stakeholder engagement strategy, and input received in the PNCIMA Preparatory Meetings and at the Forum, which will include:
 - Vision & Objectives
 - Principles;
 - Governance and Engagement mechanisms;
 - A work plan (an outline of work activities and supporting documents); and
 - How other processes are related and integrated
 3. Start the Marine Transportation Working Group (MTWG). This will include:
 - Preparing for and holding the Marine Transportation Science Workshop;
 - Drafting a scope and Terms of Reference for the MTWG; and
 - Identifying stakeholder representatives to participate in the MTWG.
 4. Take a community based approach to the PNCIMA Initiative, including:
 - Holding the next forum in a north coast community within the PNCIMA;
 - Finding opportunities to meet with both First Nations and non First Nations at the community level through new and existing processes.
 5. Contribute to the information and knowledge base. This will include:
 - Producing the Socio-Economic and Cultural Overview Assessment (SECOA) Report, the last of the three assessment reports called for under Canada’s Oceans Strategy. This report will assist in the development of socio-economic and cultural objectives for PNCIMA;
 - Posting the full PNCIMA Discussion Paper on the PNCIMA Initiative website; and
 - Generating a number of information items from the Forum such as the Summary Report, breakout notes, speaker presentations, and graphic recordings, in addition to other information items that will be posted on the website.

5.3 Commitment

Together the above actions express the Steering Committee’s commitment to the PNCIMA Initiative. However, the above activities will not be successfully implemented unless this process is advanced in a collaborative manner with all of those engaged being committed to making this process a success.

There are a number of ongoing activities and/or processes which members of the Steering Committee will continue to be involved in. These include:

- DFO's continued work with Parks Canada on the Gwaii Haanas National Marine Conservation Area (NMCA);
- DFO's continued work to move forward with the Glass Sponge Reef Area of Interest (AOI);
- Environment Canada's continued work to move forward with the Scott Islands National Wildlife Area designation;
- Linking with past and current provincial planning activities and linking land-use planning to marine-use planning; and
- First Nations continued work on the development of Community Plans

An assembly of a general timeline over the next year in terms of short, medium and long-term time frames was provided:

Short Term

Release of the PNCIMA Discussion Paper
 Development of the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy
 Release of all Forum Meeting Notes and Reports
 Maintenance and updating of the PNCIMA website
 Organization of Community Meetings

Medium Term

Development of the PNCIMA process Terms of Reference
 Establishment of the Marine Transportation Working Group
 Finalization of the Coral and Sponge Conservation Strategy
 Continued work on the Gwaii Haanas NMCA

Longer Term

Production of the Socio-Economic and Cultural Overview Assessment (SECOA) report
 Organization of the 2010 Fall Forum

6 Conclusion

The inaugural PNCIMA Forum was held March 26-27, 2009 in Richmond, BC. The Forum was structured to:

- Generate participant discussion around the PNCIMA Initiative;
- Provide information through speakers, case studies and plenary discussions on integrated management, marine planning and stakeholder engagement;
- Gather information from facilitated breakout sessions on a *Vision* for the PNCIMA Initiative and the associated Stakeholder Engagement Strategy; and
- Respond to participant discussions and input with Steering Committee plans for progressing the Initiative reflecting those ideas.

In addition to the participants who attended the Forum there was additional opportunity for involvement through webcasting. Considerable diversity from stakeholder groups and governments was evident at the Forum. Speakers from a variety of initiatives and locations shared experiences on integrated management, marine planning, stakeholder engagement and different information opportunities. The two breakout sessions provided an abundance of ideas and information to catalyze the creation of a *Vision* for the PNCIMA Initiative and begin developing a framework for *Stakeholder Engagement*. These discussions included particular ideas and outputs participants desired, some widely agreed upon and others where differing opinions existed. In the end, the discussions provided both a good quantity of input and an indication of where challenges may need to be addressed.

The PNCIMA Steering Committee concluded the Forum with identification of the messages they heard and a commitment to a number of “next steps” in advancing the PNCIMA Initiative. These commitments detailed associated current and on-going processes integrated into the PNCIMA Initiative, as well as distinguishing the movement into the stakeholder engagement strategy, vision and terms of reference for the PNCIMA Initiative generated from the Forum.