

Socio-Economic and Cultural Workshop

1. Are you satisfied that the workshop structure and process adequately collected socio-economic and cultural information?

Total	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Answer
38	0	14	20	4
Percentage	0	36.84	52.63	10.53

2. Are you satisfied that the workshop structure and process adequately provided for the review and collection of the proposed analyses and approach?

Total	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Answer
38	0	19	14	5
Percentage	0	50	36.84	13.16

3. Are you satisfied that the workshop structure and process adequately fostered engagement by experts in the PNCIMA initiative at this stage of development?

Total	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Answer
38	0	16	17	5
Percentage	0	42.11	44.74	13.16

4. Are you satisfied that the workshop structure and process adequately facilitated engagement of all participants?

Total	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Answer
38	2	25	7	4
Percentage	5.26	65.79	18.42	10.53

5. Are you satisfied that the workshop covered the most important socio-economic and cultural value sets?

Total	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Answer
38	0	22	13	3
Percentage	0	57.89	34.21	7.89

6. Workshop pace

Total	Too Slow	Just Right	Too Fast	No Answer
38	3	14	16	5
Percentage	7.89	36.84	42.11	13.16

7. How satisfied are you with the opportunities provided at the workshop to network with others to exchange views and build working relationships?

Total	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	No Answer
38	5	22	5	6
Percentage	13.16	57.89	13.16	15.79

8. In your view, what was the most important part of the workshop?

Enlightening stakeholders regarding the limitations of the SECOA!
Chance to begin a PNCIMA discussion at both sectional & intersectional levels. A very beginning situation however - more important work to be done.
Local input and expertise into Marine Ocean planning
Having opportunity to voice our concerns.
Reconnecting with people in the north.
The need for more community input.
That it took place
All aspects of the workshop are important.
Lunch
The interactions

8. In your view, what was the most important part of the workshop?

Getting people together to talk about PNCIMA

There was more North Coast input because the workshop was held on the North Coast.

Explaining the process

Gaining more insights and understanding of the dimensions of the Socio-Economic report to be produced.

Sharing hopes & concerns

The chance to work together.

Exposing consultants to aspects of the "invisible landscape"

Addressing the issues facing Northern communities both social and economic

Exposure to the PNCIMA process and where it has gone to date (over the past 3 years)

People seeing "something is happening". Many are beginning to forget about PNCIMA since nothing seems to be happening from the stakeholders perspective.

The cultural/community profiles - wish there was more time to capture everyone's thoughts

The opportunity to have a dialogue about issues and trends in the different breakout groups.

Ability for consultants to recognize diversity - interests, socio-economic, culture - in area; effects of fishing policy on devastation of region

That it took place on north coast

The effort was made

9. In your view, what was the least important part of the workshop?

Cultural card exercise

Explaining the process; 1 Hr orientation & Q&A [Illegible] before would have helped

Obvious agenda's of some participants

Bin dere dun dat - Is this just another dog & pony show?

Spent too much time listening to political bashing

The amount of time given to each topic doesn't promote the discussion that needs to happen.

The session on coastal tenures was very unclear as to the content and objectives - The session on cultural values had little depth.

Not enforcing (or able to) the input scope, i.e. - too much focus on issues not baseline.

The one sided perspective of the commercial anglers as to what angling conditions are really like.

The background document

Sector specific discussions. Very seldom did the actual "actors" in the sector speak up.

Statistical data

1. Research/Enforcement or Tenures/Dumping - both were unclear and therefore unproductive. 2. Location - this should have traveled to communities to collect info at local finer scale level.

It was all important



Other Comments:

Input could have been more effectively, efficiently and cheaply captured through email & phone interviews. The workshop did not provide opportunity for meaningful input due to time constraints & a restrictive structure. Nor did it provide opportunity for community consultation. The money could have been better spent giving the research team more time to engage with available material & to improve it by calling key contacts in communities. The workshop appeared to try to collapse expert input and community engagement/consultation and by doing so, achieved neither very well.

Q4 - All that were present

Q7 - But what was the goal

Needs to be continued work communicating and the building of the socio-economic baseline

There is conflict of interest with the majority of participants being funded by Moore & that funding being contingent on supporting Spatial management as opposed to area wide management.

I am an outsider to the issue that was discussed here, so I don't want to comment on the efficiency of the workshop itself. However, as an outsider I made some observations. 1st, it really seemed that people were missing basic information about the initiative. Seems like 3 workshops would have been necessary: 1) information; 2) consultation; 3) socio-economic and cultural workshop. I also thought that the facilitator Delaney was expressing his own input too much, emphasizing comments that he thought were important, and completely overlooking some other comments. So some people were heard and got their opinions written down and some other people did not. Last comment: I am also wondering how you will be able to organize appropriately the information collected. The groups were very heterogeneous in terms of interest, but that was not taken into account in the discussion. (e.g. In the discussion on recreational fishing, most people present were commercial fishermen, but no one commented on that) Why not do meetings with specific interest groups?

Need a contact list - Need a blog to eliminate 90% of Emotion and focus on quality information - Appoint process champions to focus on positive - Use video blog for rants City TV uses this process.

More discussion on TFL's logging and the ITQ system fishing.

I'm on dial up so please no picture emails.

Q1 - Not enough time

Q2 - Too much data gap

Q5 - Though agenda is large

Q6 - For agenda

Q7 - Again workshop agenda is large for amount of time allowed

Workshop too short to address all the needs.

To the contractors/facilitators: the process is of value not the product so much

While not perfect if we do not participate we will not be heard

Q3 - Too much political grand standing

The topics discussed need proper debates/discussion which wasn't able to occur here. I heard a comment regarding this type of discussion that "the wrong people were in the room". With this type of attitude how will we ever create a plan that works well for everyone.



PNCIMA should be its own organization to manage itself. It needs to much data from stakeholders, who are likely unwilling to give because it will go to DFO. DFO has traditionally used TUS & TEK data against those who have given it. With the mistrust in DFO you will not be able to collect required information that would allow you to manage PNCIMA properly.

The community profiles session did not probe enough the Government policies that have led to a declining share of the wealth in the North being retained in the North (fishing licensing and quotas, etc.)

Preparation needs improvement. Don't wait for the opening plenary to explain the process i.e.. Make that a pre read to increase value of inputs.

The on again off again nature of DFO's involvement in the PNCIMA process is a cause of substantial concern. Implementation and enforcement of PNCIMA (if PNCIMA does indeed become reality) should be center stage, and not an after thought.

We could have developed a list of contacts , reports, data, if you did a better job at prepping us. Be honest don't write a neutral toned report. People are struggling, make sure the language captures this.

I do not doubt the effort & integrity of the consultants. I do doubt the decision -again- to hire Vancouver based consultants, to whom we have to explain about the "invisible landscape". It is the definition of insanity to do the same things the same way, & expect different results. If PNCIMA is to get a different result - try a different approach.

Q2 - Some good references

Q6 - Too short

Q1 - Need to further consult within First Nations communities

Much doubt that the PNCIMA process will help turn the outgoing tide on the declines occurring within small coastal communities. Policies & regulations still favour larger urban areas and corporations.

Q1 - Scope too large for this group

Q2 - Group - unclear what was being asked for

Q3 - People are engaged

Q4 - "Round the room" works

Q5 - Dollars & cents are such a small part of the socioeconomics

Q6 - Given other constraints

Q7 - Work in small groups within - breakouts would encourage this more

Great to have and opportunity to participate and hear others' views. - Not that well organized - e.g.. It would have been good to at least talk about the SCOPE of the report and associated timelines, e.g.. 'Research' and 'enforcement' not well thought out prior to the workshop

Q3 - Some direction would have been more efficient

Q4 - Generally the facilitators were good @ ensuring all speakers had the chance to participate. I think the key to this was the size of the group - it wasn't too big

Q6 - Not much time for certain 'values' - Not very much time to go into this - some prep work would have been good

Q7 - Great way to meet others, stakeholders & FNS

Q1 - No young people attended meetings (under 25)

Q2 - Don't understand

Q3 - Almost all participants were vested interests



Q5 - Touched upon, but not covered in depth

I want to see solutions presented. Not just issues on problems with status quo.

I felt at times the facilitators and consultants spoke too much. Also, building in adequate time to address questions and concerns about PNCIMA would have been good.

Q1 - Focus on methodology and process was perhaps the more realistic objective

Q4 - Ability to submit comments on the papers was good

Q5 - Socio-economic but not the cultural - for culture a different approach is needed

There was a very limited perspective of Aboriginal leadership voices. The discussions & information would have been considerably different if there were.

Concern that the Non-First Nations commercial fishing communities will find themselves shut out at the end of the process and have no life, no work and no home.

A previous Q&A period would have helped to get questions out of the way, where questions weren't related to the agenda.

Didn't learn about process on how SECOA fits into PNCIMA. Definitions of break out sessions should have been provided - ideally in agenda package, but brushed over in morning introduction.

Some consultants seemed to have preconceived notions on what info they wanted, but this does not encourage participants to provide everything, because we are perceiving that it will not be used or reflected.

Consultants/facilitators not fully prepared for session. Would like all presentations made available.

Q1 - Questions and break out - group explanations could have been clearly defined in advance so people brought the best info

Q2 - Draft report missing a lot of info; should have included questions & approach

Q5 - No wrap up on cultural value

Q6 - Would have been useful to utilize full two days

Q1 & Q2 - Won't know until report released

Q3 - What experts?

Q4 - Commercial fish workshop should have been later/longer & better facilitator

Q6 - Too fast - not enough participation or cross discussion.

Some other workshops were better

Most people can't write well enough to express what they can verbally - unless they are ENGOs or university participants

Values are influencing the framing of responses / discussion very heavily at this point.

Q1 - Limited perspectives

Q2 - More time to review / more of a graphic representation

Q4 - Good try, some people will always dominate

Q5 - Not the fault of the organizers, participants were ham-stringing efforts throughout

Q6 - Hard to say, sometimes it dragged & sometimes it seemed to be going too fast

