

**PNCIMA Community Meeting
Skidegate Community Hall .
March 29, 2010**

Welcome

Introduction to meeting – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Bruce Reid (DFO)

Q: How can you create certainty and stability in Ocean Management unless you do have an impact on current government mandates??

A: PNCIMA is not going to restrict existing government policy.

Q: What is DFO's Mandate?

A: Healthy and Aquatic Ecosystems, Sustainable Aquaculture and Fisheries, Safe and Accessible Waterways. Specific to Oceans program of DFO are Healthy Ecosystems and Integrated Management.

Q: How does the existence of Finfish Aquaculture down south fit in with your objective on ecological health?? It seems contradictory.

A: Perhaps we can come back to this.

Q: Has there been any adjustment of the make up of the steering committee? It has been asked several times at previous meetings to have a community representative at that table.

A: No that hasn't changed.

Q: Noted that on several slides First Nations were listed 2nd or 3rd place in a list of "who can be involved?" Described this as insulting and reminded presenters that First Nations come before other stakeholders, stating that when stakeholders come before First Nations it is Culture that suffers.

A: No particular order and no slight intended.

Q: First nations come first. We have the most to lose ... we are the ones tied here, especially on Haida Gwaii.

A: Thanks to both for pointing out the discrepancy.

Haida Gwaii Marine Use Plan – Russ Jones (Haida Fisheries Program)

Question and Answers:

Q: What are the LOMAs?

A: Large Ocean Management Areas that come to us from Canada's Oceans Strategy – PNCIMA, Gulf of St. Lawrence, Placentia Bay/Grand Banks, Beaufort Sea, ESSIM

Q: If there is conflict between the Haida MUP and the PNCIMA Plan, does one take precedence over the other? At what level do you work that out?

A: A lot of the things that are part of the HG-MUP will be on such a small scale that you won't find them being dealt with at the PNCIMA level. But if there are larger issues we would need to discuss how we would work this out.

Q: I am alarmed by the number of marine protected areas, especially Gwaii Haanas and other closures – there was not enough consultation with the Haida People on any of these. I worry about additional MPAs under PNCIMA.

A: There has been a lot of consultation with the Gwaii Hanaas NMCA and other processes, and there will continue to be.

Q: DFO has done 100 years of damage. We need to start the conversation with fixing and repairing that damage.

A: The first step is to get the process going and then we can work on those issues from there.

Q: Concern expressed re what % of the Haida territorial waters would fall under Marine Protected Area Status under the Haida Gwaii Marine Use Plan

A: We don't have a magic number, we've looked at priority areas and sensitive areas like bottom fishing on areas of fragile corals etc. The decisions will come from the information we have learned.

General Comments from the Floor:

Comment: I hope this process takes a serious look at seals and sealions. I've been trying for 29 years to get the fisheries to do something about the seals and sealions. If it were up to me I'd put salmon on the endangered species list. Sealions eat 55kg of fish a day the populations are just totally out of control. If you travel up and down our coast you will see poverty rampant but a seal and sealion fishery could make a real impact on turning around our communities and we could start tomorrow.

Comment: I think it's about getting together to do what is best for the OCEAN and we on the islands are going to do what is best for Haida Gwaii. We will not do anything that are against the wishes of our people and our island people. We have done good work and I hope people can come out to listen to us and learn about the work we have done on things like Gwaii Hanaas.

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

Q: not being First Nations or Government where would I fit in?

- A: We want to ensure process is as inclusive as possible, noting that there is a balance to be struck with regard to how many people can actually sit at the IOAC table.
- Q: Concern as to the long term commitment of DFO to PNCIMA and the need for up front financial support.
- A: If we build an inclusive process that people can see themselves in then we are in a better position to making this work. We are seeking to make agreements with other groups enabling us to draw on additional resources.
- Q: The Haida are 10 years ahead of all the other nations and groups in marine spatial planning because we've done it for the protection of our great island under the Land Use Plan.
- A: That is an important point. We can make a lot of use of things that have been done in the past both in work and in partnering.
- Q: Before even get started we need to get a financial commitment. PNCIMA is like an octopus with 57 hundred legs to be effective and inclusive it's going to take a huge amount of money. I don't see the commitment from the federal government – and before I waste my time going to these meeting I want to see that.
- A: We need to come back to what can we do to build a process that becomes irresistible. If we have interest from the communities and people who see themselves in the process. We will develop a much better product. If that is the product we are building it becomes a lot easier for government to carry it forward because the people are interested.
- Q: there is nothing about the food fishery in the Appendix B committee composition which is an insulting oversight.
- A: First Nations and other government agencies can talk about that at a governance level whereas at the IOAC FN would participate as an ex-officio capacity.
- Q: There is a group out there called the BC Seafood Alliance. I'd like you to know that they do not necessarily represent all fisheries or fishermen.
- A: This leads into a question - if we want to engage your sector, how do we do that? What do you suggest?
- Q: Consultations... the word is misused. We were very careful about that word... and when we speak in public we shoot from the hip and we would like it reflected in the notes exactly what the Haida said. How long is this PNCIMA going to go on? My gut feeling is that it will die next year or the year after without commitment to funding.
- A: We are exploring other options of bring resources into this process. I think that DFO has been proving it's commitment by continuing to fund, as it has for the past 5 years and will next year. We have demonstrated commitment to date and we anticipate carrying this forward.

Q: A lot of us have been here for years. Shouldn't these committees be made up of the people who live here?

A: A Working Group may address where the HG MUP fits into the broader PNCIMA process. How many people are on the IOAC who know the issues on the Haida Gwaii? Maybe a Haida Gwaii working group can make sure those issues are moved up to the IOAC level.

Comments from the Floor:

Comment: When you start editing your notes I hope you don't delete the negative comments. We want to see our thoughts reflected.

Comment: I sit on the Gwaii Hanaas advisory team which has been a very positive experience but occasionally a document comes to us to comment on that has already essentially been finalized. This is just a caution to you to make sure that the advisory committee, whomever it may be needs to be in a position to provide actual advice not just a rubber stamp exercise.

Comment: Half of PNCIMA falls in Haida traditional territory... so I hope that the HG MUP has a great influence

Comment: We need to address the sustainability issue within the PNCIMA process.

Thanks and next steps – Neil Davis (DFO), Russ Jones (Haida Fisheries Program)

Meeting adjourned.

**PNCIMA Community Meeting
Howard Phillips Hall – Masset
March 30, 2010**

Welcome

Introduction to meeting – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

Q: What do you mean by community consultation?

A: we are trying to get a sense of how we can develop a good process for people to participate in the broader PNCIMA process. We are looking to engage and find ways for people to engage.

A: it is a way for people to come back and talk about what has happened in the last year and look at moving ahead.

Q: Where do non government and non Haida people fit in? It seems to be missing.

A: you've hit the nail on the head... we are here to talk about just that.

PNCIMA Overview - Bruce Reid (DFO)

Haida Marine Use Planning – Russ Jones (Haida Fisheries Program)

Q: How do the terms of reference operate for PNCIMA taking into account Working Groups and other bodies?

A: The department does have it's own set of guidelines and principles and so any advisory body would have to create something consistent with those policies, but each individual working groups may have their own ToR. Recognizing that other types of resource management activities will continue to operate under their existing terms of reference.

Q: Is the CHN HG MUP component going to be a separate entity or will it be swallowed as part of PNCIMA.

A: Haida are planning to work with feds and province on the HG MUP but we are already partners with DFO on the PNCIMA initiative. The PNCIMA plan might not go down to the level of detail that the HG MUP would cover. The result is that these two plans will complement each other.

Q: Note that in your list of potential stakeholders that there is a lack of representation for migratory birds or marine birds.

A: Environment Canada is the lead on Birds. They are involved at the steering committee level and at the planning office and can bring the day to day and regulatory aspects surrounding migratory birds to the table at those levels in PNCIMA.

Q: Who is making the decisions?

A: This is going to be a collaboration between FN and DFO and other government agencies. It is meant to use the powers of all those agencies to make it happen.

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

General comments:

- Lack of time to comment on Engagement Strategy.
- Uncertainty as to commitment from Ottawa and/or understanding by Ottawa on the integrated nature of the process in this area.
- Provincial Commitment to the PNCIMA process.
- one of the really important things is to make the product we generate out of this is process something that everyone wants to be involved in.

Group One discussion summary:

Expressed a desire for:

- an engagement strategy that makes use of simplified language.
- linkages in the working groups/committees being proposed as part of PNCIMA with other committees and building linkages to other groups and other work that is being done.
- a communications focused working group
- having representatives from geographic areas as well as First Nations participants
- a facebook page for communications
- increased ways for people in a community to get involved
- an advisory board with representatives from the regions
- other ways to engage the communities
- rehabilitation of fisheries.
- Training workshops

Noted that naturalists are different than environmentalists.

Group Two discussion summary:

Expressed a desire for:

- funding commitments
- clear workplans
- clarity within the documents on how to engage other government agencies
- jurisdictional integration
- Recognition that not everyone uses the internet as a communication tool.

Workshop suggestions:

- risk assessments, enhancement, and training for fishing guides.

Group Three discussion summary:

Expressed a desire for:

- a budgetary plan for the IOAC and funding commitment by DFO
- the need to focus the mandate of PNCIMA on sustainability of the whole area considered in terms of sustainable and ecologically rational sub-units.
- a balance between oral history and written science.
- the recognition of coast wide implications built into the IOAC terms of reference
- balanced composition with an experienced membership
- the province to be involved.
- balance between first nations and non-first nations representation on the IOAC
- two members from the SFAB – one south coast and one north coast member
- inclusivity
- staff support from planning office
- liaison person or resource person
- increased enforcement

Working group suggestions:

- marine transportation especially for tanker traffic in Hecate Strait,
- economy and foreign ownership and tenure and it's link to local communities.

Workshop suggestions:

- razor clams and preventing interception of fisheries,
- air transportation and bird life.

Noted that email is familiar to many, but is not a replacement for face to face and oral tradition of Haida Gwaii.

Meeting adjourned

**PNCIMA Community Meeting
Highliner Inn – Prince Rupert
March 31, 2010**

Welcome – Bruce Watkinson (North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society); Rebecca Reid (DFO)

Introduction – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Rebecca Reid (DFO)

Q: Please explain what you mean by multiple marine spatial plans.

A: This could be plans at different scales.

Comment: In Port Simpson, the community is developing a marine spatial management plan. We hope that your PNCIMA Plan will coincide with our local Plan.

Q: Are all First Nations communities developing plans?

A: Not all, but many of the communities are working on community plans.

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

Q: What is the process for appointing persons to a working group?

A: That is a question for you. How do we do this while allowing for an open discussion and transparency?

A: Perhaps the Planning Table could develop a “Draft” Terms of Reference and then the working groups can finalize it.

Group 1 discussion summary:

Expressed a desire for:

- need to respect existing processes
- prioritization of key issues
- sounding board... not doing work but guiding the process.
- value in having the IOAC exist through time.
- regionally oriented committees that can bring perspectives and synthesize interests into a larger process.

Noted that:

- some agreement that 20 people seems to be a workable number
- breaking down things by sectors can be difficult, there can be multiple interests
- Area based management. Locally based committees need to feed into the process.

How to make the IOAC more effective:

- Equitable participation... covering travel /no loss of income, some groups may have more funding and shouldn't compromise the ability of others to participate.

Working group topics suggested:

- Climate change
- policy on siting for energy
- capacity and community building for emerging economies, how locals access resources adjacent to their communities
- monitoring indicators for ecosystem health
- Oil spill response and effective sharing of community plans and ensuring that agencies have the best information available on ecologically sensitive areas and a protocol for contacting and notifying people
- Cumulative effects assessment.
- Marine economic strategies large and regional scales
- Communications and outreach.
- Visioning.

Workshops

- Marine economic strategies, tool for economic management
- What are the tools for conservation management... beyond MPAs.

Existing processes

- Fishery advisory processes
- CEA, SMAC

Group 2 discussion summary:

- Large geographic area – How do people communicate upwards from the geographic regions and to the PNCIMA table? Local level people will make the best decisions for the local area so make sure they are in the process.
- Working groups- resource management conflicts.
- Adaptive ways of dealing with issues over time or new and upcoming issues.
- TOR that extend beyond 2012
- Facilitated meetings between parties in conflict and connecting that into PNCIMA
- Institutional arrangements need to be enduring.
- Potential for marine traffic conflicts – Oil Tankers
- Fish farms – balance north and south?
- Space for non residence that aren't industry.
- Regional and TEK is incorporated.
- Look at our mistakes and move forward.
- Limit amount of bureaucracy when forming working groups
- Spatial vs a-spatial (regulations etc.)
- Transparency of funding - Equitable funding
- Area based discussions - Areas making regional decisions, decisions that affect multiple regions made at PNCIMA level.
- Tap into other advisory boards.
- Collective, collaborative, agreeing on mandates
- Independent facilitation.

Meeting adjourned

PNCIMA Community Meeting
Riverlodge Recreation Centre – Kitimat.
April 1, 2010

Welcome – Bruce Watkinson (North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society); Rebecca Reid (DFO)

Introduction – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Rebecca Reid (DFO)

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

General concerns expressed:

- no Eulachon left in our region.
- we would like to see trends and baseline data on the herring runs and other runs, so that we can use this when we look at incoming industry
- Is that data available to the public? Accessibility is a problem.
- Establishing PNCIMA – establish community groups within the communities themselves to help feed into the process.
- Break down PNCIMA into regional areas.
- In this channel there is a concern with the shrimpers dragging the bottom. This could be damaging habitat on the sea floor which that could have a real impact.

Question for participants: What are most effective ways to engage people on the issues raised above?

- Suggest workshops for information sharing and discussion of issues (ie. issue of super tankers in channels... not necessarily the oil spill issue.)

Communication suggestions:

- Future meetings need to be advertised more, you need to engage the media and we have a community bulletin board.
- The notice in the paper looks like it was written by a lawyer, make them simple.
- Put it on local TV, but remember only 35% of people in Kitimat have cable.

Suggestions on Forming the IOAC:

- A huge area, regional tables would be better... then send people from the regions to the bigger PNCIMA table.
- Suggest regional districts... you could have 5 groups who elect one or two people to come to the overarching table. Also, there are small communities like Hartley Bay that you need engage. Regional districts might be biased to the southern part of PNCIMA.
- Small local tables that nominate representatives from all the communities.
- 2 regional districts on Vancouver Island, but this is a small part of the bigger area.
- Communities that are close (ex. Bella Bella, Shearwater) linked into one table.
- Corporate interests can come to the local tables.

General Q&A

Q: How much of PNCIMA is recognized as Canadian sovereign waters. ?

A: Other than the border dispute with the USA - it is all Canadian Waters.

Q: Is there a consensus among the meetings you've had so far?

A: Everyone seems to want to have regional participation and that is one of the biggest challenges.

Q: Enbridge is talking about regional boards and head tables made up of reps from the regional boards. This would allow there to be 80 people at the regional level with 20 at the head table... voted to be there. The people interested enough to show up and get represented. Your Advisory Board could look like this.

A: We are here to ask you that: How do you resolve the demographic arguments? Spatial arguments? Who has time? How do we make it fair? Should we fund attendance at the meetings? We want your input to address these questions.

Q: Can meetings be held on line? Use of video conferencing and other on line tools.

A: Yes they can, although the technology isn't available in all communities.

Q: We have to break the secrecy around the Termpol process. Can PNCIMA find out for us how this works, and give us access?

A: We want to ensure this process is as inclusive as possible. We are here to talk about how to engage stakeholders in PNCIMA – PNCIMA is not a lobby group.

Q: Emergency response to oil spills, ships sinking, high winds. In the case of a real emergency, local rescue boat must be given the order to go out from Victoria. Lack of radar and infrastructure for shipping and emergency response.

Q: Weather monitoring - We have a maze of channels, but it's hard to plan a safe trip without the infrastructure for weather.

A: PNCIMA is a process of integrated management recognizing values and uses but PNCIMA itself cannot restrict existing government policy or authority.

Q: Just because there is a moratorium on oil drilling doesn't mean it won't ever happen. Is this something PNCIMA would be involved with? How do we mitigate that and make sure we all get to have a say.

A: We are talking to community folks as well as industry to create a process where issues can be discussed at a broad scale.

Q: Are the ports and ships going to erode the shoreline or destroy the eel grass beds?

A: This is not a question I can answer for you right now.

General Comments from the Floor.

Comment: Noise from ships affects whales, if we have more ships around, this could be bad for our local populations on whales. We need to be able to address this through PNCIMA

Comment: Bats get hit by Wind farms and so you see an alternative energy that needs to be mitigated before the structures are built. Upset one thing and everything else has to shift to accommodate.

Comment: Oil is the most important thing in this area right now. It is in our face. We are worried about spills. We hope this will get addressed through PNCIMA.

Comment: Hatcheries have to be part of this plan. DFO has to commit to the hatcheries until you achieve enhancement.

Comment: We live on the coast and have no public access to the beach, the only public road to the beach goes through a hunk of private property. Because Alcan owns all the land and they shut the road down. For an entrepreneur who wants to start a kayak business, there is nowhere to launch.

Comment: Eco tourism is in its infancy and has huge potential to grow. We need tourism to support our economy, not oil and gas.

Suggestions for working groups:

- We have 3 huge industries... were there baseline studies done? Who has this information? A working group could gather that kind of data and put it to use.
- Alien and Exotic Species - Ballast waters and species on hulls etc.
- Fish farms. In particular escaped Atlantic salmon and Land based, contained fish farms – like Carp, Tilapia, Bass

Other processes that need to be linked in to PNCIMA?

- Termpol
- There is no one from West Fraser, or Alcan, or Enbridge, or KLM agencies tonight. We need those reps here for this to be open and transparent.
- We are concerned that this is a sales pitch for commercial entities.

Q: We understand that any way we get involved is good, but this is a white wash. This looks like you are talking to the public, but Enbridge goes ahead anyway – we know the Government of Canada has said that Enbridge is good for Canada

A: Our responsibility is to bring people together and to be informed about the range of views and support for those views so that our minister can make the best decisions. Looking for opportunities for convergence of ideas.

Meeting adjourned

**PNCIMA Community Meeting
Coast Discovery Hotel, Campbell River
April 6, 2010**

Welcome – Bruce Reid (DFO); Scott Harris (Nanwakolas Council)

Introduction – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Bruce Reid (DFO)

Q: Would like to clarify this is a federal initiative?

A: Yes, federal and First Nations

Q: Meeting not well advertised locally. Underwhelmed by ability for informed citizens to find out about meetings.

A: Advertised in a few ways – ads in local papers, listserv, radio today, information on website, Contacting different organizations and interest groups, contacting local governments, SFAB

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

Q: How do you plan to engage the FNs on the coast?

A: We have a bilateral coordination Steering Committee and Planning Office – FN and Feds working collaboratively under 2008 MOU (DFO, Coastal First Nations, North Coast Skeena First Nations Stewardship Society) which outlined how FN and DFO would work within context of collaborative governance agreement to advance PNCIMA – that's the primary way but not the only way. There are FNs within PNCIMA area not under those umbrella organizations. Working to incorporate Nanwakolas into MOU, but even then not all will be represented. We need to pursue engagement with those FNs – that work just beginning.

Q: Structure – who makes final decision in the case of a conflict between user groups

A: Jurisdictions over management of these activities aren't changing (DFO/TC/etc) but how we work towards coming to an understanding is what's important – collaboration is key.

Q: How were geographic boundaries of PNCIMA determined? I am a member of a longstanding advisory process but just found out about PNCIMA in 2008 through FN MOU. There has been no consultation with people PNCIMA hopes to impact in the future.

A: Boundary: established through a scientific process (Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat) and based on oceanographic characteristics. Engagement: the planning process hasn't yet begun – that's why we're here. We've been having conversations about how to engage stakeholders for over a year – many meetings with different interest groups in different places since the forum. But it's key that we are still in the preparatory phase – how to engage people when the planning

process actually starts. Developing a knowledge base and broader governance context are what we've been focused on to date.

Q: Where do the fish farms fit in?

A: Integrated Management – under Oceans Act/Oceans Strategy – will address all activities in oceans. Intention is coordination (not individual management) and conflict mitigation. Fish farms should be accounted for / part of IM plan. There are ways activities are managed now – we are looking at coordination, advancing, making better – working with existing management and advisory structures to account for different uses in same areas.

Group 1 discussion summary

- 3 sub-groups (Climate Change, Independent Science, Trade-offs/Human Uses)
- Industry/Tourism – suggest a working group to resolve issues
- Renewable energy, waste management and discharges working groups suggested
- Feedback on the internet is one way, need to find others
 - o Skype for small working groups
 - o Webcasting is already done – cost?
 - o Library of key docs and seminars
- Funding: how much? When is it available?

Group 2 discussion summary

- Responsibilities of IOAC
 - o Key issues
 - o Helping ID working groups
 - o Science
 - o Communicate to broader public
- Advisory committees – smaller – 16-20 people max
- Facilitation
 - o Enough funding
 - o Replace members when they leave/have alternates
 - o Clear process for resolving issues
 - o Communicate to broader public
- Working groups
 - o Address some interactions (aquaculture & wild stocks)
 - o Better solutions for understanding
 - o Each PNCIMA area – own topics for Working Groups
 - o Ecosystem sustainability – trying to account for everything that happens in a given space (Cumulative Effects)
- Meetings and Workshops
 - o Local knowledge
 - o Summarize what is already known – start with EOAR
 - o Oil spills, key areas, spill response
 - o Alternative energy options
 - o Planning approach
 - o Make sure workshops have a result – a solution or change

- Link to existing processes and policies
 - On webpages – put links – visitors to PNCIMA – other areas that have similar processes and links to credible organizations
- Communication of meetings – this is a starting point
 - Need another one here and to get more people in

Group 3 discussion summary

- IOAC
 - need to have strong scientific background
 - Comments around smaller area-based districts
 - Academic representation
 - Stronger representation for specific wildlife
 - engage equitably and equally
 - Supported by science
- Working Groups suggested:
 - Aquaculture/wild stocks
 - Alternate energy
 - Ocean Health in terms of Human health implications
 - Marine interface
 - Cumulative effects of increasing marine transportation and oil tanker traffic
- Meetings
 - Stewardship and sustainability
 - Ocean health
 - Education and outreach
 - Point and non-point source pollution
 - Energy
 - Land use planning
 - Logging plan
- Internet
 - Surveys, feedback and reporting back
- Work to be done on enforcement – workshops, activities
 - Bring agencies together to discuss how
- Protection should be anchor for process
 - Precautionary principle

Group 4 discussion summary

- General suggestions:
 - Biology the top of the heap
 - Science from different sources, unbiased
 - 3 arms (economic, nature, cultural)
 - independence from political affiliation
 - funding for travel needed
- IOAC
 - Participation should not favour the squeaky wheel
 - Could result in really big committee

- Needs more local focus and smaller tables reporting to larger
- Working groups:
 - i.e. finfish aquaculture
 - Once a working group is formed and doing some work, could use a forum or meeting to get input
- Meetings – forum
 - Could accomplish more through website (information out and feedback in)
 - Forums could be good but local more important
- Other processes:
 - FNFC, SFAB, FRAWG
- Internet
 - Listserves, polls, feedback
 - Acknowledgement of input received is important

Next Steps – Neil Davis (DFO)

Meeting adjourned

**PNCIMA Community Meeting
Port Hardy Civic Centre
April 7, 2010**

Welcome

Introduction – Alex Gryzbowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Bruce Reid (DFO)

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

Q: Will the engagement strategy be a living document?

A: Once IOAC established, we expect process to be adaptive.

Q: Will presentations be available?

A: Yes, we can provide them and they will be available on the PNCIMA webpage

Q: Is there an opportunity to provide feedback on the two other documents?

A: These are background documents, but we can talk about what the planning process looks like

Q: Specifically the funding aspect?

A: At this time our intention is to develop this plan. The first thing we will do in the process is look at what the funding and resource plan looks like and how to resource all the things we want to do. We want everyone to have opportunity to provide feedback

Note: Concern about process: early on you need to address funding to groups that cannot afford to participate. If they want us to participate, DFO needs to provide funding to do this.

Note: Douglas Treaty Rights – not been followed by Fisheries. People are starving because of how Fisheries managed the fishery. Allowed draggers to come in without consultation and destroyed Eulachon.

Group 1 discussion summary

IOAC

- Composed of 4 subregions
- IOAC and mandate at more regional level, brought together through representation
- What is missing? Land.
- Improve access to information
- Scientific and local knowledge need to be communicated
- Planning office must communicate progress
- The foundation should be the missing principle, respect (authority, rights, titles, First Nations)

Working Groups

- process should be constituted in regions
- Local economy should see some economic benefit
- Concern with Fisheries
 - o The damage they cause
 - o Impact of one fishery on another

Meetings and Workshops

- Science and local knowledge
- Intention to bring people up to a higher level of understanding so that in the future they will be better informed to discuss issues

Internet

- Some like, some want hard copies

Group 2 discussion summary:

IOAC

- Potential for regional table that feeds into larger
- Better representation of people who live in the community
- Provide locally relevant input to broader recommendations
- Composition would be similar to IOAC, but with local representation
- Who would fund it?
- Who would run it?
- Local government bogged down
- Use Coastal First Nations Model to select
- Responsibility of IOAC
 - o Management decision making important
- Issues with consensus seeking body – is it realistic to achieve consensus?
- Suggest a definition of consensus in ToR

Working Groups

- Return of salmon
- Commercial/recreational interface
- Aquaculture
- Local knowledge
- Regional management and enforcement

Topics for meetings

- Local knowledge
- Distribute blank maps (Community to fill in, feed into spatial planning)
- Link to Species at Risk Process (ID and recovery plans, Bring to areas, ID threats)

Internet

- Incorporate Marine Map – California
- Recognize that the web is new tool for some
- Make videoconferencing available at community facilities

Other Communications

- Contacts in communities
- Press releases
- Budget for advertising
- Posters
- More interesting posters

Next Steps – Neil Davis (DFO)

Meeting adjourned

**PNCIMA Community Meeting
Shearwater Marine
April 8, 2010**

Welcome – Chief Gary Housty

Welcome from PNCIMA Steering Committee – Alex Chartrand (FN Governance Committee)

Introduction – Neil Davis (DFO)

Introduction – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Neil Davis (DFO)

Q: Who is “we”?

A: Steering Committee (leaders and managers from federal agencies, representatives from FNs) that provides direction and oversight to Planning Office – which does the day to day work. This is a collaborative governance arrangement between feds and FNs. Provincial government is involved as an observer. Impetus comes from Oceans Act – federal government identified PNCIMA as an area for integrated management.

Q: Oil companies – give local government a pile of money and then expect something – does PNCIMA have power to override that?

A: The most important part of developing this plan is having everyone at the table. Aiming to build a process that has all of the interested parties at the table (including, where appropriate, oil and gas, local government)

Q: Does that mean there are OOG people involved in the process currently?

A: In the same way we are engaging communities, we are doing the same thing with various sectors (inviting to meetings, forwarding information, etc.)

Q: What about forestry?

A: Forestry interests are part of the picture in terms of how oceans are used. So tonight we should talk about who needs to be at the table.

Q: Evident that OOG drilling and testing going on in our back yard. Moratorium is not legislated. Would be beneficial to discuss this at this table. Could have big effects on our way of life.

A: We are looking at this process as an opportunity to bring all these interests to the table. If you’re suggesting PNCIMA needs to address future of oil and gas as an issue, there’s different ways PNCIMA can organize – we are going to want to hear from you tonight about how we should go about doing that.

Q: Minister of the environment is reducing the power of the CEAA specifically in oil and gas discussions; concurrently, a CEAA process has been set up bringing some environmental organizations into a discussion re. Enbridge pipeline. If that comes through here, your picture of the BC coast will have lots of oil tankers in it. If you're saying that OOG interests all have a legitimate place at this table, you're talking about mitigation rather than yes or no to a pipeline. Can an equivocal statement be made against a pipeline?

A: Enbridge project is being assessed through an EA process. That process is under way and will continue. Broader question of how and whether these things fit into the future for the coast is precisely why we are having this discussion. We are not saying that we have accepted certain futures – we couldn't do that even if we wanted to. But we can ask if and how they fit into the picture for this area. Our approach will not be to exclude those parties from the planning process. Our approach will be inclusive – all parties interested in participating will be able to.

Q: Will everyone have equal footing in the discussions?

A: Great question – we'll be talking about that tonight – what does a fair process look like? How do we create equal footing? Note that recommendations go to the governance bodies – if there is no agreement on the future of oil and gas, maybe PNCIMA to develop better understanding of what the issues are.

Q: Gary Coons and Nathan Cullen should be here to hear what the concerns are. They are our links to Ottawa and Victoria.

A: Great suggestion – fits into the question of how to make this process more effective. Keeping political reps up to speed is one way we might make the process more effective.

Q: Note that FNS are right now developing marine use plans that reflect their values and interests in terms of protecting fisheries and aquatic resources. We have a strong arm in ensuring that some of these things don't happen.

Q: Central Coast FNs oppose oil and gas exploration – too much of a risk to our livelihood and way of life.

Q: Throughout the meetings – I don't see any representatives here for industry – ie. herring. Have you had comments from industry people at these meetings? I don't like the attitude of taking what's out in the ocean to provide us with a commercial season. We have to get that cycle back.

A: Important that industry is part of the process and at the table and we have had a number of meetings with industry at the table. But we also want to be asking question: how are decisions made based on best available science and knowledge. Making well informed decisions.

Q: I have been in meetings with DFO Science and I disagree with how they use biomass. We are part of the science now – monitoring boats out in the community that are doing a hell of a job – we need to get in there together.

Neil Davis – Engagement Strategy

Group 1 Discussion Summary:

IOAC

- key is effective representation of local communities at that committee. There needs to be a working group in this area that enables the local communities (not just BB and Shearwater, but also Klemtu, Ocean Falls) to come together to talk about all the issues. One or two reps of the WG would go to that advisory committee, and using the internet at the school, people could actually observe the IOAC meeting.
- With respect to the mandate, responsibilities of the IOAC – add in: providing advice on how local communities should be compensated for suffering impacts of developments.
- Adjusting IOAC representation: local; balanced; add forestry interests
- How to make the process more effective: emphasis about what's going to happen next. This must be a living document, not set in stone. But it won't live or be effective if there isn't local oversight and monitoring on an ongoing basis. Local control where possible.
- In order to participate, need resources to support that participation (local meetings and discussions as well as participation in IOAC)
- Suggest a WG that brings together scientific and local knowledge on complex questions.
- Oil and gas – we talked about it a lot. No final conclusion on what needs to happen but there needs to be a focused discussion on OOG at PNCIMA. Perhaps start with a workshop that brings together experts and local communities, and from there, a working group.

Advisory bodies:

- IHHPC
- Chamber of Commerce in Shearwater

Working groups:

- No young people looking to careers/futures in fishing. Suggest a working group or discussion on increasing local economic benefits of the ocean.

Internet:

- could be used more effectively; access a real issue here. School has good access, maybe something could be worked out with the school to use the internet to connect with PNCIMA. Use the local radio station.

Group 2 discussion summary:

IOAC

- clarify its role in identifying appropriate timelines

- Participation – lots of small voices in many communities – how to bring those small voices to a process in a way that they can be heard. Get local communities talking to one another and synthesizing local views to be a stronger voice at broader table
- Include forestry
- Participation from people in PNCIMA – not just those from outside (even if they make their livelihood within PNCIMA)
- Need to balance between bigger interests and these local interests and communities
- Need opportunity for FN and non FN communities to collaborate at a local level

Communication suggestions:

- communication needs to be better and earlier, and the internet isn't the only way to connect with local people.
- mailouts and using the local DFO office as a place to pick up info or provide feedback.
- Use the chamber of commerce as a point of contact
- Input needs to be unfiltered in terms of how it's communicated upwards. Make sure the input is accurately represented when it reaches higher levels
- Decisions to be based in science, not speculation or peoples' interests.

Working groups:

- OOG – Enbridge pipeline and what it means for local shipping traffic; areas that are more or less dangerous for navigation; sensitive or important areas for resources that should be avoided; economic impacts for areas of the coast; should it even happen
- What are local economic opportunities to benefit from resources in this area – what can be done to develop those opportunities.

Workshops:

- Support for regular meetings where local knowledge is shared and up to date science about status of areas can be shared.
- More focused discussions about how sport fishing is conducted in the area
- Suggestions to link to transboundary processes (ie. Alaska); link to first nations planning in various communities; TULA foundation (non-profit based in CC); Central Coast Chamber of Commerce
- Include human impacts of oil and gas.

Internet

- Should not be the only way we invite feedback
- We could do live video webcast or online forums – sending out questions and asking for votes online – using social media like Facebook.

Group 3 discussion summary:

IOAC

- There should be regional tables – they can work with a broader table but most work should be done at regional level (maybe a WG)
- looks like IOAC not grounded enough to make decisions, decisions should be made locally. Most work identified for IOAC should be done at local tables
- Concern that process won't have enough teeth – not making real decisions – recommendations are not enough to make changes.
- Participation: regional tables; broadly represented; bringing in local municipal governments, FNs, sector representatives – outreach and education; engage youth
- Build enduring relationships
- Consistent representation (same people)
- Recommendations are strongly supported
- Solid goals and objectives and identified outputs that everyone buys into
- Constant followup
- Because CFN has unanimously opposed Enbridge process, that also should be a position of this effort that purports to protect our coast.

Communication

- send materials at least a month in advance
- Use Chamber of Commerce; local bulletin boards; etc. Internet not widely available – use faxes, mailouts, etc.
- It's difficult for people to talk about process and separate it from the issues

Final Comments:

Who's going to interpret the results of this meeting? What's going to happen with the notes?

Note that your timelines are very short. Not giving us a lot of time to reflect on the material.

Q: How do you reconcile the different things you hear in different communities?

A: Things we have heard a lot of will influence the choices we make. But we have to be conscious of what different places have said that are different.

Q: Who makes the decision?

A: Planning Office and Steering Committee will take what we've heard at meetings and incorporate. Once advisory committee formed, they will be part of these discussions as well.

Neil Davis – Next Steps

Meeting adjourned

**PNCIMA Community Meeting
Lobelco Community Hall – Bella Coola
April 9, 2010**

Welcome – Alex Chartrand (FN Governance Committee)

Welcome – Sandie MacLaurin (DFO)

Introduction – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Neil Davis (DFO)

Note: Must include an implementation plan that considers monitoring and adaptive management

Stakeholder Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

Q: Why is there no connection between the province and FNs on the governance slide?

A: Should be a dotted line – some direct discussions between First Nations and the province on marine planning issues although no formal marine planning structure in place at this time

Group Discussion

IOAC

- Importance of chairperson/cochair – at sport fish committee meetings there is usually a DFO person and elected person as cochairs – need a process to elect a chairperson
- Can be a long process to get to the ToR if there isn't a straw dog already – structure/expectations/guidance on how to participate (Roberts Rules)
- Composition: what do you mean by communications and infrastructure? A catch-all for different kinds of infrastructure – ports/cables/etc
- Most of what I see here is about economic opportunities. If you don't invite ENGOs into the process you will have some trouble – marine conservation can mean a lot of different things (could include restoration, existing hatcheries, community wellbeing)

Q: Where is food fishing in the list of interests to be represented at the IOAC? Under local communities? How is food fishing going to be incorporated, reflected into PNCIMA process?

A: FNs and federal government are working collaboratively on this plan and there's a place for FNs to input into the structure. In the marine planning work that FNs are currently doing, food fisheries are included. FNs will be sitting at the IOAC table ex officio, and providing input in at all levels. Note that food fishing is dealt with on a bilateral basis between feds and FNs – not usually up for discussion.

Q: How large to you expect this committee to be?

A: That will be a key difficulty – LRMP – 130 people at the table wanting to have equal say. Struggle to figure out how you have the right representation and a workable size group. Expect we'll draw on success in other planning processes.

Other comments

- Integrated herring management experience – difficult. DFO has tried to work with North and South Coast boards that feed into a meeting in Vancouver. This is a much broader scale than what we've done before. Suggest talking to herring and salmon groups to see what their issues have been.
- Regional District wants representation as well
- Need funding for an individual within the communities to actually coordinate the communities. Then amongst the communities they could elect a representative to the IOAC.
- As long as local people feel like they are contributing and being listened to then they will take ownership. If it all goes one way, or comes down as thou shalt, they won't take ownership. Needs to be an information flow to and from communities.
- What about protected areas? A whole marine component has been designed as part of the CCLRMP process. Options that we have recommended have no effect on federal legislation – we are looking towards this process to provide some guidance. The province isn't going to declare any marine protected areas until getting feedback from these processes.
- I didn't know anything about this meeting until 4 hours ago – involved in recreational fishing all my life. As a community member, you see demise of fisheries. It's good that something like this is taking place but I would like to have had more information in advance. Would have been nice if more people had come to this meeting – I can think of others that should have been here. Important that all people in the community have a voice in some of these processes. Local rod and gun club – some of the people there are interested in this process.
- No separation between FNs and non FNs in these local communities. The same issues exist today for native and non-native folks. Key issues include: employment in the fisheries; forest industry; closure of Interfor and Ministry of Forests; unemployment which affects the whole community – schools, hospitals, other infrastructure.

Suggestions for Working Groups:

- Commercial fishery
- Tourist industries
- WG to identify issues and objectives for local community
- WG to discuss economic issues
- Healthy ecosystems/sustainability model. What is sustainable and what is actually going to create economic opportunities for communities
- Increasing local/community benefits derived from ocean resources (LRMP process – more outsiders than local people. Common complaint on Central Coast – people from other places dictate what happens in our community. Hard to have a sense of ownership in a process that comes from somewhere else.

- MPAs, other conservation areas. (Concerns: what are we giving up (access) and what are we gaining? Local people would still like to have access to local resources – we live here. Maintaining opportunity to use resources.)
- New conservancies – established without prejudice to aboriginal rights and title. Traditional things will go on in those conservancies. Rehabilitation/restoration and enhancement are a big part of that. Availability to local communities is important. Restoration, recovery of: Eulachon, Sockeye, Steelhead
- Bycatch in this area not relevant because there is no fishery
- Local people are concerned about crab – don't know what or how much is there.

Connecting to existing processes

- Rivers Inlet/Smiths Inlet Sockeye Recovery had a steering committee where the main interests designated or appointed people to represent their interests on the committee. As far as how that interest was weighted – a bit of an issue due to pressure from commercial fishery. That process had a facilitator and over the years has had different funding sources. Need to have a dedicated person (people) making sure that things continue to move along.
- Science and Technical committee on the RSSEPS team were the drivers – you need something like that. They didn't have a vested interest.
- Rivers Inlet Salmon Process – sometimes FN felt that we didn't have enough input – goals and objectives were great but you need support for that body to function properly.

Role of Science

Q: Where is Science? Not just science – but local/traditional knowledge as well. Could invite known specialists into the process to give us ideas towards a solution

A: This is one of the themes we have been hearing from other communities – open question of how we bring science and LEK TEK into process. Should it be a working group? Workshops with specialists sharing info with public? When we convene an advisory committee, how we incorporate science will be one of the early topics of discussion of that advisory committee

- Science should develop a number of options that are then taken out to the community – the community decides. Come up with a suite of possible solutions and see which one is the most acceptable.
- Science shouldn't be swayed by economics or protectionism. Both of those influences can have a number of drastic objectives that are quite different and doesn't really give us a range of pure science options to choose from.

Workshops, forums, meetings

- With CCLRMP – so many people who needed to meet that they met in Richmond or Port Hardy, which excluded us. More inclusive meetings and they have to be on Central Coast so that we can be there.
- Having groups of the same interest discussing issues on a larger geographic scale might be beneficial. We'll hear input and ideas from other ideas that we might not otherwise think of – broader strategic approach to the issue.

- Bring everyone together for working session where you aren't always sitting with your community, you're with others. An actual workshop that's a Work. Shop.
- There has been separation between native and non-native and it shows over time in terms of employment numbers in our communities. Some people now feeling how we have been feeling over time re. unemployment.
- Note that FNs are developing marine use plans. How is our marine use plan going to fit into broader PNCIMA process? One of our top priorities is protection and enhancement of marine resources. Hopefully our kids and grandchildren will benefit.

Other methods of communication:

- our school district doesn't have internet access. Without a systems upgrade we are limited re. what we can do here. Can't do videoconferences.
- difficult for elderly people to navigate internet although they do have internet access – so a capacity issue in the communities
- people are often overwhelmed / bombarded
- line speed is 230Kb per second – some documents/presentations that are available are not accessible to us. Could be a good secondary source of information to us. Ex. can't watch the video clips of the PNCIMA Forum.
- Means of communication that work more effectively?
 - o Come and sit down with us
 - o People in the community (attend rod and gun club meetings and other community groups)
 - o Conference calls work (but try not to make us follow along with things)
 - o Hospital, MoF have videoconference capacity. Maybe one community point for videoconferencing
 - o Simplify documents – take fancy graphics out
 - o Establish networks and points of contact in communities – people who are knowledgeable about the community and can distribute information much more effectively than one of us can from afar.
 - o Community contact (or someone local from planning office) would hold local meetings and be local contact. Again, the funding issue.
 - o No local DFO people doing oceans management in Central Coast area – so it's hard for us to be up on everything
- Appendix A – one of the principles of the initiative – accessibility. Up to us as a Steering Committee to provide that kind of opportunity – make sure this information gets to the right people to then provide better opportunities for engagement

Final notes:

- FNs have hired technical people to help us with marine use planning – provide advice, give direction, with our own voice in that document. That's what we're looking for in terms of engagement: your voice in the IOAC.
- We have gone through a lot of these issues in our marine use planning. Important that your voices are heard and your interests are disseminated into the process.

- People that live on the central coast have similar values (protecting, enhancing, sustainability)
- If you want to get advice from local communities and FNs are already engaging and involved, would you want to engage local communities the same way?
- I would like to assist and help with marine use plans that FNs develop
- Why don't we ask FNs to take the lead in our communities ? Don't reinvent the wheel/duplicate the work

Next Steps – Neil Davis

Meeting adjourned

PNCIMA Community Meeting
SFU Harbour Centre – Vancouver
April 13, 2010

Welcome – Rebecca Reid (DFO)

Welcome – Larry Greba (Coastal First Nations)

Introduction – Alex Grzybowski (Pacific Resolutions)

PNCIMA Overview – Rebecca Reid (DFO)

Engagement Strategy – Neil Davis (DFO)

Q: What have you heard in communities on the coast in terms of where they'd like to see this go?

A: Hearing an interest in ensuring strong, localized voices in this process. Communities within PNCIMA share an interest in ensuring they have a meaningful voice, so we need to consider structures that can have input on a sub-PNCIMA level.

Priority issues identified include marine transportation and associated development, aquaculture (esp on N Island), creating strategies that allow locals to benefit from resources adjacent to their communities, seeking to enhance or encourage economic growth within communities, bringing science and local/traditional knowledge together for a more accessible information base, renewable ocean energy.

Q: One of the outputs you noted was a spatial plan (s). Are you anticipating multiple spatial plans?

A: We recognize that it's going to be a challenge to do everything we want in two years, and planning can happen on different scales. So potential to localize. Cautious about idea of one concrete rigid master plan. We want more flexibility in terms of what spatial planning looks like – not a one-off process but something informed by issues as they arise over time.

Q: Input from all tables – where does that correlate to development of plan? Which body?

A: Plan a product of all the different engagement mechanisms. IOAC, WGs, workshops will all inform what different pieces of a plan look like. Part of the job of PO and SC is to put some framework to what the plan looks like (based on legislation, policy). So IOAC wouldn't sit down and type up an IM plan – not a typical request for an advisory body. Individuals within PO would work with IOAC and others to develop that plan. What eventually goes to decisionmakers in different agencies is informed by that dialogue and hopefully reflects a shared set of interest and some common ground.

- Q: Planning Process as the centre of the star – somewhere inside that process circle would be governance ... who creates work groups? What are the connections?
- A: One of the responsibilities for IOAC is identification of priority issues most suitably addressed through something like a WG, but there are a few inputs to that. The role of government (in collab w FN) is to scope out what we think some of the priority issues are. That then comes to a body like the IOAC for discussion – what kinds of topics need to be the focus of more detailed discussion thru wgs or a workshop.
- Q: Concern is around transparency. How are existing advisory bodies brought into process, directly via Planning Office? Meeting with IOAC?
- A: Good question – initial thoughts are that this would be one of the responsibilities of the PO as a coordinating body – they would initiate contact, say that within WG there have been some recommendations and based on what we have heard from the rep at the IOAC, it needs broader discussion within your particular community. Then response brought back into process. Key in terms of transparency is that participants within the process that have affiliations to communities know what's going on and have a role in terms of ensuring that what we bring back into IOAC or WG is congruent with what we've heard at that advisory board.
- Note: Over the course of our meetings, have heard that participation in IOAC needs to be enhanced in terms of community participation. Have also heard some potential ideas for what WGs might focus on. PO and SC want to convene IOAC in June, get some ideas about which WGs based on feedback from community meetings, and then ToRs of those WGs might define the communication between that WG and the advisory/existing process.

Group 1 Discussion Summary:

IOAC

- suggestions to clarify – where recommendations go, who writes plan, what is process for plan, how does IOAC interact w governance framework
- clarify that IOAC has opportunity to comment on whole IM plan package
- refining the role of the PO and IOAC in getting information out
- participation/balancing: keep it small (25ppl max, 15 ideal) and clarify that it's not the only opportunity for participation. Don't just consider balance between individual sectors but also recreational, commercial, community interests
- effectiveness of IOAC:
 - o rules of engagement/participation agreement at the outset
 - o training or capacity building to bring people onto same page re how to work together
 - o clarify how that group to be supported
 - o allow for alternates (attend and be informed, step in when someone's away) But also allow for more people in the room from that same interest that don't speak but stay informed – UN model

- developing good networks within regions/interest groups to get that information out... identify points of contact

WGs

- input of neutral 3rd party scientific input to inform decisions. The key is that you need them to be credible and objective
- topics – more detailed work to refine definition of ecosystem functions and services that inform identification of EBSAs
- how do you account for tradeoffs between choices in planning – and mechanism to identify those tradeoffs
- don't get too sector specific (idea of IM) – should address specific topics that are also multi-sectoral
- economic opportunities – break down by regions
- how do we link to other plans and processes

Meetings/Workshops

- using workshops to bring early products of planning process out for public review
- to explore different tools/strategies that can be used to advance IM (planning, protected areas)

Existing Processes

- involve community outreach centres as local points of contact
- linking to smaller scale planning throughout PNCIMA – FNs, Gwaii Haanas, local coastal zone or estuary planning

Using Internet

- in addition to the internet – blogs/social media not used so much in local communities as in urban environments
- use community access program centres that exist in some communities that can help people find and access information
- community tv, articles in local papers, local radio

Group 2 Discussion Summary:

IOAC

- include dispute resolution process
- strong need and role for independent science and need to clarify that role
- ensure everyone around table understands rules of engagement (provide training)
- participation: under 30 would be ideal; include academic, educational institutions in some form under the list
- some participants should not be lumped together (should have a rep from each of renewable and non-renewable)
- role of independent science that might include a role for TK
- need for ToR and clearly understood rules of engagement for the process

WGs

- marine transportation

- sustainable fisheries (all different fishing interests instead of independent sectors)
- clear goals, timelines, deliverables for those working groups which would provide legitimacy

Meetings/Forums

- workshop to bring together current knowledge around IM processes worldwide
- (note: inform IOAC once convened of lessons learned from other planning processes - orientation)
- sustainable fisheries workshop
- Enbridge workshop
- Marine spatial planning as it would relate to PNCIMA area

Existing processes

- fisheries advisory processes
- Gwaii Haanas National Marine Conservation Area
- Scott Islands
- These processes could be a way to bring in marine spatial planning discussions

Internet

- not everyone uses Outlook
- ensure community libraries have access to hard copies and the website
- use schools and colleges for advertising meetings
- meetings to be up front and centre on the website

Summary

- great opportunity to do something new and different – need to build on expertise and knowledge around world and in the room

Group 3 Discussion Summary:

IOAC

- Be pragmatic about concrete outcomes it can deliver over a 2 year period
- analogy to CCLRMP Phase 1 – some spatial outputs, definition and commitment to EBM, areas identified that needed more work
- Resourcing strategies will be important
- Membership: add forest sector interest (through transportation given the shipping/storage of logs as forestry interest in the ocean itself)
- How to ensure effective community representation – different proposals:
 - o Blend sector and regional representation (commercial fish takes on added responsibility to represent a region) – keeps table small and workable
 - o Parallel processes – expanded IOAC – a forum for feedback, regional groups feed in WGs feed in
 - o Expanded group but not too expanded – community representation expanded to 1 or 2 from every area
 - o Variation: second row – representatives at table, then outside of that have some affiliates of representatives but they are still in the room

- CCN model – regional forums that send representatives to IOAC on the basis of what issues will be discussed at IOAC (solutions happen at regional level, and PNCIMA wide issues discussed at IOAC level)
- Equitable participation more complicated than it looks (commercial fish harvesting covers a lot of different interests that need to be represented – fish processing is smaller) Don't want table overwhelmed by one group or interest

WGs

- science panel – feedback on EBM thresholds, adaptation to marine environment
- economic sustainability WG – delivering concrete outputs that result in sustainable economic activities in communities delivering benefits
- contentious issues – transportation (tanker traffic); aquaculture (finfish); fisheries (common vision for the future for fisheries)
- integration WG – what and how? Integrating sector visions (20 years from now)
- EBM WG – short term to assist in developing EBM definition

Meetings

- renewable energy
- aquaculture (finfish and shellfish separate)
- rare and endemic species
- high productivity areas
- marine protected areas (existing work, what's possible, uses that are compatible or not, bringing people up to speed wrt developing MPA network)

Existing processes

- area a crab/naikun wind group and broughton area monitoring plan may produce specific outputs that are useful and could be integrated into PNCIMA
- CMAC – a useful sounding board for MTWG
- Integrated fish harvest planning committee
- NC sustainable marine fisheries and communities initiative (could potentially support a NC regional table)

Internet

- access limited in smaller communities
- feedback using the internet on particular products needs to be interactive. ex. web based workshop that facilitates input from a broad variety of people – communication and dialogue, not just email)
- none of this replaces need for periodic face to face engagements

Any final questions or statements?

- forestry not just about transportation– integrates with land – suggest an interface workshop – pollution from land is a big issue – habitat an issue

Next Steps – Neil Davis (DFO)

Meeting adjourned