

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

# Integrated Salmon Dialogue Forum Widening the Circle III

**Date / Time:** Monday, 18<sup>th</sup> April 2011 4:00pm – 8:00pm  
Tuesday, 19<sup>th</sup> April 2011 8:30am – 4:30pm

**Location:** BCIT Downtown Campus, Vancouver.

**Attendees:** (In Person) Chris Ashton; Dave Barrett; Angela Bate; Karen Brady; Jessica Bratty; Ernie Crey; Mark Duiven; Sue Farlinger; Meg Gaily; Stephen Geiger; Gordon Gislason; Mike Griswold; Jessica Hawkins; Ange Hill; Barry Huber; Bert Ionson; Corey Jackson; Ron Kadowaki; Paul Kariya (Day 2); Gerry Kristianson; Frank Kwak; Dave Lightly; Colin Masson; Dave Moore; Barbara Mueller; Randy Nelson; Rose Point.; Jordon Point (Day 2); Clifton Prowse; Peter Sakich; Wayne Saito; Les Sam; Glenn Sigurdson; Barry Stuart; Marion Town; Diana Trager; Michelle Tung; Boris Tyzuk ; Bob Resansoff;

**Regrets:** Craig Orr, Ryan McEachern, Howie Wright, and others

---

## SUMMARY NOTES

---

The Monday evening session opened with a prayer.

### PANEL DISCUSSION

#### **Panel Members**

Ernie Crey; Sue Farlinger; Gerry Kristianson; Peter Sakich.

#### **Question to the Panel**

It is 2016 and you come across this evening's discussion paper: "Evolving a New 'Framework' for Decision Making in Salmon Fisheries: Drivers and Directions". What was the most important point on target in the paper and what went through your mind when you saw the phrase "culture of collaboration"?

**Many different perspectives were offered by the Panel, with some of the key point made including:**

- Catching monitoring comes first, then collaboration. Each sector needs to have confidence in the other sectors' numbers before collaboration can occur. The phrase "no data, no fishery" captures the essence of what is needed in order for collaboration to happen.

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- Recognizing that “one size does not fit all” is very pertinent in the case of fisheries management as it is extremely complex. It would be a mistake to try to simplify it.
- The Panel recognized that a number of changes are likely to take place over the next five years: changes in the environment that may affect salmon populations; the signing of new treaties in B.C. that involve deals on salmon; and the likely reduction in government funds that support work on pacific coast salmon. In the event of such changes, we will be forced as citizens to step up to the plate and work together to help the salmon.
- As things change, DFO will be increasingly dependent on collaboration across the sectors - First Nations, recreational, commercial, conservation, and DFO will need to work together to plan and manage their fisheries together.
- As things change, we need to evolve in order to survive. This sentiment applies as much to bureaucracies as it does to individuals and groups. A future vision was described wherein DFO is smaller and is working much more closely with other departments and governments. In this vision, all DFO staff members have developed strong skills in engagement and collaboration. Groups, as well as individuals, are resilient because they have built structures and relationships between themselves. In five years we will have a basis for this relationship. The basis is transparency around what each of us (as individuals or groups) brings to the table. Build resilience to engage with salmon stocks and rebuild the stocks, and enjoy the cultural and commercial benefits. In the future vision, DFO managers will understand that building and nurturing relationships is the basis and core of having a resilient structure to manage natural resources such as fish.
- The test in five years is whether we have found creative answers to the challenges we are dealing with today such as the question of access and the “hierarchy of authority” that exists within some stakeholder groups.
- It should not be assumed that “collaboration” always carries a positive connotation. Some members of the different constituencies disapprove of their representatives engaging in collaborative dialogue. It was suggested that the context in the past led to these negative connotations, but today the context is a lot better. A question was posed as to how one can generate a positive connotation around the word “collaboration” when the playing field remains uneven, leaving certain players at the table with a stronger position than others.
- The ISDF has been a very important space in which many conversations have opened up, and relationships built, that simply had not been happening, and would not have without it. The real question that we must ask ourselves is how we keep the spirit alive that it fostered, so that we do not lose the benefit of having this continuing conversation kept alive as we continue to work through these difficult challenges in responding to change at so many levels. We must develop concrete ways of continuing what has been started here...

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

### Points of Discussion Open included:

- A concern was raised that although great progress has been made in working together and building relationships in some areas (e.g. the lower Fraser), resistors still exist outside this small geographic area and that these resistors will come into play the moment we try to move this dialogue into the upper Fraser. How should this issue be addressed?
- It was suggested that the main resistor to collaboration is the issue of “who gets what” and that this issue can only be resolved by defining shares across and within sectors.
- It was recognised that moving forward requires courage and that everyone must look past the zero-sum mindset.
- The way to make progress will be to work up from what may seem like small beginnings, but it is this that enables people to put the fear away and move forward together.
- A question was posed as to how the allocation issue should be resolved in the near future in the event that the economy of the sports fishery outstrips the economy of the commercial fishery.
- The Panel were asked what they felt was most valuable about the ISDF, and the responses included:
  - The ISDF has provided an opportunity to have important conversations around the big picture drivers around the fishery without getting bogged down in the allocation argument and policy knots before a conversation even begins,
  - The ISDF has provided an opportunity for people to see how things can move forward, e.g., by looking at the work of the M&C Panel.
  - The ISDF, through the M&C Panel, has gone well beyond the regulations set by the government by building relationships and a collaborative governance structure that demonstrates how government can work effectively with the other sectors to fulfill mandates, respect rights, and advance the interests of all participants.
  - The lessons learned in the ISDF about relationship building can be brought into DFO to make it a better organization. Basic training on how to effectively engage with the other sectors to inform and support fisheries management and planning processes.
  - The ISDF has given everyone the chance to stand back and look at the bigger picture rather than being caught up in making decisions and planning as happens in conventional advisory processes through an open and frank exchange of ideas and opinions.
  - The ISDF allowed people to move past media reports and stone throwing, to get to

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- know each other personally, to learn about each other's values and interests.
  - The ISDF facilitated the mending and building of relationships between people from different sectors.
  - The ISDF has been a place where "safe politics" can take place, where people can talk about how to resolve differences.
  - ISDF could also be a frustrating environment at times because when someone tried to establish hard objectives people got very concerned about the lack of any explicit mandate from their constituency, and being tagged with misrepresenting them.
  - The Making Peace and Decisions workshop held in Sumas in early 2011 has demonstrated the importance of building understanding of the concepts and skills for collaboration- the tools - to use on the water and in the office.
- The participation of representatives from the Cohen Inquiry was noted, and the hope was expressed that some of the important lessons that have come forward through the ISDF will be taken forward to the Commission in responding and recommending in respect to the difficult systemic issues facing fisheries management.
  - In general, great optimism was expressed for the future. However, several participants expressed concern as to what would be the legacy of the ISDF and what would be the successor process?

**The Participants were given an opportunity to meet in small group sessions, and then to provide individual responses on "stickies" after a report back from each of the groups and related debriefing conversations.**

*It is April 30, 2011. You are reflecting back on the Panel Session two weeks ago. What were the most important takeaway messages as to what needs to happen to build off the work that has been done at the ISDF?*

**The responses which were given included:**

- There is an interest and demand for a forum to have conversations such as those had by the ISDF. Government will be well served to meet that need.
- The need to agree on continuing the ISDF in some way, perhaps in the nature of a "policy forum".
- Connecting the "local" networks. Figuring out how to successfully move beyond the lower Fraser area is the key to success.
- A decision to continue the work of building relationships first, then finding common ground

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

for projects.

- Make sure the message of what has been done and achieved here by this group is kept alive and brought back to the constituency of each group in a way that transforms their relationships with the resource and with each other.
- The level of trust across sectors must continue to increase – nothing more affects the ability to make quality decisions. Low trust levels mean: high cost, delays, little commitment, and low level of innovation.
- DFO needs to invest in collaborative solutions inside and outside the department.
- A continuing dialogue between stakeholders to stay connected; acceptance from DFO that co-management means listening to advice and implementing; everyone should play by the same rulebook.
- A standing panel is required that involves interests and the department to pick up where the ISDF left off – identify resistors and successes.
- New collaborative process that drives technical, monitoring, and relationship development.
- Fraser Basin Council annual “Think Tank”. Make at least one new friend each salmon season that has a different perspective on what needs to be done.
- We need a follow-up, thorough process.
- People from different sectors need to keep talking together in an honest and open way to resolve future challenges in fisheries management.
- Need a forum that allows discussion/collaboration to continue.
- Continue a “safe” place to continue discussions and convene in the event of conflict that might arise in-season.
- That we have a long way to go but we have started.
- What assurance is there that ISDF will continue?
- Structured safe place for politics, without specific deliverables attached. Kept open to identify opportunities.
- It is imperative for the future that we find some way to keep collaborating.

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- We need to commit to continuing to build on the relationships that have grown in the ISDF.
- Documenting the initial elements of the “culture or language of collaboration”.
- To move forward on ideas established by the working groups.
- What should the Cohen Commission recommend to improve future collaboration?
- Needs to be a process where policy issues on difficult issues can be discussed in a “safe” way.
- Understanding and resolving defined access.
- Agreeing how to define and implement access.
- Need to have a way to move forward – relationships are the key building blocks but we need to continue with a forum to resolve issues.
- Continue to meet and discuss in a non-confrontational environment.
- Groups collaborating to meet their mutual needs and a process of monitoring for the survival of the salmon.
- We need a successor process and movement from DFO on defined shares.

The Monday evening session closed with a prayer. A social mixer event took place afterwards.

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

The Tuesday session opened with a prayer.

## **MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE PANEL SESSION**

The Monitoring and Compliance (M&C) Panel is a full and complete demonstration of collaborative governance in practice. An overview of the M&C Panel was presented covering: history, structure/projects, lessons learned, and the meeting-to-panel transformation.

### **History**

- A critically important feature of the M&C Panel is that its composition covers all fisheries and includes from First Nations, Recreational, Commercial, NGOs, Federal and Provincial members and alternates.
- The M&C Panel grew out of the ISDF, first as a working group, and then evolved into an independent Panel in 2009. Its scope is across the pacific region. When established the importance of defining a specific period of time it would be given to demonstrate how a Panel like this could add value for all sectors was recognized - with a review of its effectiveness to take place in 2012, at which point it will be “sun-setted” unless there is agreement and funding to continue it with a mandate to be determined at that time.
- The M&C Panel Chair position has been rotated to date (currently Peter Sakich, Commercial Sector), and is independently facilitated/coordinated by Stephen Geiger of Edge Consulting Ltd. (Vancouver BC). The administrative host for the M&C Panel is the Fraser Basin Council.
- The M&C Panel’s goal is to “get past the numbers” and to develop fair and practical monitoring and compliance practices for sustainable fisheries.
- A major issue for the M&C Panel has been the need to make monitoring and compliance cost effective and attractive for others to use (i.e., incentives).
- As monitoring of fisheries continues to increase over time, as it surely will, there will need to for an ongoing place where people can come to talk when there is conflict over each other’s numbers. This may be an important role for the M&C Panel into the future.

### **Structure/Projects**

- The M&C Panel structure is defined by the following working groups:
  - Project 1: Identify Best Practices

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- Project 2: Communication, Education and Awareness
- Project 3: Governance & Lessons Learned (Making sure that the lessons learned by the M&C Panel are fed into the ISDF Governance Tools Working Group)
- Project 4: Achieving High Levels of Compliance (Fed into the capacity building workshop held in Sumas in early 2011)

### Lessons Learned

- The M&C Panel is a place where people are able to interact in a way that strives to achieve mutual understanding and make improvements.
- The M&C Panel is a “contributing” – and not a decision making - process. The energy and interests of the M&C Panel can be used to influence agency decision makers, sector organizations and their members.
- A key document developed by the Department and Panel working together through the M&C Panel was a discussion paper titled **“Charting Our Course: Fishery Monitoring In the Pacific Region (A Strategy for Improved Confidence and Support)”**. This report demonstrates the benefits that can come through this kind of collaboration, while respecting that there is also a need for the Department to independently deal with internal policy considerations and directions to staff (as was done through the **DFO Strategic Framework Policy Document** developed in parallel with this process). The development of this report demonstrates how working together “externally” supports work that must be done “internally”, and vice a versa.

### Lessons Learned - Lower Fraser River Pilot Project / Field Trip

- The First Nations Sport Fishers Joint Working Group of the Fraser River Salmon Table Society collaborated with the M&C Panel to see how they could work together on projects of mutual interest.
- The M&C Panel needs to be able to say that “it has been there” and to do this it needs to get out onto the water where issues are present. So the M&C Panel went on fieldtrips and people got the opportunity to experience life on the water from the perspective of how a First Nation, commercial, or recreational fishery operates. It was an eye-opening experience for everyone. They also had debriefing session and workshops following these field trips that were very helpful and constructive.
- The Lower Fraser Pilot Project took place between Hope and Mission and involved First Nations, recreational, and commercial fisheries. The project sought to identify gaps in

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

information and knowledge and to develop a strategy to get from where they were to where they need to be. The project involved a lot of discussion on each other's fishery monitoring and catches reporting practices and there was a strong interest to see if improvements could be made in 2011. The lessons learned from the Lower Fraser Pilot Project will be used to inform other pilot projects elsewhere in the province.

- A major challenge faced by the Lower Fraser Pilot Project was getting everyone in the room that was affected by same issue onto the same page. There was a critical need to effectively communicate goals and interests. Everyone had the potential to impact progress, so they needed to get everyone on the same page. They also needed to get clarity around the purpose of the M&C Panel.
- If you wait for the perfect set of circumstances, you will never move forward. The M&C Panel feel they have enough positive energy and will move forward for 2011.

### **Participant Driven Collaboration**

- There is a big difference between the people who monitor the fishery and the people who enforce the fishery.
- For monitoring: close and trusting relationships are needed between monitors and fishers. Monitors are interested in how many fish come out of the water. Monitors are not interested in what is done with the fish once they are out of the water.
- Monitoring, compliance, and enforcement – ultimately the effectiveness of these efforts will turn on the quality of the relationships across sectors.
- The Making Peace and Decisions 4-day workshop held in Sumas in early 2011 was all about finding ways “to see the world through the eyes of the ‘other guy’ – that is what it takes to move people of positions, trying to find ways to live together notwithstanding their differences.
- In times of scarcity, there is a great need for fine-detailed data. To get this fine-detailed data you need to build relationships both between the sectors and between the monitors, enforcers, and fishers. The politics of scarcity requires that these relationships exist.
- There is a need to keep practicing participant-driven collaboration. It is not enough to have a 4-day workshop on the topic. You need to keep up the efforts.

**Key questions and points made in the discussions that followed the overview given by the Panel included:**

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- Diminishing dollars is a fact of life within government today. **What are the ways in which we can respond to the challenges of cost and affordability within a monitoring and compliance context – including ongoing resources for the work of the Panel?**
- Development of the “Charting Our Course” report DFO’s Strategic Framework Policy Document considered this constraint - it was broadly recognized that it would take some combination of resources from both DFO and the harvesters to achieve what it will take to do the task effectively. There is no one answer to this affordability issue. One needs to look at it as consistently as possible across all fisheries. The idea of a “user fee” was raised, however it was recognised that there is a problem with this, namely that those who are doing the right thing end up paying for those who are not doing the right thing.
- At the end of PICFI, there is no more funding to support the M&C Panel. It was suggested that relating the funding to the direct benefits of the M&C Panel might be a way to move forward – and the important role it has played as a catalyst was recognized.
- It was suggested that in any type of catch and monitor program the risk has to outweigh the reward. It is human behaviour to under report, so you need to make sure that the risk of being caught is higher than the reward if the program is to work.
- An alternative to having a high risk associated with being caught, is to put in place an incentive strategy (and there might be many ways to do this, e.g., something as basic in the Skeena where fishers were entered into a draw for prizes if they completed their catch logs)
- Inevitably, the potential for suspicion arising increases when each sector exercises responsibility for its own monitoring – finding ways to increase accountability within each sector, and confidence across sectors is the central challenge and it is one which the M&C Panel is uniquely positioned to consider and recommend approaches. And beyond the sectors, the public has to have confidence that what is being done is credible, and the sectors have a common interest in speaking with one voice through a structure like the Panel to this.
- Within FNs, most of the investment has been in Tier 1 and Tier 2 discussions. As a result, there are not that many tools available for First Nations’ groups to engage in Tier 3 discussions with third parties. (Note: In the context of First Nations, Tier 1 is relationship building and the establishment of goals and interests between First Nations, Tier 2 is when First Nations bring their common goals and interests to government and establish bilateral agreements with government, and Tier 3 involves multi-sectoral interactions between and among First Nations and the other sectors.)

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- The point was also made that the deeper question that was raised was priorities across different departmental programs and activities – and resourcing based on those priorities. If having accurate and credible counts of fish removals is a critical underpinning of effective management – like accountants and proper financial records are to a business – is this not such an important priority that resources must be redeployed across departmental budgets to ensure that this responsibility is fulfilled? And with greater confidence in the “numbers” will come more effective collaboration, which will reduce the costs associated with compliance and enforcement? Are the dollars associated with monitoring and compliance, and the work of the Panel not misrepresented as a cost when they are really a critical investment into a viable management structure?
- It was pointed out that relative scarcity and low trust makes the cost of enforcement skyrocket. The one thing that brings down the cost of enforcement is a high level of trust and a sense of collective responsibility. The hard cash needed to fund the M&C Panel and monitoring efforts could come from investing the infringement/violation fines into an enforcement/monitoring trust fund.
- The point was also made that if a share based system were in place, monitoring and compliance would not be something to debate; it would be critical to the system operating

### Small Group Dialogue Sessions

#### Questions

What is the role of the M&C Panel? What’s next for the M&C Panel (i.e., what are the key priorities for the M&C Panel)?

#### Responses

- The M&C Panel is a strong multi-sector group that stands up for all sectors. It has a role in increasing the credibility of catch data.
- Moving forward the M&C Panel could monitor the environmental and economic conditions in addition to just monitoring the catch.
- The M&C Panel needs to develop the communication tools to deliver the message effectively as to how it adds value to each of the sectors, including DFO and the public. The M&C Panel must be its own advocate in convincing people that this kind of work is needed and in doing so increase the level of buy-in.
- Moving beyond a salmon-specific approach to include multiple species.

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- The time cost involved when organizations restructure is usually very high. It must be recognised that the change happening here is a fundamental change in the way decisions are made, and how people are involved in making them – and it is in light of those realities that the role of the M&C Panel must be understood.
- The M&C Panel should have a role in overseeing the calculations involved in the transfer of licenses as these transfers are sometimes based on numbers.
- Moving forward, as the workload expands, recognition will need to be given for remuneration consistent with the work involved for M&C Panel members – but this will need to be considered carefully as it could raise concerns and suspicions in some quarters.
- It was recommended that the M&C Panel strengthen their role slowly over time and avoid trying to get there right away (i.e., do not mandate the M&C Panel as a Tier 3 process immediately).
- The M&C Panel could serve well as an information hub to inform the public and fishing communities of things that are happening. It could also be used to highlight issues.
- The M&C Panel should focus on issues and opportunities that cut across all sectors.
- A question was raised as to whether the current “soft” sector representation in the M&C Panel should be maintained or if it should be made more formal.

## **MAKING PEACE AND DECISIONS SESSION**

The *Making Peace and Decisions* pilot capacity building program held in Sumas in early 2011 was designed to help people learn the concepts and skills needed to build good relationships that are at the core of moving forward in overall efforts to improve the way we make decisions and resolve differences which is at the heart of achieving more effective fishery management.

The lower Fraser was selected as a pilot area in which to hold the workshop, and to involve participants who had been active in the important work that has been advanced through the Salmon Table.

### **Panel Members**

Mark Duiven; Frank Kwak; Dave Moore; Randy Nelson.

### **Question to the Panel**

What did you value the most during the capacity building program?

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

### **Responses from Panel:**

- It was the right time, the right place, and the right people. There is a language that goes with collaboration, a behavior, a set of skills and many people do not know that. The groups that attended the workshop had been working together for 18 months - 2 years before the workshop took place, so they were really ready to learn from the workshop.
- The vignettes/role-plays allowed people to work through issues in a way that added value and ended up approximating the real challenges people face on the ground.
- The workshop brought diverse groups together and allowed them to learn a common language and skill set that will help them in the future.
- The workshop was a great “portable training session” and could be brought elsewhere throughout the region and laid out just after the end of the fiscal year and just before the start of the season.

### **Question to the Panel**

What are your thoughts on the restorative justice / peacemaker circle experience at the capacity building program?

### **Responses from Panel:**

- The circle lets you hear better and see better. The honest and openness that the circle brought about led to the expression of strong emotions. External distractions, although bothersome at first, faded away as the circle proceeded and everyone’s attention was drawn into the circle and was focused on the moment.

### **Question to the Panel**

What was the value-added of the capacity building program in comparison to other avenues that exist for communicating with the different sectors?

### **Responses from Panel:**

- The workshop quickly brought to the fore that everyone has similar interests.
- One did not have to ask for respect during the workshop – it was just there.
- The workshop was very different from a typical public meeting.
- The workshop allowed for a sympathetic and meaningful relationship to develop.
- Problems seemed smaller in the workshop.

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

### **Question to the Panel**

How could the capacity building program be improved?

### **Responses from Panel:**

- Using microphones to ensure that everyone can hear what is being said.
- Use simpler and clearer language when communicating.

### **Question to the Panel**

Would you like to see the capacity building program pilot continue? If so, how?

### **Responses from Panel:**

- Yes. It needs to happen across several scales. Regional areas and local levels need to experience this skill-building and relationship-building workshop. It could be tailored to each area.
- Yes. It might be a good idea to put it in an area where you know it will be successful. This way it will generate more and more buy-in from people, as they will want to become part of it.
- Yes. The workshop is akin to “conflict resolution triage”. You need to make the people who are part of the conflict part of the solution. But to be part of the solution, these people need the skills and understanding and the common language. The course is really about bringing the skills and capacity to the processes that people are in.
- It was suggested to bring people back after a season and ask them how the skills worked and what went wrong.
- Another suggestion was to ask people to engage in a “write your own vignette” session in situ when there is conflict in the heat of the fishery (e.g., in August).

## **ISDF: MILESTONES AND OUTPUTS SESSION**

An overview of the ISDF was presented starting with the initial conversations that took place when Paul Sprout contacted Glenn Sigurdson and Barry Stuart back in September 2006. This session was designed as an opportunity for different participants to contribute their input and perspectives on the history of the ISDF, what motivated its initiation, and the different events that had occurred over the four years. Different people took the lead on different aspects where they had been most directly involved.

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

A Power Point presentation had been prepared to begin the discussions. Everyone was made aware of the fact that an “inventory” of all the ISDF materials that were already broadly circulated as notes, memos, reports, etc was being prepared which would be made available to participants and broadly accessible on a website.

Some of the points covered in the overview of the ISDF major milestones and outputs included:

- The inaugural meeting on 27 January 2007 that saw the establishment of the ISDF Framework and Descriptor and the creation of the following four ISDF working groups: Monitoring and Compliance, Access, and Integrated River and Resource Management.
- The Four Main Pillars of Monitoring and Compliance
  - Standards, Objectives, and Principles
  - Incentives and Opportunities
  - Awareness and Education
  - Increased Engagement in M&C Decisions
- Access “Conversations”
- Governance
  - Learning By Doing Workshop (Nov 2008)
  - Annotated Bibliography of Governance Papers
  - Fisheries Governance Discussion Paper
  - Chinook Matrix and Case Study Report
- The 1<sup>st</sup> Widening the Circle Symposium (Dec 2008)
- M&C Panel (Real Pilot / Case Study of Governance in Action)
  - Charting Our Course Draft Report (Apr 2010)
  - Lower Fraser Pilot Project / Fieldtrips
  - Peacemaker Training Concept Development
  - Communications Plan
  - Sector Engagement
- Capacity Building
  - Partnership among the M&C Panel, the Governance Tools Working Group, and the Fraser River Salmon Table Society’s First Nations Sport Fishers Joint Working Group.
  - Making Peace and Decisions (MPD) Program (Jan/Feb 2011)

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- MPD Training Modules
- MPD Lessons Learned Report
- Access / Values & Benefits
  - The discussion on “Access” confined to a focus on achieving greater certainty and clarity around respective “shares” among the sectors was very challenging as it raised sensitive and complicated questions at all levels – rights, interests, mandates. The conversation evolved into a broader discussion around “value’- how different people and sectors saw value around salmon differently, and the potential to widen the discussion to refocus discussions on “increasing value to access”, not just dividing up diminishing numbers of fish. This involved different aspects from traceability to certification, new markets and better marketing, etc.
  - A Discussion Paper was developed for Widening of the Circle 2, which also included an information session on the Allocation policies to meet the clear recognition that the operation of the Allocation Policies was not well understood even within the commercial sector, much less the other sectors.
  - There was a clear recognition that this was a conversation that needed to continue- that there were fundamental questions on which discussions needed to continue, and that achieving a better understanding of how the allocation policies worked on the fishing grounds, and the ripple effects of the operation of the policy across the commercial sector and into the other sectors, was a key first step in understanding the issues that needed to be addressed, whatever one’s views might be on “shares”.
- The Governance Tools Working Group and Chinook Subgroup’s:
  - Chinook had been used throughout as a “learning tool” in grounding the discussions around what it would take to improve decision making processes ( initially prompted in May 2008 by in season decisions were taken on short notice that prompted vocalisations by all sectors concerned with Chinook management).– and this had lead to the report that Bert lonson had completed in reviewing Chinook management in the Skeena, the Fraser, and Barclay Sound which was directed by the working group who had developed a “matrix” of considerations to guide his work in developing information and interviews.
  - Draft Process Design for the Development of a Southern BC Chinook Management Framework; The Southern BC Chinook Subgroup met from June 2010 to March 2011. Its terms of reference were to focus on providing advice to DFO on the potential design of a process to develop a new management framework. The subgroup considered harvest, hatcheries, and habitat engagement strategies.
  - A Practical Guide to Collaborative Fisheries Governance: A Guidebook for BC Salmon Fisheries; and

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

- Evolving a New ‘Framework’ for Decision Making in Salmon Fisheries: Drivers and Directions.
- The 3rd Widening the Circle symposium (Apr 2011).
- The ISDF Inventory Project (available June 2011).

## **SOUTHERN BC CHINOOK SUBGROUP SESSION**

The work of the Chinook Sub Group (within the Governance Tools Group) was reported on as it was active and ongoing. Bert Ionson led the debriefing with an overview, and discussion followed.

### **Lessons Learned**

While the process to develop a management plan is not yet underway, important lessons learned by the subgroup include:

- Fostering and affirming the First Nations / Crown relationship. Need to make sure that nothing compromises this bilateral engagement in a multilateral context. First Nations, in different ways and places, with the FN Fisheries Council playing a central role, continue to build their capacity around fisheries management through Tier 1 and Tier 2 processes. It will be critical in moving forward with both “bilateral and multilateral processes” that it be, and be seen to be, clear that the development of any multilateral processes involving other sectors is not being used to deflect or defer the achievement of those goals, but may be a way to augment achieving them in a timely and effective way.
- Recognizing “technical” as distinct from “decision making” within the management framework will be key. Building an understanding of the information base is a critical step - for better information will ground better decisions, but as importantly having the information seen as credible and acceptable will be key to building capacity across the sectors to have the more difficult conversations on management processes options. The “technical” processes must be carefully designed with clear parameters, focused clearly and transparently on information development and not “management policy” and the more bored based the involvement is from the beginning (by representatives with a clear and limited technical focus) the more likely that all sectors will find the results credible and acceptable.
- The purpose of the Southern BC Chinook Subgroup has been to suggest ways of designing/informing /involving – the process through which to develop the plan - responsibility for producing the Chinook plan rests with DFO.. The main objective of the subgroup has been to identify the interests in the process and the process through which

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

to involve and work forward other interests, it is DFO's responsibility to take the lead on implementing the plan, and use the guidance from the subgroup to align internally and externally how to move this forward..

### **GOVERNANCE DISCUSSION PAPER SESSION**

- The world of fish and governance on the decision-making side is extremely complex as it involves both geographic and political scales. There was a need to improve and to improve jointly.
- The guidebook is seen as the “how to guide” (i.e., the principles and objectives) to which we all agree. The context in which this guidebook can be applied – what has been referred to as the Framework – has been and will continue to evolve. The purpose of the Framework Paper is to identify the key elements that have and are emerging within this framework, and the fundamental drivers and directions that will continue to shape it. The Framework will continue to grow and evolve, like a city, but within the principles and parameters which this will take place are becoming clearer.
- The purpose of the governance discussion paper is to set the table for a more detailed discussion on the key drivers and challenges that the framework might help us work though (both internally at DFO and between DFO and the different sectors).

### **NEXT STEPS**

#### **Continuing the Dialogue and Building Capacity:**

- Continue the conversation among participants in a setting similar to the ISDF, informed by what it accomplished and learned.
- Clarify the role of DFO around co-management and governance. DFO will produce a document that considers the Framework discussion paper and adds a DFO specific perspective, and distribute it for comments/feedback.
- Finalize key ISDF work products including the Evolving a New Framework paper and the ISDF Inventory.
- Ideas Generator: Broader nature of needing a place where interests can be continued to be understood and people can continue to talk and generate ideas together. Perhaps leaders

## DRAFT

*These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution, within the ISDF and its sub-groups. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests solely with the CSE Group. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are not nor were intended to represent consultation as contemplated by the duty to consult and thus are without prejudice.*

need to meet one or twice a year. There should be another Widening the Circle symposium in the third or fourth quarter of 2011 as part of the closed season that reviews and presents or further develops the framework.

- We need to ask what might be a broader implementation of the capacity building program. Training and creation of relationships is critical. We also need to revitalize monitoring efforts.

### **Monitoring and Compliance:**

- Improve the credibility of the M&C Panel by clarifying the link between the M&C Panel and government decision-making.
- Independent reporting should continue to be the role of the M&C Panel.
- There is a real need to establish a sustainable funding source. But there is no silver bullet for this financing issue. Just need to widen the circle of potential additional funding.
- The M&C Panel needs an assessment tool they can apply to identify gaps in information and priorities.
- The M&C Panel needs to engage and meet with other sectors, promote their objectives (i.e., improved catch monitoring), and possibly write out some case studies to champion the initiative by showing it through an ecological lens.

The Tuesday session ended with a closing circle and a prayer