

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE

Mark Saunders

Manager, Salmon Assessment and Freshwater Ecosystems, DFO Science

16 and 17 November 2010

Development of the Wild Salmon Policy – Development Team

- Mr. Saunders will say that he held the position of Wild Salmon Policy (WSP) Development Coordinator from April 2003 to June 2005.
- He will say that, when he began as the WSP Development Coordinator, the WSP was a contentious policy. He will say that there had been internal conflict between the sectors on WSP development, which although difficult was valid. The WSP was controversial internally at DFO and externally.
- He will say that he was made WSP Coordinator because he had a history of working with teams. There was recognition by senior management that a coordinated team approach would be necessary in view of challenges and competing interests.
- In particular, he will say that there was tension between Science staff, who wanted a more prescriptive policy, and FAM who wanted a management framework that was practicable and flexible with the ability to consider social and economic factors in setting management objectives. He will say that some Science staff saw the role of Science as identifying conservation limits to harvest activities and the role of FAM as implementing those limits, without integration between the sectors.
- He will say that the WSP Development Coordinator position was created because it was rare that a policy crosses every sector at DFO, and that all sectors needed to be engaged and committed.
- He will say that not did the only policy have to be accepted in the Region, but it had to be approved at the national level, and that to that date National Headquarters (NHQ) had not fully accepted the WSP.
- He will say that he was the first person at DFO to have this title. The Policy branch had previously engaged Steven Wright as the lead for Policy on the WSP.
- He will say that, when he started this position, it was as a secondment. He was told that the position would be for one year. However, he ultimately served as the WSP Development Coordinator for over two years, and then served as the WSP Implementation Coordinator for another two years after the policy was finalized.
- He will say that this position was a senior policy analyst position at an AS6 level. When he began in this position, the Policy branch held the WSP file. He reported to the Regional Director of Policy. When he began, the Regional Director was Rebecca Reid. He later reported to Mary Hobbs, Allison Webb and Mel Kotyk.
- He will say that, when he arrived, he first worked on confirming the members of a WSP Development Team and formalizing the Team's working arrangements. He does not recall if any terms of reference were formally adopted. His role was to coordinate this Team.
- He will say that the Team received its directions from the WSP Steering Committee which was comprised of the Regional Directors and may have included the Regional Director General Paul Sprout when he was in the Region.

- He recalls that people on the Team included Jim Irvine and Brian Riddell for Science, Carol Cross for Oceans, Habitat and Enhancement (OHEB), Andy Thompson as an aquaculture manager, and Sandy Fraser for FAM. He also recalls that Blair Holtby had input. He recalls that there were a series of Team members from Treaty and representatives from the Areas. In addition, the Team was supported by communications advisors and by the Consultation Secretariat, primarily Jay Hartling. He recalls that Paul Ryall joined the WSP team later, shortly after the WSP was finalized.
- He will say that the Team worked substantively on developing the policy for approximately four months before Pat Chamut was brought in to join the Team. He will say that Mr. Chamut spent a lot of time learning the file and listening, and then working to build consensus. He will say that Mr. Chamut's leadership was instrumental, and that Mr. Chamut had the sophistication, experience and focus to get the WSP developed and approved by DFO at the regional and national levels. He will say that, over the course of 2004, with Mr. Chamut's leadership, the Team achieved heightened collaboration. He will say that collaboration came to define WSP development.
- He will say that Mr. Chamut was not afraid to go back to the drawing board and have the Team revise the draft when needed, to build consensus.
- He will say that, in the months after Mr. Chamut arrived, the Team began to meet every week. He will say that, in drafting and re-drafting the WSP, every word was considered. He will say that this process involved incorporating input from DFO internally, and from First Nations and stakeholders, and taking revised drafts to the Steering Committee.

Challenges and successes in developing the Wild Salmon Policy

- Mr. Saunders can discuss the various policy and institutional challenges that were most significant in the development of the WSP.
- He will say that a significant debate was about the respective roles of science and management in pursuing conservation, and what should be the management implications of scientific advice on conservation limits. He will say that much of this debate centered on whether the WSP would include reference points that reflected automatic decision-making roles. Part of this debate engaged whether the WSP would incorporate the precautionary approach to fisheries management promoted internationally. He will say that this debate was resolved by the evolution of the idea of benchmarks, and by a new understanding of how Science and FAM roles would interact under the WSP.
- He will say that the UN Convention on Biological Diversity was a driver for the WSP that was considered by the Team in developing the WSP.
- He will say that a significant issue was the use of conservation units (CUs) and particularly what was meant by CUs, how many CUs there would be, and what would be their operational implications. He will say that, by 2004, there was commitment to the idea of developing the policy around the CU concept. He will say that a fundamental step was acceptance of the idea that the Minister could write-off or give up a CU where he or she viewed the costs of recovery as too high.
- Regarding the definition of conservation unit in the WSP, he will say that the reference to "an acceptable time frame" referred to whether a lost population within a CU could be replaced within a human lifetime.

- He only vaguely recalls discussions about COSEWIC and designatable units. He recalls that Science did not want to use DUs in the WSP. He recalls that the *Species at Risk Act* (SARA) was a driver for WSP development in that success of the WSP in protecting CUs would proactively prevent listings under SARA.
- He will say that the definition of conservation was a critical part of developing the WSP, and in particular its separation from the concept of use. He will say that the concept of “wise use” in the definition of conservation, which was originally supported by the recreational sector, was strongly rejected by First Nations.
- He will say that the development of the principles in the WSP was crucial, and in particular the abandonment of the “balance” principle. He said that many people were opposed to the balance concept, saying that their experience was that when DFO balanced conservation against economic development, the latter always won. The balance principle was replaced by the sustainable use principle, which was instead aimed at simultaneously achieving both conservation and economic goals.
- He will say that another challenge was determining the role of First Nations and Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge (ATK) in WSP implementation.
- He will say that the planning process in Strategy 4 was also a significant focus.
- He will also say that there was debate about the process of developing the WSP, and to what degree that process should be open. He will say that, beginning in 2003, Jay Hartling was fundamental in encouraging a more progressive consultation process and was central to the success of the future consultations. He will say that DFO ultimately made an explicit decision to take the draft WSP to a more open consultation process and a broader constituency.
- He will be asked about DFO's efforts to create operational guidelines for the WSP, to guide activities including harvest, habitat management, enhancement and aquaculture. He will say that Strategy 4 overrode the need to think through and develop specific guidelines. He will say that, rather than creating specific guidelines for a wide range of activities, the decision was to use the Strategy 4 planning process for making longer-term decisions about those activities.
- He recalls that the shift away from operational guidelines (see e.g. CAN000366) occurred during his time as Coordinator. He has only a vague recollection of this shift. He does not recall when the idea of using operational guidelines was abandoned (see e.g. CAN053355) or if any such guidelines were ever drafted.
- He recalls discussion, both internally and through the public consultations, about whether and how the WSP would address aquaculture. He will say that Andy Thompson was especially involved in these discussions. He will say that the decision was to keep the WSP's guidance on aquaculture very general. He will say that rather than include detail on aquaculture, decision-making about any impacts of aquaculture on a particular CU would occur in Strategy 4.
- He has some recollection of the discussions by the Development Team regarding how the WSP would address enhancement. He will say that, in the enhancement context, Dr. Riddell did not recommend detailed monitoring of fish genetics in the WSP. Rather the WSP focus was to be aimed at a higher level, at ensuring that there is some recognisable component of wild salmon in the landscape.

Consultations and approvals over 2004 and 2005

- Mr. Saunders will say that the WSP Development Team finalized a draft for ministerial approval and public consultation by December 2004 (CAN001105).

- He will say that the drafts created in 2003-2004, prior to the December 2004 draft, were not released to the public (see e.g. October 24, 2004 at CAN036467 and November 3, 2004 at CAN015893).
- He will say that, in releasing a glossy booklet in December 2004, DFO in retrospect may have made a misstep as the public thought that it was a final product. The Team had simply wanted to provide a more polished-looking version for senior management.
- He does not recall input offered by the Area offices on the penultimate drafts of the WSP in November 2004, including any concerns raised with the financial costs of monitoring and assessing CUs and their habitat.
- He does not clearly recall the November 2004 briefings to the shadow committee or the Departmental Management Committee (DMC) (see e.g. CAN011378).
- With Mr. Chamut and other members of the WSP Development Team, he recalls attending the DMC briefings in November 2004 and May 2005. He recalls that Mr. Chamut made a 15 minute briefing, that there was a discussion for about an hour, and it was approved without changes being requested.
- He recalls that the Commissioner on Environment and Sustainable Development released a report in the fall of 2004 regarding Pacific salmon and recommending that the WSP be finalized. He will say that this report influenced the efforts to finalizing the WSP by creating additional pressure.
- He may recall specific meetings in late 2004 or early 2005 targeting particular stakeholders, such as the Sport Fishing Advisory Board, and the Province. He was ill on the day of the meeting with the Province and did not attend. His understanding in this time period that the Province was generally supportive of DFO's efforts to develop the WSP, at least at the technical working level.
- He may be able to identify efforts made to consult other various stakeholders on the WSP and its implementation, like the Commercial Salmon Advisory Board
- He can generally describe the public consultations in the spring of 2005, including the two day meeting in March 2005, meetings with First Nations, and correspondence received from the public and stakeholders.
- He recalls that stakeholders and First Nations proposed meaningful changes to the WSP which were worked through in an ultimately collaborative way.
- He recalls a great deal of comment during consultations on the importance of including and strengthening habitat and ecosystem considerations. He will say that environmental groups and First Nations were strongly supportive of including an ecosystem component in the WSP.
- He recalls many people in the consultations expressing concern that DFO would not be able to devote sufficient resources to monitoring CUs and their habitat.
- He believes that the level of consultation was critical to finalizing a policy that was widely supported and having it approved by the Minister. He will say that the WSP Development Team went through the transcripts of all public meetings and through every written comment received and carefully considered all of them.
- He recalls hearing the concern expressed that there would never be sufficient financial resources to monitor CUs.
- He recalls the recreational sector made a real effort, in the final consultation meetings, to expressly support some of the views of First Nations, including its proposed revisions to the definition of conservation.
- He recalls that the Marine Conservation Caucus (MCC) were the most vocal critics. He recalls that the MCC took some adversarial stances including submitting a 10 point critique (CAN045782, CAN45784, CAN45785) and leaving

a public consultation. He recalls that the MCC submitted more constructive comments late in June 2005. He recalled that the MCC wanted to take the policy as far towards prescribing automatic decision rules as it could. He recalls that, after the WSP was finalized, the MCC switched focus to promote the WSP and its implementation.

- He will agree that, by December 2004, DFO had linked the WSP to efforts to seek Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification for BC salmon (see e.g. CAN036032 and CAN047062).
- He recalls that, near the end of the consultations, Christina Burrridge of the BC Seafood Council wrote a letter to DFO and the Province advising that it would discontinue its support of the WSP if any more restricting revisions were made. He will say that DFO has since worked with Ms. Burrridge on MSC certification for BC sockeye and that certification is now linked expressly to the implementation of the WSP. He will say that he is not directly involved in DFO's work on MSC certification, apart from being asked whether his staff at Science are able to meet the needs of DFO's Action Plan.
- He vaguely recalls being involved in a briefing to the Pacific Salmon Commission or its caucuses regarding the WSP and that the PSC was supportive.
- With Mr. Chamut and other members of the WSP Development Team, he attended the meeting of the DMC in May 2005 at which the WSP was endorsed.
- With reference to the Memorandum to the Minister regarding the 'Approval and Announcement of the Wild Salmon Policy', he will say that he was likely involved in drafting this (CAN036632). He may be asked to comment on the advice given and on the three concerns raised in April 2005 that had not been addressed: aquaculture, a desire for a more prescriptive approach, and the need for funds to ensure effective implementation.
- He will say that he was likely being involved in drafting another Memorandum to the Minister, dated May 31, 2005, on the topic of "Stakeholder Positions on the Wild Salmon Policy" (CAN053235). However, he believes that Pat Chamut would likely have been the lead drafter.
- He will clarify that the stated concern regarding the need for more resources for implementation refers to both financial and human resources. He will say that throughout the 2005 consultations that the need for funds to support implementation was a consistent issue. He will say that stakeholders were raising concerns that DFO was not sufficiently committed to implementing the WSP.
- He will say that he does not recall any stakeholder ever taking the view that the WSP did not require additional resources for its implementation.
- He can comment on the press materials dated June 24, 2005 accompanying Minister Regan's approval and release of the WSP. He agrees with the press release statements, except for the statements that the WSP is a "living document" and not designed to be set in stone. He will say that the WSP is a policy and it is being implemented as such.
- He can comment on the Strategic Environmental Assessment that he wrote for the WSP and that was submitted to NHQ on October 5, 2005 (CAN042923, CAN042924, CAN042925). He will say that the SEA was required to get national approval for the WSP. He will say that the SEA was not done until after the WSP was approved by the Minister, and that this was simply an administrative oversight of no substantive consequence.

- He will say that, in his view, SEAs are more important where a policy or program being assessed is anticipated to have negative rather than positive impacts on the environment, and he believed that the WSP would have positive impacts.

WSP Implementation Team and current governance structure

- Mr. Saunders will say that, after approval of the WSP in June 2005, the WSP Development Team was excited and daunted about the prospects for WSP implementation. Team members expected that it would be a challenge to change the culture both inside and outside DFO. The Team had concerns about whether there would be adequate resources to begin implementing the WSP.
- He will say that the WSP Development Team ultimately became known as the WSP Implementation Team, but that it was not immediately clear if the Team would continue, who would lead it, and what its terms of reference would be.
- He will say that the terms of reference for the WSP Implementation Team are still in draft form (CAN185478).
- He will say that his position title changed in the summer of 2005 to the WSP Coordinator or WSP Implementation Coordinator, and that he continued to report to the Regional Director of Policy, who was then Mary Hobbs and shortly thereafter Allison Webb.
- In the summer of 2005, he was tasked with developing a WSP work plan and with turning the WSP Development Team into a WSP Implementation Team.
- He will say that the membership of the Team largely remained the same over the next couple of years, although Paul Ryall joined for FAM when Sandy Fraser retired. He recalls that Andy Thompson remained on the Team for a short period as an aquaculture manager but not an active member. He will say that the Team had the largest representation from Science staff. Carol Cross and Heather Stalberg participated from OHEB. He recalls that the membership from Treaty and Aboriginal was often changing.
- He will say that he continued as the WSP Coordinator until March 2007, although he served in an occasional advisory capacity to new WSP Coordinators and to the WSP Implementation Team.
- He will say that, in his current role as Division Manager, Salmon Assessment and Freshwater Ecosystems (SAFE), the WSP is one of his top priorities. He will say that he actively oversees Science staff progress on the WSP, and in that role, he sits on the WSP Implementation Team.
- He can identify the current members of the WSP Implementation team (CAN185508). He will say that he official representative of Science on the WSP Implementation Team is Mr. Neil Schubert. He will also say that, on occasion, he himself sometimes acts at the Strategy 1 lead.
- He will say that, despite initial 2005 workplans and briefings to the Regional Management Committee (RMC), DFO ultimately did not put much emphasis on identifying project teams as part of the implementation structure. Rather, staff or contractors were assigned to certain projects.
- He will say that the governance structure for WSP implementation was not highly formalized.
- He will say whether the WSP Steering Committee continued to exist and provide him with guidance after the WSP was finalized.

- He will say, to his knowledge, where accountability sat among regional and national management for WSP implementation, and what governance structures were used by senior management to make WSP decisions.

WSP implementation planning in the fall of 2005

- Mr. Saunders will be asked whether DFO ever created and released the WSP implementation plan referenced at page 35 of the WSP.
- He will say that in the summer and fall of 2005, he considered the need to create an implementation plan and provided briefing materials to the RMC referencing an implementation plan. However, in the fall of 2005, DFO shifted away from this effort. He does not recall any specific decision to not pursue an implementation plan. He will say that, from the fall of 2005 onwards, DFO documented its implementation commitments through internal annual work plans instead.
- He will say that Sharon Johal is one of the executive secretaries to the RDG, and maintains the records of decision, materials and agenda for RMC meetings.
- He will be asked about the August 9, 2005 RMC meeting, at which he was in attendance, including by detailed reference to the record of decision and to the presentation deck. He will say that he has a vague recollection of this meeting.
- He will say that he and the WSP Implementation Team were tasked with developing recommendations for RMC on the WSP implementation, and that this was a major focus of his job in that time period. He will say that he would have been involved in creating the presentation materials for the August 9, 2005 meeting, which contained these implementation recommendations. He will say that he made the presentation to the RMC on August 9, 2005.
- He will say that, with some exceptions noted in the record of decision, that the RMC supported the implementation approach recommended at the August 9, 2005 meeting.
- He will be asked about a number of the recommendations made to and approved by the RMC on August 9, 2005.
- He will say that the RMC approved the “phased approach” proposed in the August 9, 2005 presentation, which proposed full implementation within five years. He will say that a phased approach also reflected the idea that initial implementation stages would be in the nature of scoping and CU identification, followed by a more adaptive period of monitoring and assessment. Other aspects reflected by a phased approach,
- He will say that he is surprised that, in proposing a phased approach, the presentation proposes full implementation in five years instead of ten years. He will say that, at that time, he contemplated that the WSP would be implemented in ten years, with the five year evaluation under Strategy 6 at the mid-point.
- He says that the five year review required under Strategy 6 reflected the WSP Development Team’s thoughts on how long it would take to get Strategies 1, 2 and 3 operational across the whole Pacific region. He will also say that, until the CUs were defined, the WSP could not really be operational.
- He will say that full implementation, in the context of this presentation, means that all aspects of each of the action steps would be done for the Pacific Region, at least for Priority CUs. However, he will say that the expression “full implementation” can be interpreted in many ways.
- With regard to the August 9, 2005 record of decision, he will say that the reference to resubmitting the overall proposal to RMC means, according to his

recollection, that while the proposed approach was approved, the RMC wanted more detailed work plans submitted.

- With regard to the reference on how to “market” the approved approach, he will agree that this reflected a concern that the phased approach of full implementation within five years would be difficult to sell. He will say that the phased approach proposed may be seen by external stakeholders as too long a period, and that internally, DFO was struggling with being able to identify how long implementation would realistically take.
- He does not recall why it was decided that September 2005 was too early for consultations. He will say this relates to the recommendation at the final page of the presentation. He does not recall exactly when these consultations were held but believes it was a few months later.
- He will be asked about the reference in the presentation to an implementation plan being approved on October 24, 2005. He will say that this did not happen, as DFO moved instead to annual work plans. He will say that a draft implementation plan does not exist.
- He will also be asked in detail about the materials associated with the September 20, 2005 RMC meeting, including the powerpoint presentation entitled WSP Implementation Workplan and the draft document entitled Wild Salmon Policy Implementation Workplan, both dated September 20, 2005. He will say that DFO moved to a simpler annual workplan format, using Gantt charts, in subsequent years rather than the Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework
- He will say that he vaguely remembers the September 20, 2005 meeting. He does not believe that the September 20, 2005 draft Implementation Workplan was approved by RMC. In this context, he will say that the timing of implementing the WSP Strategies was difficult to predict.
- In the context of WSP implementation planning and the progress on implementation made to date, he will be asked about the merits of DFO's timelines for implementing Strategies 1 and 4 for BC sockeye CUs committed to in the December 21, 2009 DFO Action Plan for meeting Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification conditions. He will say that, now that Science has identified CUs under Step 1.1 and are working on a monitoring framework for Step 1.3, Science has a better idea than it did in 2005 of the time and resources are required to fully implement Strategies 1 and 4 for sockeye CUs.
- He will discuss the statement at page 4 of the draft Implementation Workplan that the most significant challenges to implementation and the success of the policy will be attitude and resources. He will discuss the timelines presented throughout the document, including at page 20 regarding an Implementation Plan.
- He will say that DFO does not offer its staff training on the WSP or its requirements, and did not discuss training during implementation planning. He will say that there was an internal communication strategy on the WSP, which involved a series of town hall meetings with managers and staff and some update briefings through province-wide conference calls. On this issue of training, he will say that perhaps 95% of DFO staff would have little direct operational contact with the WSP at least in the first five years.
- He will say that given uncertainty related to the outcome of the initial action steps in Strategies 1 it was difficult to determine whether DFO had the financial resources that might be required for WSP implementation.
- He will be asked whether it would be useful for a future implementation plan, as required at page 35, to include elements of a long-term business plan.

Consultation with First Nations on WSP implementation planning

- Mr. Saunders will say that DFO held consultations with the public and First Nations on WSP implementation, generally each year in the fall, at which the WSP would be discussed among other topics. From time to time, DFO also held multi-day WSP forums organized by its Consultation Secretariat, which could address in detail the implementation of specific Strategies or action steps.
- He will say that the WSP forums cost roughly \$40K per meeting not including staff time.
- The WSP forums and consultations featured meetings with First Nations exclusively and multi-stakeholder meetings, which were generally held on consecutive days. They were an opportunity for DFO to explain its progress on the WSP Strategies and to seek input.
- He will say that, for the most part, the WSP forums were a successful approach and the First Nations engagement was generally productive. He will say that First Nations expressed interest in being engaged broadly in WSP implementation, with specific interests in the designation of CUs and in monitoring and assessment activities.
- He will say that, while DFO made offers to all First Nations to meet bilaterally regarding the WSP, there were few if any requests received. He will say that most individual First Nations do not have the capacity to meet with DFO bilaterally in particular on technical issues.
- The last WSP consultation meeting that he attended was in 2008.
- Mr. Saunders will be asked about the Memorandum to the Deputy Minister entitled 'Update on First Nations participation in WSP implementation.' He recalls that he would have been involved in drafting this Memorandum.
- He will be asked about the four specific WSP implementation topics on which the Memorandum advises there will be consultation with First Nations.
- He will say that, in the context of WSP Forums, the Implementation Plan was the subject of consultations with First Nations. He will agree that there is no hardcopy document called an Implementation Plan or a detailed implementation plan. He will agree that DFO did not consult upon its internal annual work plans.
- With regard to the Memorandum's discussion of aquaculture, he will also say that while aquaculture is still a major issue with some First Nations, aquaculture has not come up recently in the context of WSP discussions. He will explain that, during the policy development period, it was thought that the WSP would include guidelines for key activities including aquaculture. However, he will say that the final WSP took the approach that aquaculture was just one of many activities that needs to be managed responsibly, and it did not direct DFO to take any new actions specific to aquaculture. He will say that currently there is no direct link between DFO's WSP implementation activities and aquaculture but that the WSP informs DFO's approach to aquaculture.
- He will clarify that there is a typo in this Memorandum, regarding a date. He believes that this Memorandum would have been drafted in roughly June 2005.
- He will agree that the Memorandum is overly optimistic in predicting timelines for identification and assessment of CUs
- He may also be asked about similar content, regarding First Nations consultation on WSP implementation, in a Memorandum to the Minister regarding a meeting with Grand Chief Doug Kelly of the Sto:lo Tribal Council (CAN019833).

Implementation funding

- Mr. Saunders will agree that additional funds, including for human resources, would have allowed faster WSP implementation over the last five years.
- He can describe the basic funding levels and funding trends for the WSP over the 2005-2007 period and may be able to give information for subsequent years.
- He will say that, in the first year of implementation, NHQ ended up providing extra funds for WSP implementation despite the statement in the WSP that it would be implemented within existing resources. In the first year, the Region received approximately \$1M for WSP implementation.
- To his knowledge, after the 2005-2006 year, DFO never made a Treasury Board submission seeking additional funds for WSP implementation. Instead, in subsequent fiscal years, he will say that each sector in NHQ diverted some discretionary funds towards WSP implementation from the sector's existing budget. Each sector did not always provide the funds in the amount requested.
- He is not aware of any regional management discussion regarding the need for a Treasury Board submission. He will say that it was made clear to the Region that they should not seek any new monies for WSP implementation.
- He will say that the funding level required, as the implementation of the WSP progresses, may change over time. For example, approximately \$100K per year was devoted by Science to defining the CUs initially, which is now complete except for minor revisions and the release of a new version every few years. On the other hand, monitoring and assessment of salmon is ongoing but may require some modification to fully address the steps under Step 1.3.
- He will be asked whether Science has ever done a costing exercise similar to that done at OHEB. He will be asked for information regarding the costs of implementing Step 1.3 which requires monitoring and assessment of CU status.
- He will say that Science is currently at a tipping point with WSP implementation funding. He will say that CU benchmarks will be identified soon under Step 1.2, leading to the requirement to monitor the status of CUs under Step 1.3.
- He will say that there is internal discussion about what is required to monitor and assess CU status under Step 1.3, and that staff are considering whether that work can be done from existing resources. He will say that for approximately one-third of the CUs, DFO has very little data and thus may need new resources to start collecting baseline data. He will say that for the CUs that are already managed by DFO, through existing stock assessment programs, it might be possible to implement Step 1.3 within existing resources.
- He will be asked if the WSP Implementation Team has ever conducted or been informed of any costing exercise to determine what full implementation of the WSP would cost, including for implementation of Strategy 4.
- He will be asked if he is aware if Priority CUs have been officially determined, and for his awareness of reasons for delay related to determining Priority CUs.

Interactions with the Province on WSP implementation

- Mr. Saunders will describe the ways in which DFO coordinates with the Province on WSP implementation, or informs the Province of WSP implementation efforts.
- He will say whether, as WSP Coordinator, he has ever briefed regional directors about the WSP in preparation for meetings of the Pacific Council of Fisheries and Aquaculture Ministers or the Pacific Fisheries and Aquaculture Committee.

- He will say whether there are any active current efforts by DFO to partner with the Province on WSP implementation, particularly on Strategies 1, 2 or 3.
- He will say whether, to his knowledge, there have ever been discussions with the Province on the costs of WSP implementation.
- He will say whether the Province has been involved in any discussions about implementation of Strategy 2, including on CU habitat status reports, CU habitat monitoring and assessment or the creation of an integrated data system.
- He will say that some existing programs, like the Fraser Salmon Watershed Program (FSWP), to which he was seconded for a year, offer meaningful opportunities to progress WSP implementation, particularly on Strategies 2-4. I
- He will say that, DFO is prepared to participate in watershed-planning and watershed-governance initiatives like the FSWP that could serve as vehicles for WSP implementation, particularly for Strategy 4. However, he will say that the direction of the previous RDG Paul Sprout was that the Province should lead watershed initiatives, and then would DFO participate.
- He will say that, for the FSWP, there was a five-year business plan that set out not just tasks and timelines, but also how resources are being allocated to them.
- He will be asked if a similar approach to implementation planning would benefit the WSP, including with reference to page 35 of the WSP.

Implementation of Strategy 1

- Mr. Saunders will say that, as Division Manager of SAFE, he currently oversees Strategy 1 implementation efforts by DFO Science.
- With respect to Step 1.1, he will say that Dr. Blair Holtby and Kristie Ciruna's work on a methodology for defining CUs was an outstanding piece of work that is highly regarded.
- With regard to the CUs defined under Step 1.1, he will say that the CUs were defined before he officially departed as WSP Coordinator in March 2007.
- He will say that there were more sockeye CUs than originally anticipated.
- He will describe the process that Science is using to update the CU lists. He will say that there have been two revisions to the CU lists since 2007, but that these have not been publically released to date.
- He will say there have been recent minor changes to Fraser River sockeye CUs.
- He will say that the list of CUs is dynamic and effectively always under revision as new information is obtained or provided.
- With regard to Step 1.2, he will agree that this Step is partly complete, as the methodology for determining CU benchmarks has been published by Dr. Holt and others.
- He will say that one contentious issue which came out of the peer review of Dr. Holt's paper is aggregate assessments of CU status.
- He will say that First Nations were very concerned, in reviewing the benchmark methodology, that DFO would give too much weight to the abundance metric and not give sufficient weight to metrics on distribution and abundance trends.
- He will say that the CU benchmarks themselves have not yet been identified. He will say that there is a CSAS review of Fraser River sockeye benchmarks scheduled in November. He will say whether, to his knowledge, those benchmarks are CU-specific.

- He will also say that processes are underway to determine benchmarks for Barkley Sound and Skeena River CUs. He will say that these benchmark processes are coordinated and that Dr. Carrie Holt is the lead.
- He will also say that Science has developed a preliminary version of software to identify CU-specific benchmarks of spawner abundance, using spawner and recruitment data. He may know if the software identifies benchmarks for other dimensions of status like abundance trends and distribution.
- He may be asked if, since the benchmark methodology was finalized in January 2009, DFO staff including Area staff have sought to have greater emphasis put on the abundance metric alone due to concerns like data deficiency.
- With regard to page 18 of the WSP and the reference to operational guidelines related to the level in the Red zone where no fishing mortality would be permitted, he will say that DFO has not drafted any such guidelines. He will say that such operational guidelines would be done by Science, if by anybody.
- With regard to Step 1.3, he will agree that DFO does not yet have any CU monitoring plans. However, he will say that DFO has stock assessment programs do monitor data for approximately 19 of the 36 Fraser River sockeye CUs. He will say that DFO generally only has data for the most abundant CUs, obtained including through escapement monitoring.
- He will say that Science has been planning for how it will monitor and assess, under Step 1.3 of the WSP, the remaining CUs. He will say that such monitoring does not need to await the finalization of CU benchmarks under Step 1.2.

Implementation of Strategies 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6

- Mr. Saunders will describe the interaction between the WSP Habitat Working Group and the broader WSP Implementation Team.
- He will be asked whether the discontinuation of the WSP Habitat Working Group, and the lack of an OHEB WSP Coordinator in recent months, impacted WSP implementation efforts and how.
- With regard to Step 2.1, he will say that he is aware that some CU Habitat Status Reports have been prepared to date, though he does not recall for which CUs. He will say that a Habitat Status Report template was created by Heather Stalberg. He will say that template is sound but it has not been applied broadly.
- With regard to Step 2.2, he will say that DFO's WSP habitat indicators were published by Heather Stalberg and others. He will say whether candidate benchmarks were identified for every indicator. He will say that the focus was trying to land on what the indicators should be, and coming up with a useful, practical list of pressure and state indicators.
- He recalls a lot of discussion regarding the decision to publish in a journal rather than through PSARC, but cannot recall the reasons. He will say that the publication and the WSP habitat indicators are nonetheless endorsed by DFO.
- He will say that the Habitat Indicators Paper did not include nearshore or marine indicators, because nearshore and marine indicators are being addressed under Strategy 3.
- With regard to Step 2.3, he will say that DFO has not started implementing it yet.
- He will say that the next step in Strategy 2 implementation is for DFO to determine a monitoring and assessment approach combining Strategies 2 and 3. He will say that ultimately implementing Strategy 2 and 3 monitoring requires

involvement from other governments and organizations, although DFO could take responsibility for the fish-related or fish-habitat related indicators.

- With regard to Step 2.4, he does not recall discussions between DFO and the Province on how to better integrate their data holdings. He will say that OHEB is responsible for Step 2.4. He does not believe that the database contemplated in Step 2.4 has been created, but will say that he has not focused on that piece. He will say that a database is a critical piece, as conserving CUs requires a data inventory of where salmon habitat is and when salmon are using it.
- With regard to the reference in Strategy 2 to guidelines and standards, he will say that this is intended to acknowledge DFO's Habitat Management Program, including initiatives through the Environmental Process Modernization Plan (EPMP). He will say that, in his opinion, there are certain disconnects between the WSP and the EPMP, in that they have different purposes and origins. He will say that the EPMP was a focus of the former NHQ Habitat program. He will say that that OHEB struggles to get national support for Strategy 2.
- He will agree that, by and large, Strategy 3 has not been implemented.
- He will say that there has been some internal scientific efforts by Dr. Kim Hyatt. He will say that Dr. Hyatt is responsible for developing a discussion paper on an approach to Strategy 3, which Dr. Hyatt has now created in a powerpoint form.
- He will say that Strategy 3 implementation has taken longer than expected but is recognized to be extremely challenging. He will say there is no set date by which the ecosystem indicators and monitoring framework required under Step 3.1 will be finished.
- He will also say that DFO financially supports the work related to Strategy 3 being done by Dr. John Reynolds of SFU on the central coast.
- He will say that other efforts relevant to Strategy 3 include the Barkley Sound pilot and increasing information about salmon in the State of the Ocean reports.
- He will say that Strategy 3 reflects one of the biggest cultural shifts in the WSP, because it contemplates managing salmon in consideration of other species beyond humans.
- He will say that Strategy 3 is a critical piece of the WSP, but also one of the most complex aspects of WSP implementation conceptually.
- He will not be asked to address Strategy 4 in the November 2010 hearings.
- He will say whether DFO is yet implementing Strategy 5, in the manner contemplated by the WSP.
- He will say that Strategy 6, Action Step 6.1 refers to the Strategy 5 annual work plans, and that Step 6.1 has not been implemented. He will say that DFO does do post-season fisheries reviews, which are important, although that is not strictly what is contemplated in Step 6.1.
- He will say that, to his understanding, the independent five year review required under Step 6.2 has been put on hold. He believes that this decision was made to await the completion of the Cohen Commission and as a result of increased staff workloads. He believes that the RDG made this decision.
- However, he will also say that DFO is currently preparing for a five year review with its own internal process led by Policy. He will say that this has been discussed by the WSP Implementation Team. He will say whether he has received the interview questionnaire circulated by the Policy branch.
- He will be asked to comment on DFO's intended parameters for the independent five year review, with reference to WSP Implementation Team minutes from

meetings in 2010 and the September 24, 2010 e-mail from Jennifer Nener, A/Regional Director of Policy.

- He will say that the Pacific Fisheries Resource Conservation Council has set out some possible approaches to the independent five year independent review for DFO and the public. He may be asked to comment on the merits of the proposal.

Merit to considering new WSP governance options

- Mr. Saunders will say that there is merit in considering new governance options for the WSP. He will say that it is worth considering assigning to a senior manager or regional director responsibility for WSP implementation as a whole.
- He will say that the Policy branch has been outstanding in performing its WSP coordination role.
- However, he will agree that the WSP Coordinator role lacks the ability to direct staff resources and to require integration in implementing the Strategies.
- He will say that the WSP Implementation Team has been well coordinated, but that the engagement with senior management should be increased as widespread operational integration will require increased coordination.
- He will say that integration is fundamental to the WSP's success, particularly integration between science and management.
- He will say that the notion that Science simply provides advice and does not iteratively engage with planning is outdated and not reflected by Strategy 4.
- He will say that it the WSP fundamentally requires the participation of all sectors to succeed.
- He believes that, in considering any new governance options, it would be important for the RDG to maintain overall accountability including over funding.
- He will say that there is a need for continued engagement by NHQ in WSP implementation, although he sees no need for direct oversight of minor decisions.
- He will say that the WSP has been very well-received internationally, that there is a high degree of consensus about the WSP among stakeholders, that the policy has merit and that it should be meaningfully implemented.