

## WRITTEN RE-EXAMINATION OF MARK SAUNDERS

1. On June 3, 2011, you testified that “I would think a foundational document on the socioeconomic approach in general, and I must admit I’m not familiar with the document that’s been referenced that has been under development, so I’m outside my science box, but certainly would be something to pursue” (p.98, ll.9-14)
  - a. For clarity, were you speaking here of the NHQ paper that had been referenced in Slide 14 of Exhibit 951? Mr. Ryall had been asked about Slide 14 of Exhibit 951 and specifically about its bullet stating “Develop an approach for inclusion of socio-economic information (NHQ paper).”

Yes.
  
2. Mr. Ryall testified about the surveillance audit conducted by the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) in mid-May for BC sockeye, including that he expected a favourable outcome. With respect to Exhibit 969, a document given the title “Status Report on Marine Stewardship Certification”, Mr. Ryall testified that he put this document together with input from a lot of Pacific Region staff for MSC’s surveillance audit in May.
  - a. Were you one of the staff that provided input into Mr. Ryall’s document?

I worked with Mr. Ryall to make sure that we had effective engagement of the appropriate Science/Stock Assessment staff to ensure the summary was correct. In particular I asked Dr. Arlene Tompkins the head of Salmon Stock Assessment and chair of the Stock Assessment Coordinating Committee to ensure the Area Chief’s of stock assessment were consulted.
  - b. Are you aware if this document has been provided by DFO to the MSC?

No.
  
3. At page 1 of Exhibit 969, Mr. Ryall’s document reports on performance indicator FR 1.1.3.1, for MSC Condition 5. It identifies the PSARC paper on Fraser sockeye LRPs as the deliverable for this condition. It states: “*Fraser Sockeye WSP Stock Status paper was reviewed and accepted at CSAP Nov. 15 and 16, 2010. This paper incorporates abundance and trends in abundance indicators of stock status for the 26 assissible (sic) CUs. This is the first assessment to present stochastic and structural uncertainty in biological benchmarks for abundance indicators. Formal reviewers include Dr. Randall Peterman, Dr. Kim Hyatt and Mr. Mike Staley. The paper is being finalized for the summer 2011 and a workshop will be planned to develop steps for finalizing status.*” Under the heading “Status”, Mr. Ryall’s document states: “*Paper accepted at CSAP;*

*currently being revised for publication and workshop planned for late Spring*". You are identified as the "Accountability Lead" for this deliverable.

- a. For what date has this workshop been scheduled?  
A formal date has not been set but anticipate holding it in November subject to resources and capacity.
4. You testified on December 3 (TS pg. 3, lines 13-26) regarding this CSAP paper that *"this paper is in part of a scientific review process right now that is peer reviewed, and as she's noted, there was direction to go back and revise the paper and not to consider the actual status that was presented in that initial draft. So in terms of advice going forward to senior management, that will wait until that peer review is completed. There are – I believe it's 45 days to complete the paper, et cetera."* As of June 13, 2011, 179 days have passed since that peer review meeting in November 2010.
  - a. Why has it taken so much longer to finalize this paper than the 45 days allotted by the CSAP scientific review process?  
Given the complexity of the revisions it was agreed during the CSAP meeting that the work would require longer than the 45 days. There have also been competing priorities such as Cohen.
  - b. Is the Grant, Holt et al. paper finalized for publication? Please provide with your answers to these questions the paper in its current form as of today (you may communicate with Ms. Grant for this limited purpose).  
The Grant et al. paper has not been finalized. I anticipate it being completed before the end of August.  
  
Regarding the current (today's) version of the paper, it is a partial revision. Ms Grant feels that is would serve to confuse readers. Please advise whether you still require it.
  - c. Does this delay cause you any concern that the DFO Action Plan timelines related to the WSP cannot be met?  
I am confident that we will meet the DFO Action Plan timelines.
5. At pages 1 and 6 of Exhibit 969, you are identified as the Accountability Lead for MSC Conditions 7 and 28, which relate to Cultus Lake sockeye. Under the heading "Work Product Description" for Condition 7, at page 1 of Exhibit 969, there is a reference to the CSAP paper authored by Dr. Bradford et. al on the Status of Cultus Lake Sockeye Salmon (Exhibit 804).

- a. Have you ever consulted with Dr. Bradford or with the Cultus Lake Conservation Team on the implementation of MSC Conditions 7 and 28?  
[Not that I recall.](#)
  - b. Have you ever informed Dr. Bradford or the Cultus Lake Conservation Team that the CSAP paper on the Status of Cultus Lake Sockeye Salmon would be used to support MSC certification purposes?  
[Not that I recall.](#)
  - c. The entry on page 6 regarding MSC Condition 28 refers to the May 2010 version of Dr. Bradford's paper, which was the draft version prior to peer review and finalization. Do you know if DFO has provided MSC with the final published version of Dr. Bradford's paper?  
[I do not know.](#)
6. Exhibit 969 does not mention a particular Strategy 4 deliverable committed to in the DFO Action Plan for MSC certification (Exhibit 159). The Action Plan states in the table at page 9 that, in order to "Implement WSP Strategy 4: Design and implement a fully integrated planning process for salmon conservation", DFO will "Define a regional framework for integrated planning".
  - a. Has the WSP Implementation Team been consulted on any such draft regional framework for integrated planning?  
[I do recall discussing approaches to integrated planning but I do not specifically recall discussing a regional framework.](#)
  - b. Have you worked on this deliverable as the SAFE Division Manager?  
[I informally discuss integrated planning approaches regularly with implementation team members but we have only recently begun to set a course as noted in exhibit 951.](#)
  - c. If you currently have in your possession a draft regional framework for integrated planning, please provide that document with your answer.  
[I am not aware of a draft regional framework.](#)
7. Mr. Ryall testified that the United States has "a slightly different view than Canada as far as what a Wild Salmon Policy would look like. I don't think they necessarily totally agree with our view of what the conservation units are."
  - a. Are you aware of the U.S. Government's views, if any, on the WSP?  
[I am not aware of any formally stated view. The U.S. does define an Evolutionarily Significant Unit \(ESU\) under the Endangered Species Act that](#)

is similar in intent but defined differently than Conservation Units under the WSP.

b. Have you heard any about any concerns held by the U.S. Government on the conservation units identified by Blair Holtby and Kristina Ciruna?

No.

8. Mr. Ryall testified that the draft 2011-2012 IFMP (Exhibit 942) now incorporates the recovery objectives from the 2005 Cultus Lake Recovery Strategy.

a. Was this revision of the 2011-2012 IFMP, to include the 2005 Cultus Recovery Objectives, meant to support Condition 7 of MSC certification?

I do not know.

b. Why does the draft 2011-2012 IFMP not incorporate the provisional WSP abundance-based lower benchmarks identified for Cultus Lake sockeye, published in Dr. Bradford's published CSAP paper (Ex. 804)?

I do not know.

c. Should it?

I do not see why the IFMP would include benchmarks. They are not specific limit reference points that would inform the annual management plan.

b. Do you agree that the WSP lower benchmarks for Cultus sockeye are more precautionary than the 2005 Recovery Strategy recovery objectives?

I may be mistaken but exhibit 942 does not refer to the IFMP. I searched for the document but could not find it.

9. In answering questions about Strategy 4, Mr. Young often referred to "management units" under the Wild Salmon Policy (WSP). However, the WSP makes no reference anywhere to "management units". Rather it refers to "planning units" as discussed in the blue sidebar at pages 25-26.

a. As a drafter of Strategy 4, can you explain why DFO chose to describe and utilize "planning units" in Strategy 4 rather than "management units"?

Management Units generally refer to run timing groups of CU's used for fisheries management purposes ie Early Summers. We did not want CU's confused with MU's. The CU is the unit of diversity that DFO will be accountable for and we will bring a group of people together in a planning unit to plan for a number of CU's concurrently.