

First Nations Access to Fish for Food, Social and Ceremonial Purposes

Part 2A:

Pacific Region Evaluation and Decision
Framework

Request for Allocation Change

May 2006

Working Draft Version 1.1

PROTECTED

2006-XXX-XXXXX
EKME # XXXXXX

MEMORANDUM FOR THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL

**Temporary/Permanent Change to the Fish Mandate for the
XXXXXXXXXX First Nation**

Decision Sought

SUMMARY.

- First Nation X is seeking a (permanent/temporary) increase in their FSC allocation of (Species X) from (X amount) to (X amount)
- The First Nation fishing area is in (DFO Area – South Coast/North Coast etc)

Recommendation:

Background

- See attached information summary.
-

Analysis / DFO Comment

(Outline key issues of concern here, “pros and cons”)

Implications for other users:

Implications for DFO:

Recommendations and Next Steps

(To be signed by Directors of TAPD, FAM, Area)

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

I concur, (RDG)

DRAFT

\\svbcvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\The Cohen Commission\Stock Assessment\Timber Whitehouse\Email02\Cohen2-Whitehouse\Active 05OCT04\Inbox\Fish Management Stuff\2006\07\

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Summary of Criteria and Indicators for a Request in Allocation Increase

Criteria and Indicators Considered	Key Information	DFO Issues/Comments	Evaluation (✓, -, X, or NA)
Criteria #1: Legal Considerations:			
1.1 Will approving/not approving request result in a conservation issue?	SARA issue? Other conservation issue related to target species or by-catch?		
1.2 Will approving/not approving the request have implications for any other valid legislative objective (e.g. human health & safety)?			
1.3 Issues with priority of access for FSC purposes?	Priority of access can include both FSC amount and fishing opportunity.		
1.4 FN preferences – social and/or cultural importance	Identify any info re: social and or cultural preference/importance.		
1.5 Possible infringement on other FSC harvests if increase approved?	e.g. will this affect ability of another FN to obtain their FSC?		
1.6 If the request is for “new” species, is there historical information relevant to this request?	Summarize any information available, including conflicting information.	Any thoughts/concerns/interpretations of the information?	

Legend

✓ supports approving request; - neutral; X does NOT support approving request; NA Not Applicable

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Criteria and Indicators Considered	Key Information	DFO Issues/Comments	Evaluation (✓, -, X, or NA)
1.7 Other			
<i>Grouped Evaluation of Legal Considerations Indicators:</i>			

DRAFT

Legend

✓ supports approving request; - neutral; X does NOT support approving request; NA Not Applicable

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Criteria and Indicators Considered	Key Information	DFO Comments	Evaluation (✓, -, X, or NA)
Criteria #2: Fisheries Resource Diversity, Abundance, and Parity Issues			
2.1 Current & Requested allocation of species /stock (Total <i>units</i> and <i>units</i> per capita)	<p style="text-align: center;">Current: Requested:</p> <p>Total <i>units</i> <i>Units</i> per cap.</p>		
2.2 Compare current allocation of <i>requested species/stock</i> with other FNs in same Geographic Aggregate (GA).	(e.g. High, Near-average, or Low, or % of average for Geographic Aggregate) (AFS-RHQ will provide the data)		
2.3 Current allocation of all fish species/stocks (Total lbs per capita)	<p style="text-align: center;">Current: Requested:</p> <p>Total lbs Lbs per cap. (AFS-RHQ will provide the data)</p>		
2.4 Using AFS summary table, compare current allocations for each species with average for Aboriginal groups in same GA. For shellfish, evaluate availability (high, medium or low) as usually there is no allocation.	(e.g. Percent of average, OR High/Near Average, Low) Salmon: Herring Herring SOK Halibut: Sablefish: Other Groundfish: Shellfish Other:	Could help identify alternate opportunities, not just something between zero and what the FN has requested.	

Legend

✓ supports approving request; - neutral; X does NOT support approving request; NA Not Applicable

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Criteria and Indicators Considered	Key Information	DFO Comments	Evaluation (✓, -, X, or NA)
2.5 Changes in Aboriginal Groups' fish needs (e.g. population, etc.)			
2.6 Other			
<i>Grouped Evaluation of Diversity, Abundance, and Equity Indicators:</i>			

Legend

✓ supports approving request; - neutral; X does NOT support approving request; NA Not Applicable

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Criteria and Indicators Considered	Key Information	DFO Comments	Evaluation (✓, -, X, or NA)
Criteria #3: Fisheries Capacity, Governance, and Operational Issues			
3.1 How does request compare with reported FSC catch data?	The FN should be providing catch data	e.g. issues with data?	
3.2 Does the FN have the capacity to harvest the requested allocation?	Area staff should discuss with the FN how they plan to harvest the requested fish.		
3.3 Concerns regarding compliance with licence conditions?	Identify concerns, even if no charges have been laid.		
3.4 Is the request to facilitate short-term access to unusually high stock abundance?	Could be for directed harvest or high abundance of by-catch species.		
3.5 Can the requested allocation be caught within the FN's current fishing area?			
3.6 Is request linked with a commercial issue (e.g. by-catch retention)?			
3.7 Other			
<i>Grouped Evaluation of Performance of FSC Fisheries Indicators:</i>			

Legend

✓ supports approving request; - neutral; X does NOT support approving request; NA Not Applicable

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Criteria and Indicators Considered	Key Information	DFO Comments	Evaluation (✓, -, X, or NA)
Criteria #4: Treaty-Related Issues			
4.1 Is the requesting FN participating in the Treaty process?	Stage in Treaty process? (Treaty negotiator will fill in)		
4.2 Compare the requested allocation with what has been offered (or planned) for the requested species.	Higher, similar, or lower? (Treaty negotiator will fill in).		
4.3 Can the requested allocation (or species) be caught within the SOI? Within the negotiated Fishing Area?	(Treaty negotiator will fill in)		
4.4 Compare the requested allocation to treaty allocations proposed/offered for neighbouring First Nations	(Treaty negotiator to fill in)		
4.5 Other			
<i>Grouped Evaluation of Treaty-Related Issues:</i>			

Summary Recommendation:**Supported by:****Legend**

✓ supports approving request; - neutral; X does NOT support approving request; NA Not Applicable

PROTECTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Appendix 1: (Insert AFS Summary Data Table and Graphs here)

DRAFT

Legend

✓ supports approving request; - neutral; X does NOT support approving request; NA Not Applicable

\\svbvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\The Cohen Commission\Stock Assessment\Timber Whitehouse\Email02\Cohen2-Whitehouse\Active 05OCT04\Inbox\Fish Management Stuff\2006\07\