

From: Thomson, Andrew
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2010 7:28 AM
To: Drouin, Emily <Emily.Drouin@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Subject: Re: further views on transparency and monitoring

How much coffee have you had today??
Andrew Thomson
Director - Aquaculture Management

From: Drouin, Emily
To: Swerdfager, Trevor; Ford, Sharon
Cc: Porter, Edward; Thomson, Andrew
Sent: Wed May 19 10:25:36 2010
Subject: RE: further views on transparency and monitoring

Yes, very good recommendation overall

Here are my comments

Do we have a process in the works to obtain BCSFA data as historical need-to-know and for upcoming reporting and auditing purposes?

I think we are planning on having companies report all to us instead or as well as BCSFA - in this case, we need to work with industry and BCSFA to secure a reporting format and timing - to ensure consistency with both IM and our reporting/transparency strategies
We also will (are) need to have a list of reporting requirements to give them - based on our last meeting (that I attended) there is still discrepancy between what they want/can provide and what we want/need. We need to come to the table informed on what is possible v. what they say is not.

What is our reporting/transparency strategy? Regional or National (Jamie) monthly, quarterly (yearly won't cut it with interest groups)

Is there anything in the NB collaborative reporting system that we can mirror in BC:
- Collaboration between companies for research that enhances self-policing of the industry
- Government and industry research collaboration that gives incentive to companies for providing data

What do we need to do to include Aquaculture in the list of NPRI reporting industries?
What other industry can we use as a comparable in terms of reporting requirements and disclosure of reported information by government? Not off the top of our head, but as a rationale for what we will want to impose.

Is the fact that net cage aquaculture is more profitable because of its use of the natural environmental benefits a justification for imposing the costs of reporting, auditing and monitoring on the companies.

Don't think we need to impose on companies to report to other interest groups but we could work with a representative group of other interested parties to audit the data as part of a DFO science collaboration - then we can help with cost but still leverage some financing from the ENGOs - ie solid collaboration that will be documented and that will produce collaborative research papers

I may not be up to speed on some of the things that have been going on: please fill me in where this is the case

DFO-343689

\\svbcvafp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\FAM\Andrew Thomson\Email_001\COHEN_Production_AndrewThomson\AQ2010sentitems\

CAN161472_0001

Emily Drouin
613-993-6905

From: Swerdfager, Trevor
Sent: May 19, 2010 8:21 AM
To: Porter, Edward; Ford, Sharon; Drouin, Emily; Thomson, Andrew
Subject: FW: further views on transparency and monitoring

i find this paper quite good. i think we can and should agree with pretty much all of it. Indeed, I think our planning is proceeding along these lines. Please let me know if any of you have any objections to what they are proposing.

Trevor Swerdfager
Director General, Aquaculture Management
Directeur G n ral, Gestion de l'aquaculture
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Minist re de P ches et Oc ans
trevor.swerdfager@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
613-949-4919

From: David Lane [mailto:davidlane@bucksuzuki.org]
Sent: April 12, 2010 7:35 PM
To: Swerdfager, Trevor
Subject: further views on transparency and monitoring

Attached you will find a paper on transparency and monitoring done by Steven Catania from the University of Victoria Environmental Law Centre.

On pages 16-17 he compares transparency in the regulatory regimes in B.C., Norway, Ireland and Scotland.

Ireland has a very good system of ensuring public transparency in a timely manner (monthly).

We will be submitting this paper during the official consultations when the draft aquaculture regulation is gazetted, along with specific recommendations regarding the draft.

I wanted to send this paper to you as it was not completed by the end of February for submission to DFO, but has some useful comparisons that you might consider in your deliberations with the regulation drafters. I think it will go a long way to restore public confidence in the salmon farming industry if it is clear that potential impacts on wild salmon from sea lice and disease are reported on a monthly basis so that it is clear what actions have been taken.

Certainly, the Marine Harvest sea lice and SLICE treatment data has been posted in public view on their website, allowing anyone to see trends and to see if treatments were done in a timely way and resulted in the desired effect. This has been seen by most environmental groups as a major contribution towards industry transparency, but unless all companies are required to do the same, important data gaps will continue to exist and research efforts made more difficult.

Cheers,

\\svbcvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\FAM\Andrew Thomson\Email_001\COHEN_Production_AndrewThomson\AQ2010sentitems\

David

David Lane
Executive Director
T. Buck Suzuki Environmental Foundation
100 - 326 12th Street
New Westminster, B.C. V3M 4H6
Ph: 604-519-3635
Fax: 604-524-6944
www.bucksuzuki.org

"Working to Protect Fish Habitat"

\\svbcvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\FAM\Andrew Thomson\Email_001\COHEN_Production_AndrewThomson\AQ2010sentitems\