

May 5 2009 EOI Review – David Reedman, Dean Allan, Rita Purdon, Barb Snyder, Jennifer Nener, Barry Huber

Evaluation Questions	Discussion Summary	Rating (#1 to 5 for background information only, no rating)
Eligibility		(+, Neutral or -)
<p>1. Is the proponent eligible to apply?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the proposal for a group of First Nations along a watershed or the coast joining to establish a CFE at an aggregate level so as to achieve economies of scale; Are the applicant First Nations located where Fisheries and Oceans Canada manages the fishery in British Columbia; 	<p>Secwepemc Fisheries Commission (SFC) is a non-profit, support service agency operating as a division of the Shuswap Nation Tribal Council Society on behalf of the 10 affiliated Secwepemc First Nation communities. They SNTC are geographically linked but one band is in Invermere – they are in the Columbia drainage. They don't fish in the Fraser system but trade elk for salmon.</p> <p>The SFC is a progressive First Nations body formed in 1992 that works within the mandate of Shuswap Nation Tribal Council Communities and Tribal Chiefs. Currently the only bands directly involved in Demonstration Fisheries have been the Kamloops Indian Band and Skeetchestn at the top end of Thompson River.</p> <p>Siska Traditions Society (STS) is a non-profit organization with a board of directors made up of Siska Indian Band community members and representatives from Siska Indian Band Chief and Council. Siska is on the Fraser but the other bands in the Nicola Tribal Association are not.</p> <p>Siska used to be affiliated with the other Fraser River bands but they fractured away from these neighboring bands in 1993 to access AFS funding while the other bands did not. They are interested in PICFI but their neighbors are not at the moment</p> <p>The EOI references the NTA but the entire NTA is not actively involved in the EOI at this point.. The NTA acts as the tribal fisheries administrative center for Siska. Although they have</p>	

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

	funded some of the work done at Siska through the NTA's AFS agreement (\$45.7K through BCI PICFI dollars). Further involvement of the NTA in the PICFI CFE could be expanded in the future if it is feasible from a business perspective.	
Overall Evaluation of Section		
Context/Background Information		
<p>2. What is the collective population of the applicant First Nations?</p> <p>List the member nations and their populations.</p>	<p>Adams Lake: 728 Kamloops Indian Band: 1,050 Shuswap: 231 Little Shuswap: 309 Neskonlith: 591 Skeetchestn: 484 Spallumcheen: 757 Stuctwesemc Bonaparte Band: 794 Whispering Pines: 131 Simpw (North Thompson): 640 Secwepmec Fisheries Commission Total: 5,715</p> <p>Coldwater Indian Band: 761 Cook's Ferry Indian Band: 286 Nicomen Indian Band: 122 Nooaitch Indian Band: 194 Shackan Indian Band: 119 Siska Indian Band: 293 Upper Nicola Indian Band: 866 Nicola Tribal Association Total: 2,641</p> <p>Total population of the aggregate: 8,356</p>	
<p>3. Which First Nations involved with the EOI have AFS agreements and what type of agreement do they have?</p> <p>What is the funding level in the current fiscal year?</p> <p>What is the funding level on a per-person basis?</p>	<p>Siska</p> <p>Ongoing NTA AFS agreement (since 1994) supports stock assessment in the Nicola watershed and catch monitoring at Siska. Dean Allan has voiced some concerns over Siska's recent reporting history. NTA has had AFS agreement for a long time. Reporting is "average" – up and down. This year it</p>	

	<p>was difficult to agree on project priorities. The NTA fisheries group used to be run almost like consulting company. Tracy Sampson is program coordinator and Neil Todd is technical advisor. Getting some focus on fisheries management has been a challenge. The AFS agreement does include FSC catch monitoring which they contract out. Siska report data to NTA who then report data to DFO. Siska is on the periphery of NTA territory.</p> <p>BCI PICFI dollars in 2008: \$45, 692 (Siska feasibility)</p> <p>AFS for NTA: \$356, 400</p> <p>SFC</p> <p>AFS contribution agreement holder 1993-2008 on behalf of 6-8 Secwepemc communities; The SFC reports quarterly.</p> <p>AFS contribution agreement holder 1995-2005 (administration on behalf of Fraser River Aboriginal Fisheries Secretariat);</p> <p>2008:</p> <p>AFS funding: \$ 288,016</p> <p>AAROM funding: \$465K and \$6,250 from BCI PICFI</p> <p>\$250K is converted from AFS to AAROM. SFC has a fair bit of capacity.</p> <p>Some of neighbouring bands may be interested in PICFI but want assurance around FSC fisheries.</p> <p>There is no formal relationship between Siska and SFC – plan is to create this when PICFI proceeds. They are still learning and nobody has made money to this point. Roe market is something they are working on.</p>	
<p>4. Which FNs participating with the proposal are part of an AAROM organization? Which AAROM group?</p> <p>What is the approximate funding level on a per-person basis?</p> <p>What type of AAROM agreement does the applicant</p>	<p>SFC has a Collaborative Management agreement. The per capita funding is \$132.85</p> <p>Siska - Still some uncertainty around the involvement of the Nicola Tribal Association as a whole, but the NTA is supportive of looking into CFE development but it is only the</p>	

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

have e.g. Access, CM or CB?	<p>Siska band at the moment that is engaged in the feasibility studies and looking in to actually fishing and processing. Siska receives funding through the NTA AFS agreement, roughly \$47K. Population is 293 = \$160.41 per person.</p> <p>Overall NTA per capita funding is \$152.25</p>	
<p>5. What communal commercial fisheries access does the proponent already have through ATP?</p> <p>Is the proponent eligible for ATP access? (i.e. do they have a CFA in place?) if not, why are they not eligible? Is the Applicant located in an area with existing commercial fisheries?</p> <p>Does the proponent have any licences/quota allocated to them currently under ATP? In the case of in-river First Nations, have any commercial demonstration fisheries or feasibility work towards such a fishery taken place?</p> <p>List ATP licences and quota allocated in the current fiscal year (in % TAC and Pounds where appropriate), and list the value as per Stu Nelson estimates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the approximate funding level on a per-person basis? <p>What is the ranking score of the applicant member nations under the interim ATP Allocation Framework?</p>	<p>ATP is not applicable in the BCI. However there is some history with respect to demonstration fisheries in the area. See below.</p> <p>SFC has conducted 5 years of preliminary feasibility studies and has held communal commercial fishing licenses for 5 years (2005-09). They have planned and operated commercial pilots using beach seining and selective gillnet fisheries.</p> <p>Siska First Nation has operated fish wheels for stock assessment purposes beginning in 2000. A community vision for commercial fisheries tied to a local test fishery was developed in 2005, and initiated with the development of a pilot inland processing plant and stock assessment partnership. Since then they have operated stock assessment fisheries, experimented with beach seine fisheries, constructed commercial landing and processing facilities, and hosted collaborative management strategy discussions with other emerging in-river fisheries proponents from the Fraser and Skeena rivers.</p>	
<p>6. Is the scale of the proposal consistent with a balanced distribution of PICFI commercial access and funding?</p> <p>Broad implications: Is this a reasonable amount of access given the requirements of their neighbours & region as a whole?</p>	<p>Relatively large AAROM body at SFC. Siska may have some other issues with respect to “buy-in” from the entire NTA in the long-term, although there is support for the development of a business plan to move forward. At the moment the NTA provides Siska with technical support and Siska provides the insights with respect to the CFE and their coordination with the SFC.</p> <p>I think that we will likely need some clarification from Siska/NTA about their relationship with respect to the PICFI</p>	+

	<p>EOI and potential CFE in the business plan. Further details on this in #20.</p> <p>There are also still questions to be answered around what amounts of fish will be requested/required to be viable and whether or not DFO will hold enough licences to allow the CFE to met its business needs. Also the issue of transferring these salmon to terminal areas still requires some clarification. This pertains to the issue that we do not have a final mechanism for converting from marine mixed stock to in-river share. The group was still learning how to catch fish and were not overly successful, although they have shown improvements from year to year. Conditions of licence – DFO is committed to independent verification. In the 2008 demonstration fishery there was 100% monitoring by First Nations with DFO stopping by. We were unable to achieve the 100% independent monitoring due to the lack of service providers. In 2009, we worked around this by using DFO staff as monitors on these fisheries in conjunction with training opportunities as a part of the in-river mentoring program.</p> <p>The issue of neighbours also needs to be identified. There is significant history between the NTA and the NNTC (Nlaka'pamux Nation Tribal Council). These groups were once allied but fractured apart years ago with the introduction of the AFS program. Recently there have been some promising discussions between the NTA/Siska and the NNTC. There seemed to be confusion over the implications that this would have on FSC fisheries for the NNTC. It has been explained that FSC would still have priority and the area coordinator was asked to give a presentation to the NNTC Fisheries Committee. I have not been able to deliver this presentation yet, but have again asked to be put on their next agenda.</p> <p>Invermere group (Shuswap) may also have an issue around neighbors but it has not been identified and practically should</p>	
--	---	--

	not be an issue as they will not be undertaking any fisheries	
<p>7. What is the history of the FNs participating in the EOI with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reporting on agreements? - Fisheries (FSC & commercial) catch monitoring and reporting? Submitted Timely? Accurately? Interim and final reports? How many reports were received in the last 2 or 3 fiscal years? - What is the Applicant's reporting like relative to other First Nations (the detail and accuracy of reports submitted by FNs vary). How do we standardize our evaluation on this point? Suggest scoring as per benchmarks developed in the short term distribution framework. - If FN does not have an AFS Agreement, what other programs with reporting requirements provide background on timely/accurate reporting? DELETE: or leave in for review of BCI FNs? 	<p>Siska</p> <p>Ongoing NTA AFS agreement (since 1994) supports stock assessment in the Nicola watershed and catch monitoring at Siska. Dean Allan has voiced some concerns over Siska/NTA recent reporting history. Siska does not have an AFS agreement where they need to report directly to DFO. Siska has a catch monitoring program which requires that data is submitted to DFO. They have a good record of getting their data in on time for in-season management. One small negative issue to note is that there have been occasions where joint boat patrols were planned with DFO staff and Siska did not show up for the scheduled boat patrol.</p> <p>SFC</p> <p>SFC has demonstrated considerable financial and administrative reporting expertise and experience with DFO including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAROM Collaborative Management contribution agreement holder (since April 2005) on behalf of 9 (now 10) Secwepemc communities; AFS contribution agreement holder 1993-2008 on behalf of 6-8 Secwepemc communities; AFS contribution agreement holder 1995-2005 (administration on behalf of Fraser River Aboriginal Fisheries Secretariat); Habitat Conservation and Stewardship Program (HCSP) contracts 1998-2002 (1 full-time and 2 part-time staff positions). <p>BCI RM staff report an excellent reporting history from the SFC. Actual reporting content/structure has been variable. Need to consider reporting structure and this will largely be addressed with the new Aboriginal Programs reporting</p>	Neutral/+

	<p>structure. Catch reporting has been good.</p> <p>There have been some challenges with NTA reporting on financials in the past.</p>	
Overall Evaluation of Section		+
Commercial Fishing Enterprise		
<p>8. Has the CFE currently operated successfully and sustainably over a number of years? Does the EOI clearly demonstrate that the additional assets will provide a more diversified and viable enterprise.</p> <p>Or, has the proponent engaged in a demonstration fishery or EO fishery for a number of years, and has experience equivalent to that required in operating a successful CFE.</p> <p>Is there a strong record of compliance and reporting?</p>	<p>Commercial fisheries have not occurred in the BCI other than some small demonstration fisheries in recent years. Concern re: mixed stocks and impacts to North Thompson Chinook. We have the results on the DNA sampling from the 2008 CN fishery in Kamloops Lake and do not have concerns around impacts to North Thompson Chinook stocks.</p> <p>For diversification they are looking at different products including roe and value added. There may be other Economic Development initiatives ongoing that they can align this with. The SFC and Siska do have some business expertise.</p> <p>SFC has conducted 5 years of preliminary feasibility studies and has held communal commercial fishing licenses for 5 years (2005-09). They have planned and operated commercial pilots using beach seining and selective gillnet fisheries.</p> <p>Siska Indian Band has operated fish wheels for stock assessment purposes beginning in 2000. A community vision for commercial fisheries tied to a local test fishery was developed in 2005, and initiated with the development of a pilot inland processing plant and stock assessment partnership. Since then they have operated stock assessment fisheries, experimented with seine fisheries, constructed commercial landing and processing facilities, and hosted collaborative management strategy discussions with other emerging in-river fisheries proponents from the Fraser and Skeena rivers.</p> <p>It must be noted that from a business perspective the venture</p>	<p>Neutral/+ rating in context of other BCI groups.</p>

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

	<p>has not yet turned a profit. Although there has been efforts made for continuous improvement. These are outlined in the Key Issues for 2009. Page 5 of the EOI.</p> <p>Reporting on the previous years' demonstration fisheries has been quite good. Also this was used as a case study that was presented a many of the 2008 Fall Dialogues. 2009 in-river demonstration reports are forthcoming.</p>	
9. If so, how long has it been in place and what steps have been taken to improve the CFE?	See above.	
<p>10. What infrastructure and organizational capacity has the CFE already got in place?</p> <p>(e.g.: licences and quota, FN harvesters, boats, docks, processing facilities, partnerships, articles of incorporation, well functioning operational plans& administrative processes, business manager, etc.</p> <p>If the proponent has ATP licences, do they have an administrative process in place for annual distribution of the licences to determine which band members will fish each licence?</p> <p>How are the proceeds from ATP fisheries currently distributed within the community?</p>	<p>Siska- fishwheel and processing plant. Also there are still significant mixed stock concerns at certain times of year at Siska Fishwheel. Co-ordination between the Siska fishwheel and/or any other methods of harvesting and any downstream tagging projects (radio and/or conventional tags) and DFO staff would be required. This work is of interest to the Pacific Salmon Commission to acquire better up-river data sources and a potential for a long term observation site. The issue of using fishwheel for a formal in-season stock assessment is currently not supported by StAD/PSC due to number of samples. As far as the use of the fishwheel, BCI StAD has no concerns with the Riverfresh proposal other than to note that obviously co-ordination between the Siska fishwheel and any downstream tagging projects (radio and/or conventional tags) would be required. Success with fish wheel is variable due to variable water conditions. Also, there is a need to properly maintain the fishwheel and not leave baskets out in the sun, etc. This has been a problem to date and may impact the CFE if equipment care does not improve.</p> <p>SFC – Have significant capacity but are still learning as to how to operate the fishery effectively from both fishing and marketing sides. They have already partnered with a variety of partners for marketing, quality management, UBC and other First Nations. We may want to request further information</p>	<p>Neutral/+ rating in context of other BCI groups.</p>

regarding the SNTC's business interests and some of their histories with respect to their forestry related businesses and associated business capacity, although it may not relate well to fisheries as the CFE has not been a business priority for the SNTC.

Messaging on equipment needs to be clear and has been to date. PICFI is not willing to pay for transport, processing and other related costs. Only costs relating to the undertaking of the fishery (fishing site to landing site) will be covered. How do we manage this for training? This will largely be addressed by the in-river mentoring program and the 2009 demonstration fisheries. DFO will need to continue to reiterate that PICFI is not going to fund these fisheries in to the future and that this PICFI money should be used as seed money to establish a CFE.

Preliminary List of Vessel, Gear & Infrastructure Requirements.

<i>SFC Fishery Upgrades</i>	<i>Siska Infrastructure Upgrades</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> gillnet boats with trailer, power drum, deck lights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ice machine
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> marker buoys, anchors, chain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> blast freezer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fish totes with lids 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> air conditioner
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> custom-made gillnets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> transport vehicle and forklift
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> custom-made beach seine nets 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ice machine 	
<i>Siska Fishwheel Upgrades</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fish totes with lids 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> boat 	

	At the moment there have been no revenues generated from the demo fisheries that SFC/Siska has undertaken so there have been no revenues to distribute.																	
11. Are any changes being proposed to the CFE so that it will be consistent with PICFI requirements?	The reports generated from the demonstration fisheries have made numerous recommendations on how to improve the CFE down the road. See EOI for details. The issue of governance and arms length management still needs to be addressed and should come out of business planning process.	+																
12. Is current commercial access being fished by community members? For First Nations where ATP isn't available, or for those who have not had the capacity to fish, list the Applicant's experience with demonstration fisheries, or EO fisheries, etc. If Applicant First Nation(s) has ATP licences, or has undertaken a commercial demonstration fishery or ESSR fishery, list the status of each licence/quota as either a) being fished by band members, or b)being fished by aboriginal persons who are not band members, or c)designated to non-aboriginal persons; & provide rationale for licences not being fished by band members, or d) not fished. Designation to non-band members may still be an economically viable practice if it will lead to band-members being trained to take over the fishing in future. (i.e. are band members working as crew on a non-aboriginal's vessel to be trained?) Are temporary or permanent jobs being created for band members, & if so, for how many persons & how many months of the year?	<div>Base comments on the background information presented in #5: No ATP. Their demo fisheries have been fished by community members. 3 main bands are Kamloops, Skeetchestn and Siska so not yet spread across all the member nations.</div> <div>SFC has conducted 5 years of preliminary feasibility studies and has held communal commercial fishing licenses for 5 years (2005-09). They have planned and operated commercial pilots using beach seining and selective gillnet fisheries. In conjunction with participating <i>Secwepemc</i> communities, SFC has been developing capacity to harvest, transport and market their production. By 2006, SFC had designed a framework for a commercial salmon business plan (Table 1).</div> <div>Table 1: Framework for a Multi-Year, Multi-Species Commercial Salmon Business Plan.</div> <div><table><tr><th colspan="2">Multi-Year Production:</th></tr><tr><td>2008</td><td>chinook</td></tr><tr><td>2009</td><td>chinook, pink</td></tr><tr><td>2010</td><td>chinook,</td></tr></table><table><tr><th colspan="2">Multi-Species Marketing:</th></tr><tr><td>chinook</td><td>local retail & restaurant, direct sales</td></tr><tr><td>sockeye</td><td>local retail & restaurant, direct sales</td></tr><tr><td>pink</td><td>buyer/broker</td></tr></table></div>	Multi-Year Production:		2008	chinook	2009	chinook, pink	2010	chinook,	Multi-Species Marketing:		chinook	local retail & restaurant, direct sales	sockeye	local retail & restaurant, direct sales	pink	buyer/broker	+
Multi-Year Production:																		
2008	chinook																	
2009	chinook, pink																	
2010	chinook,																	
Multi-Species Marketing:																		
chinook	local retail & restaurant, direct sales																	
sockeye	local retail & restaurant, direct sales																	
pink	buyer/broker																	

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

		sockeye (late)		
	2011	chinook, pink	roe	buyer/broker
	<p>Siska First Nation has operated fish wheels for stock assessment purposes beginning in 2000. A community vision for commercial fisheries tied to a local test fishery was developed in 2005, and initiated with the development of a pilot inland processing plant and stock assessment partnership. Since then they have operated stock assessment fisheries, experimented with seine fisheries, constructed commercial landing and processing facilities, and hosted collaborative management strategy discussions with other emerging in-river fisheries proponents from the Fraser and Skeena rivers. Siska also participated in a trap-net pink salmon fishery in 2009 and has been processing the majority of the catch from the SFC demonstration fishery.</p>			
13. Is there demonstrated fishing capacity? (include individual licence holders in response)	<p>There are the results of the demonstration fisheries but the group is still learning the best method to fish, process and market these fish. Need to learn more efficient methods which will be addressed though the in-river training and mentoring through the PICFI Capacity building.</p>			
14. . Is there demonstrated business capacity such that very little support is required from PICFI? (include individual Licence holders in response).	<p>Within the SFC there is business capacity but I'm not sure that it is very well captured within the EOI. The SEDCO operation (forestry) that reports to a board of directors at the SNTC has been financially successful business. We may need to ask for further details around SEDCO and other businesses but overall the SNTC has demonstrated business capacity. Also due to the fact that the CFE to date has only run as a demonstration, the chiefs are unwilling to commit whole-heartedly to the long term because there are still so many unknowns in the process. They have been supportive of doing work towards a CFE to explore its viability. One of the problems to date has been the difficulty in longer term planning due to uncertainties in access to fish. Does the SFC/Siska have a cross section of expertise? This will be determined in the business planning process.</p>			

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

	There has been a significant amount of work towards the marketing and quality management planning component of the operation. i.e River to Plate and Virtual Warehouse.	
<p>15. If the existing CFE is being revised does it meet the standard for good business governance?</p> <p>Is there a transparent approach for equitable distribution of profits/jobs within the community?</p>	<p>The existing CFE that has operated through demonstration licenses has not yet turned a profit and to date has been operating in the feasibility stages. It is still a bit early to determine whether or not the business governance will be good or not. Support from the Tribal Council on equitable distribution of profits will occur at the business planning stage.</p> <p>The specifics around equitable distribution of profits have not been an issue as there have not been any profits to distribute. The project to date has created some direct seasonal jobs at both Siska (processing and fish wheel) and at SFC (fishing). In discussions with this group they have indicated that they feel the business planning process will provide the funding necessary to formally address the issue of job and profit distribution within the communities.</p> <p>Another issue to note is that there still is not a total understanding of how the CFE operates by all members of all the various bands. Some examples of this are concerns voiced by some people that the commercial fishery at Kamloops Lake and Thompson River has resulted in a particular community not getting its food fish. Another person expressed concern that the fishery in the Thompson River was resulting in dead sockeye floating down the Thompson River. Both of these issues are unfounded. The issue of not getting food fish was the result of that particular band going out too late in the season for their fish. The stock that they were targeting was abundant but it had already passed them by. The second issue of dead sockeye was actually observed pre-spawn mortality and not mortalities associated with the beach seining just downstream of Kamloops Lake – which is a very selective and very low non-target mortality fishery.</p>	Neutral
Overall Evaluation of Section	They are organized and taking a business-like approach especially when compared with other BCI groups.	+

<p>Expected Viability– Strength of Proposal</p> <p>This section will look at the overall strength of the proposal, starting from an initial evaluation of the Overview section of the EOI. A well constructed Overview should contain the proponent’s short term strategies and long term vision. The short term strategies should describe the processes the Applicant will be taking initially to advance their business (feasibility studies, initial work, etc) to achieve their ‘vision’. This might include lessons learned from recent projects, and adaptations for new processes, including how capacity will be built. The long term vision should clearly describe objectives for the future of the business. Long term is intended to capture 4-5 years in the future and beyond, particularly for sustainability beyond PICFI.</p> <p>Evaluation should point out both strengths and weaknesses of the overview, for follow-up with the Applicant.</p>		
<p>16.Does the proposal exhibit economies of scale? (e.g. Sharing of infrastructure, expertise...) and are there individuals qualified in administration and technical capacity?</p> <p>Has the Applicant considered that within an aggregate, licences might be rotated between FNs as is done now in ATP.</p>	<p>Yes and Yes. There is an agreement in place for the SFC providing fish to Siska for processing. The EOI mentions also partnering in the future with other fisheries in the mid/upper Fraser but no formal partnership agreements have been established. Pat Mathew is engaged with fisheries management from the SFC. Murray Ross is a capable employee of the SFC in his role as Director. Aaron Gillespie is the SFC fisheries technician and has some technical, hands-on experience. The SFC also has a fisheries biologist, Michelle Walsh on staff, another factor strengthening their technical capacity.</p> <p>There is also discussion in the EOI around looking to other partners downriver (Chehalis/Scowlitz) to maximize the</p>	<p>+</p>

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

	<p>benefits of the CFE with respect to fishing and processing capacity. The geographic scope opens opportunity to harvest in larger geographic area – opens options for more stocks on which to fish terminally.</p> <p>The SFC and NTA have fairly good technical capacity with respect to fisheries knowledge. However, to date this has had an FSC focus rather than a commercial focus. The SFC would like to use some of the business planning dollars to hire a business manager to focus solely on the development of the CFE and the associated business plan.</p>	
17. Does the applicant demonstrate internal economies of scale (i.e. areas of expertise gained from other business ventures)	The SNTC has other business ventures going on in their territory and may be able to harness some of this expertise to further the advancement of the Riverfresh CFE. At this point it is difficult for the SFC to get much attention from the SNTC business people, as they have not been able to generate any profits to date and there is no security in the access provided to date through the demonstration fisheries.	Neutral/+
18. Is the proposal diversified or does it add to the diversification of the proponent? e.g. Diversification can represent a range of species, or a diversity of value-added products.	<p>It is diversified in that it recognizes the need to use a variety of species (Chinook, sockeye and pink) but being inland the group is limited to salmon. The proposal also has looked in to the roe caviar market and recognizes that this is one of the most lucrative markets for salmon products. At the moment they are lacking some of the infrastructure to deal with this product in a timely enough manner to get the maximum value for the roe. The results of the 2009 pink demonstration fishery should provide additional information as to whether the value added products are viable.</p> <p>The work of the River to Plate initiative to date has looked at the potential of a suite of salmon products that could be marketed on a global scale. There has also been significant progress on the traceability element of these fisheries with the virtual warehouse concept.</p>	+

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

<p>19. Have any steps been considered to seek partnerships to improve viability? List them.</p> <p>e.g. Partnerships with government agencies, or other business partnerships?, etc.</p>	<p>Yes. It is clear that the groups are interested in pursuing partnerships but the majority of these partnerships have not yet been formalized. The bullets below are excerpts from the EOI regarding partnerships. After speaking with the Murray Ross and Dave Moore, they foresee these/any partnerships becoming more formalized in the business planning stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Fraser First Nation producers – investigations into collaboration with the UFFCA including sampling, valuation, processing and marketing is ongoing with respect to possible sockeye production in the Chilcotin and Quesnel is ongoing. • Other Fraser First Nation co-processors - investigations into collaboration with Scowlitz and Yale fish plants (and others) are ongoing as part of the business planning for 2009. • Skeena producers – investigations into collaboration with the Skeena Fisheries Commission and Lake Babine Sockeye fence production is ongoing. • Industry partners – ongoing development that will provide both co-processing and marketing support when the local fishery outstrips local capacity. • Academic partners – an ongoing partnership with UBC and BCIT is assisting with quality control, product development and marketing challenges. Specialized systems, tools, products and training are being developed in collaboration with these institutions. 	<p>+</p>
<p>20. Is there a clear indication of a high level of community support for the proposal?</p> <p>Are there strong plans to distribute assets within the community? What are they?</p> <p>Does the proposal address cultural interests of the supporting First Nations?</p>	<p>This is one of the weaker points in the EOI in my view. I have had further discussions with both Siska and the SFC to ensure that they are able to demonstrate that this CFE is/will be strongly supported by their communities.</p> <p>Band Council resolutions and Tribal Council resolutions have been received from SNTC, and Siska/NTA. These resolutions improve the support but it has been difficult to get 100%</p>	<p>-/Neutral</p>

<p>How was community support for the proposal identified?</p> <p>Does the evaluation team know whether the applicant's proposal supports positive relationships with neighbouring communities? Discuss. Has the EOI been signed by Chiefs in Council? E.g. as a measure of broad community support.</p>	<p>community buy-in as the details of the CFE have not been determined and there are still numerous uncertainties around access and markets. I am awaiting governance documents from Siska and the NTA to indicate clearly to DFO what the resolution process is with each of these groups and what the specific rules are around passing resolutions at Chief and Council meetings.</p> <p>The EOI says: SFC: "The SNTC Chiefs have been generally in support of previous research projects, but have not yet made a decision on moving to a legal entity for a CFE. Two SNTC communities have been actively involved in demonstration commercial fishing to date: Skeetchestn and Kamloops bands".</p> <p>There have been regular discussions on the findings from the research feasibility studies and plans for future studies with community representatives at the SFC Steering Committee meetings. The annual project reports have been routinely distributed to all 10 SNTC communities. A SFC briefing note on PICFI was presented to the SNTC chiefs in July 2008.</p> <p>Siska: "The Siska vision for fisheries was created and passed by community consensus in 2004 and provides a principled foundation for the development of their fishery. Regular reports to the STS and community meetings provide for feedback on the developing fishery."</p> <p>There could be a better demonstration of community support in my view. I have spoken with the authors from both the SFC and Siska regarding this. Murray Ross indicated that the EOI of has been sent around to the SFC steering committee for comment. This group meets monthly. Murray also indicated that he would likely be able to get a Tribal Council resolution</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>from the SNTC to support moving forward on the EOI to the business planning stage and continuing with the feasibility work that has taken place. These resolutions from Siska, the SNTC and the NTA have been received.</p> <p>At this point the Chiefs may be a bit nervous about forming a legal entity – not that they would not go there at some point but at this point do not feel that a business is ready. No profits have been generated yet.</p> <p>Also Murray indicated that he would easily be able to get band council resolutions from the Kamloops Indian Band, <u>Skeetchestn</u> Band and Siska Band. These are the bands that have been primarily involved in the demonstration fisheries to date. Some of the other bands may not be supportive of a band council resolution at this point, but the issue of flow of benefits to communities will likely have to be ironed out before a particular community would make a resolution. This key component has not been 100% addressed yet, largely because they have not yet generated any money.</p> <p>The issue of neighboring communities also needs to be considered. Particularly with the NNTC:</p> <p><u>Ashcroft Indian Band</u> <u>Boothroyd Indian Band</u> <u>Boston Bar Indian Band</u> <u>Oregon Jack Creek Indian Band</u> <u>Spuzzum Indian Band</u></p> <p>There is history between the NTA and NNTC. These two groups are all Nlaka'pamux (same linguistic group) and were united in their relation ship with DFO until the introduction of AFS in 1993. Siska is affiliated with the NTA, although the neighbours bands on either side of them are NNTC members.</p> <p>There is a need to do some communications planning. There is the potential to get these groups participating in Area harvest committee sessions through the First Nations representatives</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>(Marcel Shephert and Pat Mathew). Pat Mathew (SFC) is on the Salmon IHPC but we need to consider how to get in-river fishers interacting with other fishing sectors. First Nations must be aware of co-mgt opportunities. The co-management work is evolving through PICFI and there are a number of initiatives underway that the SFC and the NTA participates in.</p> <p>A co-mgmt position is under development for BC Interior.</p>	
21. Is there likely to be ongoing access to the species or stocks of interest?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CN Thompson 4sub1 have been strong in recent years. There are some concerns about impacts to North Thompson Chinook stocks. All parties do not want any additional pressure on these stocks. The 5/2s have been in decline. Differentiation between the 4yr olds and the 5yr olds can be done by reading scales. From the results of the DNA collection from the 2008 Kamloops Lake Chinook fishery it does not appear that the concerns around North Thompson area are an issue. We may need to continue monitoring this in the future though to ensure that catch is directed on the Thompson 4sub1s. Scale samples were also taken during the 2009 Chinook demonstration fishery at Kamloops Lake and the results will be available post-season. • Pinks every 2 years • Sockeye variable. There are some mixed stock concerns on the mainstem Fraser. There will be challenges with weak stocks from year to year. Dominant and sub-dominant years should have some sockeye available for harvest. <p>There has also been some concern that commercial demonstration fisheries are cutting into FSC on these stocks. This is unfounded as the abundance is high enough for both fisheries to reach their targets. It was suggested that the fishery could occur higher up, but the quality of the fish would decrease and reduce the marketability. The concern is largely a</p>	

PROTECTED: FOR PICFI REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY

	result of un-informed comments from local communities. The SFC provides updates to the SNTC tribal council regularly and there has been additional work prior to this year's demonstration fisheries to keep member communities informed around the management of the in-river commercial fisheries and the separation of these from the FSC fisheries. These efforts need to be continued.	
Overall Evaluation of this section		
Other Factors		
22. Does the proposal fit within Treaty parameters e.g levels & types of access, fishing areas, etc.? If the Applicant is in Treaty, at what stage are they? Would the access proposed help or hinder on-going, or proposed, Treaty processes?	SNTC member bands are not involved in the B.C. treaty process but are engaged with the Province in New Relationship and other discussions associated with land and resource use within asserted traditional territories. The Nicola Tribal Association and member bands are outside of the British Columbia Treaty Commission treaty process.	
23. Does the proposal address other departmental interests or objectives? e.g strength of claim, consistency with management objectives, consistency with Fisheries' long term goals/vision.	Yes it will address some other departmental management strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains or improves management control and conservation performance in the salmon fishery; • Promotes the use of clearly defined shares to improve manageability and viability; • Increases the ability of harvesters to work cooperatively to harvest available surpluses and to take on greater responsibility for control and monitoring in the fishery. 	
24. Does the proposal involve leveraging resources from other sources?	Yes. Siska received funding from INAC in 2005 to build the processing plant. Siska has also submitted a BC Capacity Initiative proposal. The PICFI funding and the development of a CFE will provide opportunities for further leveraging of funding from other sources.	

Overall Evaluation of Section		
Overall Evaluation of Proposal		
Considerations regarding capacity building funding level (e.g. what capacity building funds is the group already receiving through AAROM and/or AFS for similar work?)	<p>The SNTC receives \$37,039 in there AAROM agreement for Economic Opportunities.</p> <p>The NTA receives no funding related to commercial fisheries or economic opportunities.</p>	
Considerations regarding amount of commercial fisheries access support.	<p>\$2 – 3M in access has been suggested in the decision note. I think that we need to consider the actual value of these licences in terms of fish available for harvest in these terminal areas. It is not the same value on the coast as it will be in the BC Interior. The salmon available for harvest will not be available in the same numbers as in the marine areas due to the cyclical nature of particular salmon stocks, the fact that not all stocks will pass through the interior fishing locations and the environmental conditions in-river that can impact returns. Also, the issue of transferring shares needs to be addressed in the Fraser to determine what a share in the marine area would equate to in up-river areas.</p> <p>Another factor around the access that needs to be considered is the fact that there are a number of First Nations in the BC Interior who are reluctant to engage in the EOI process and to move towards in-river commercial fisheries as there are still a number of unknowns around these fisheries. I foresee that there could be a number of First Nations who will quickly become interested in joining in with these interior CFE's should they prove successful. If this was the case I think that DFO would be supportive of increasing the access to the in-river commercial fisheries to support Wild Salmon Policy implementation and improved ability to manage fisheries in</p>	

	<p>more terminal areas. I am concerned that these groups may not have the same opportunity as coastal groups (through ATP) to acquire additional salmon access in the future as we do not have mechanisms in place for interior groups to acquire access outside of PICFI.</p> <p>I would encourage DFO to consider the upper end of the access amount, or higher, for salmon for BC Interior groups to allow for the best opportunity of success for the CFE's that do establish in the BCI. This is necessary to ensure that these businesses will have the allocation to allow them to take advantage of the economies of scale that PICFI is encouraging and to allow for some flexibility for these groups to find optimal access amounts to allow for solid businesses to become established for the long term in the BC Interior.</p>	
--	--	--