

**Strategic Directions Committee (SDC)  
2010 Action Log**

<b>Date assigned</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action Required</b>	<b>Responsibility Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
January 21	Socio-Economic Analysis in DFO	<p>The purpose of today's discussion was to inform on the work the EAU is doing and discuss strategic approach to socio-economic analysis, impact from new PAA and capacity and consider future needs.</p> <p>It was agreed catch monitoring is a very important issue for the department and region and therefore, it should be added to the list of priorities. We need to look at the implications of what the public involvement should be versus the private involvement. It was agreed we need a process that provokes discussion and seeks views prior to finalizing the workplans.</p> <p>There's strong support for being more strategic and a proposal should be submitted to SDC for consideration, a process that would allow branches to request support from the Economic Analysis group and which would also explain how requests would be prioritized and selected, which in turn will be submitted to RMC as a recommendation.</p>	<p>J. Nener P. Mahaux</p> <p>Scheduled for March 4<sup>th</sup> SDC</p>	<p>March 4<sup>th</sup> – presented to SDC. Proposed approached agreed to and to be presented to RMC for decision on March 30<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>March 30<sup>th</sup> – approved by RMC.</p>
	SEP Performance Indicators	<p>A presentation was made on reviewing the progress to date on SEP Performance Measure Framework (PMF), why the PMF matters to SEP and the region and how implementation of the SEP PMF will affect other programs. The presentation included two questions for discussion: (1) should a cost benefit indicator be developed? and (2) What should be considered when developing targets for indicators that measure resource allocations across logic model outcomes?</p>	<p>R. Reid G. Savard</p> <p>Scheduled for March 25<sup>th</sup> SDC</p>	<p>Discussed at April 15<sup>th</sup> SDC meeting and being presented to RMC on April 27<sup>th</sup> for a decision.</p>

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
		<p>With respect to the questions, it was agreed that a cost benefit indicator should be developed and other social or intangible values should be incorporated, beyond financial. It was identified that there may be common or linked indicators with the Fisheries Sustainability Frameworks that should be considered. It was agreed that we need to consider cost and benefit more broadly and we should be able to identify if an activity is useful from a cost benefit perspective. Therefore, it was agreed to that a comprehensive cost benefit indicator would be useful and linkages should be made with other programs in its development.</p> <p>In regard to the second question it was agreed the direction that SEP is taking with regard to resource allocation is correct i.e. an increasing emphasis on enhancement of vulnerable stocks. Indicators that support the PAA and MRRS at the sub-sub activity level are necessary to meet national requirements. The key critical indicators need to be clear on what criteria we are using and represent where we are now in a way that allows SEP to be explained in a simple but comprehensive manner that is linked to our overall objective.</p> <p>SEP was directed to finalize the performance measurement framework, including more specific work on the indicators and return to SDC at a later date before taking the material to RMC.</p>		
March 4 <sup>th</sup>	Socio-Economic	Today's discussion focused upon an approach/process for	J. Nener	

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
	Analysis in DFO (follow up from January 21 <sup>st</sup> SDC)	<p>obtaining economic analysis (EA) and Policy is proposing a process today.</p> <p>It was noted other regions do not have a formal process in place for obtaining economic analysis. Science Sector, in Pacific Region, has a detailed approach in place for obtaining EA (see slide #4 of presentation). The Science approach is very good and Policy is suggested we adapt this approach with modifications. Policy wouldn't do a formal call letter for such request, as Science, but adopt the form used by Science (also included in presentation pkg).</p> <p>There was agreement with the proposed process and format. It was also agreed this request would be put out at a certain time of the year so that people are aware of the request. A year in advance was suggested with flexibility to include requests after the fact.</p> <p>It was agreed my moving to a call letter approach will enforce Directors to think about their needs. That in turn will lead to an evaluation and enforce discipline. It was agreed we don't want Policy checking off everyone's E.A. work requirement and if there's a huge request for E.A.'s then Policy could develop a template or guideline the branches and sectors could adopt. It was agreed Policy Branch shouldn't become a watchdog for E.A.'s.</p> <p>Lastly, it was agreed it would be useful to identify any E.A.'s that would be conducted outside of the Policy Branch this way staff are aware of what work is being done in the branches/sectors. Policy to return to RMC with a decision note.</p>	<p>P. Mahaux</p> <p>March 30<sup>th</sup> RMC</p>	
March 25 <sup>th</sup>	Cancelled			

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
April 15 <sup>th</sup>	SEP Performance Measurement Framework	<p>The purpose of today's discussion was to review the SEP Performance Measure Framework (PMF) and indicators and to seek direction on finalizing the PMF for RMC approval. There were several comments on the Indicator interdependency issue and it was noted, while the indicators are complex they allow discussion and introduces a level of transparency allowing us to have clear conversations on the priorities and program.</p> <p>It was also noted its very important how we communicate this framework and engage other sectors and external parties. It was suggested that interdependent indicators could be linked into the Regional Logic Model, currently being worked on by Policy Branch. As far as communicating, on regional Performance Measure, internally and externally we may want to consider the Regional Logic Model or an equivalent public site to the RDG exchange. We could also utilize the existing working groups, such as Salmon Working Group and Stock Assessment Coordinating Committee, to communicate Performance Measurement frameworks to external parties.</p> <p>There was general support for finalizing the SEP PMF and OHEB will be presenting a decision note to RMC on April 27th.</p>	R. Reid	April 27 <sup>th</sup> – to RMC for decision.
April 15 <sup>th</sup>	Selective Mark Fisheries	It was agreed further discussion is required on this framework. A clear objective and performance metrics are required. Before we proceed with this program for Chinook we need to assess the Coho Mark Selective Fisheries (MSF). How are the Canadian Fisheries already marked performing? We also need to conduct a true cost evaluation for a program of this magnitude and consider alternate tools		

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
		<p>that may deliver the same benefit. It was noted the U.S. is legislated to do mark fisheries which is a very expensive program and they may be reconsidering alternate options.</p> <p>There was a consensus that further work is required on understanding the information regarding MSF as outlined above. The working group will provide provisional guidelines to FAM so that staff can respond to stakeholders on the risk and benefit of MSF and we will analyze requests on a case by case basis. It was also agreed FAM requires general speaking points to respond to the MSF issue, if raised during the IHPC meeting of May 6/7, and these can be shared with other staff so that the issue is addressed consistently.</p>		
May 6 <sup>th</sup>	WSP Work Planning	<p>Policy branch is looking for a regional strategy on how to manage ATK. It was noted ATK is very specific to FNs and the circumstance and when we require this we consult with First Nations. The SARA guidelines would be helpful and more broadly applicable to determining ATK.</p> <p>It was suggested that we take the list of activities, from Annex 1, and the list of successes to date and report on the progress made to date on these activities. We could have an interim report ready for the Fall and if the Cohen Commission requests such a report we'll be ahead of the schedule.</p> <p>A comprehensive report, not an evaluation, will be presented to Operations Committee at the end of June.</p> <p>It was suggested perhaps the PFRCC could do the progress</p>	J. Nener	

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
		report on the WSP initiative as long as we provide a defined TORs to them.		
May 6 <sup>th</sup>	Pacific Region Strategic Plan 2010-2013	<p>The following comments were provided on the Pacific Region Strategic Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that Pacific Science Renewal is almost completed and not the forward looking priority for Science Sector.</li> <li>• A number of DFO priorities aren't carried forwarded into the regional priorities.</li> <li>• We talk about PICFI but we don't mention what the end result of this initiative will be. Perhaps we need to take this into consideration for such initiatives and include it in the plan.</li> <li>• The MAF reporting priorities need to be linked into this document.</li> <li>• We should report against the national performance measures and not create new ones. Additionally, the SLAs have indicators included in them.</li> <li>• It was suggested to reconvene with the logic model group and redo the language of this document, subtle changes of wording is required for the intermediate outcomes. There is likely National wording around Aboriginal rights and title that should be used.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed this document should be called a Business Plan, utilizing the National annual business plan template and adding a Regional context piece. The Business Plan would be for 3 years, and updated annually. We need to adopt something that's not viewed as problematic by</p>	J. Nener TBS	

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
		<p>NHQ. Further we need to figure out our goals with this document and who our audience is. How it is presented matters and should reflect the audience which is DFO staff. It was agreed a shorter brochure style version of the BP should be created for staff. Communications to work on this with Policy.</p> <p>It was agreed that we would return to SDC for a subsequent meeting and then to RMC . Lastly, RDs of OHEB, FAM, C&amp;P, Science and CS are to identify branch/sector leads to work on this initiative with Policy Branch.</p>		
May 27 <sup>th</sup>	Strategy for Fisheries Monitoring and Catch Reporting (follow up Dec 17, 2009 RMC)	<p>It was agreed the Strategic Framework for Fisheries Monitoring and Catch Reporting has improved from the previous version but not completely ready yet. The language is awkward and not clear in some instances. There is no national direction on this and we need to consider having this reviewed by NHQ staff.</p> <p>In the framework we talk about quota fisheries and defined shares and there's mixed views on quota fisheries. Edits are required here.</p> <p>This document also raises fundamental questions on who pays. Therefore, we need to present this nationally and shop it around.</p> <p>It was noted cost/user fees issues are being addressed through various venues and the Region has engaged Kevin Stringer's group on this (Program Policy – NHQ).</p> <p>It was agreed that we're interested in moving forward on this initiative and that we need to manage the system with</p>	RD FAM	

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
	<p>Fisheries Data Mgmt Project: Pacfish and Accountabilities</p>	<p>NHQ; word smithing to be done by party who hasn't previously worked on this framework; we need to figure out the user fee costs; figure out communications element with Terry Davis; and discuss this framework with Bevan, Stringer and Bloom.</p> <p>Pacfish – discussion regarding the which sector is accountable le concluded that FAM should have overall responsibility / ownership and we have to be fair with respect to supporting this and may need to tax others.</p> <p>We have to identify a clear unequivocal accountability structure. We need to reflect what can be done to make this work for the lead branch and we need to select a responsible custodian. It was agreed FAM would be the lead. The importance of completing as much of the development of PACFISH as possible within the PICFI program was noted.</p> <p>A consideration in determining support may be to determine who requires and uses the service. It was agreed this question would be explored at the Monitoring Steering Committee level and they would return to RMC with a proposal. That being said, it was suggested to change the distributed accountability to a single accountability and then cost it out. The implicated Regional and Area Directors need to develop SLAs under the new coordinated accountable structure that FAM is responsible for. Associated costs and implications for individuals Directors, along with roles and responsibilities and cost implications will be factored into the SLAs.</p> <p>We also need to continue discussions about who's doing</p>		

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
		<p>what now and what will the new system look like.</p> <p>A detailed accountabilities framework, with service level agreements documenting roles, responsibilities and funding requirements/realignments should come (via the Monitoring Steering Committee) to RMC for discussion and approval.</p>		
June 17 <sup>th</sup>	Pacific Region Licensing Rules Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Situate discussion paper in broader context of FM changes and high level principles.</li> <li>- Develop broader road map linking to other initiatives</li> <li>- Prepare memo to Minister attaching revised discussion and consultation plan (adding NGOs and FNs) and situating in broader context.</li> <li>- Use the "wise" people to review the documents.</li> </ul>	RD FAM	The info note should be in the system late summer/early fall to facilitate consultations in fall/winter.
July 8 <sup>th</sup>	Strategic Approach to Consultations	<p>It was noted today's presentation was useful along with the work being done. Would like to look at the role of the Consultation Secretariat versus the consultation work conducted by the programs. Corey Jackson is doing a review of the different levels of processes we're engaged in. We need to maintain connections between that work and work of the Consultation Secretariat.</p> <p>The Consultation Secretariat provides a support and coordination role. Continuation of the consultation calendar outlining all consultations taking place in the region is key. The Consultation Secretariat cannot do all of the work; it provides guidance and resources, (advice, support and coordination). National DFO consultation guidelines are being developed. We need to update principles around consultations (consistent with national) and have a fulsome discussion at SDC on roles and responsibilities, and include</p>		

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
		<p>PICFI co-management perspective with Angela Bate and Corey Jackson.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adjust the content of the call out pkg and include a cover letter clarifying the Consultation Secretariat's role which is coordination, advice and support.</li> <li>- Adjust the form to include consultation training needs and add overarching issues/context section</li> <li>- We need a list of principal consultations and annual scheduling for the Consultation Secretariat, and a mechanism to regularly update the regional consultation calendar.</li> <li>- Place emphasis on Values and Ethics training over the next year.</li> <li>- A further conversation needs to take place on how this links to Programs, Projects, Co Mgmt and Consultations (future SDC meeting).</li> <li>- We need a set of principles around consultations. This is a policy piece of work and should be presented as a separate item. It was noted a national policy is being developed on consultations by NHQ and we'll link our principles to this initiative.</li> <li>- The Business Planning piece does not have to return to SDC; however, the broader piece needs to come back to SDC, to link and sort out roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>- Return to RMC with an information note on the Business Planning piece for Consultations and the requirement for Directors to ensure that information is provided to the Consultation Secretariat to keep the consultation calendar up to date.</li> </ul>	<p>J. Nener Sept 14<sup>th</sup> RMC</p>	

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
July 29 <sup>th</sup>	CANCELLED			
August 19 <sup>th</sup>	CANCELLED			
Sept. 19 <sup>th</sup>	PSC Technical Committee Membership Process & Guidelines (follow up from Oct 14, 2008 RMC)	<p>It was agreed the following changes should be incorporated into the guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The terminology "Scientist" needs to be defined in the departmental guidelines because not everyone on the Technical Committee is a Scientist.</li> <li>• Individuals participating as technical committee members are representing Canada, at these meetings, and not their specific sectors. This needs to be clarified in the guidelines.</li> <li>• Add a clause regarding change of membership due to performance issues.</li> <li>• The statement "To participate as a Technical Committee members, DFO staff must have approval from their Area or Regional Director." Authority was officially delegated to the RDG; therefore, RDG approval should be incorporated in this area.</li> <li>• It was agreed Technical Committee members and Panel members should be offered a PSC 101 training session so that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.</li> <li>• The issue of varying number of representatives between Canada and the U.S. needs to be discussed. It was noted the DM has approved the Canadian delegation for 2010 and Policy will be working with International Affairs for future years Canadian participation.</li> <li>• Observer status is mentioned in the Technical Committee guideline document, however the rules</li> </ul>	P. Macgillivray Sept 28 <sup>th</sup> RMC for decision	

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
		<p>for observer participation are not defined. Details included in the PSC by-laws about rules for observers at technical committee meetings should be reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify that sources of funding that doesn't come from PSC funding envelop as it relates to the statement in the guidelines about Technical Committee Members being responsible for their travel and related costs through their sponsoring organizations. Also clarify that funds from AAROM and AFS etc. may be used and does not fall under this heading.</li> </ul>		

Last updated: 2010-09-10