

From: Wright, Steven
Sent: Friday, May 9, 2003 3:19 PM
To: Macgillivray, Paul <MacGillivrayP@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Subject: FW: Draft WSP RM Guidelines Deck

Once again.

-----Original Message-----

From: Wright, Steven
Sent: Thursday, May 01, 2003 1:47 PM
To: Macgillivray, Paul
Subject: FW: Draft WSP RM Guidelines Deck

Paul - Further to my email yesterday, now that I have read the presentation I have two major concerns.

First, in the transmittal email, Marc states that "there is not consensus among Fisheries Managers on the working group". To date I have accepted the differing positions between Sandy and myself by the fact that Sandy was acting in his capacity of team lead, which required him to try and forge some agreement between the various sectors within his group. As such he was acting in a non-Fisheries Management capacity and therefore not representing the views of our sector. Unfortunately, it is now clear that this is not how his role is perceived and the impression is left that FM is not of one view on the current draft guidelines. Given our views on the current draft guidelines I think we need to make it perfectly clear that Pacific Region Fisheries Management does not support the guidelines as currently drafted. While Sandy may have his own views, he must persuade you and I of the merits of his position before it becomes the position of Fisheries Management. Until such time our position remains one of non-support for the current draft.

To make our position clear and to prevent anyone from exploiting this perceived difference of view within FM I recommend that when you talk to Pat Chamut and perhaps John Davis you clarify the position of FM in Pacific Region. Further, I now believe it is time to have someone else take on the lead role for the Resource Management team. I know this will be controversial but I don't believe we have a choice. I can't see Sandy remaining as the FM representative on the team and I don't feel that I have time (or perhaps inclination) to act in that capacity. Perhaps it is time to fundamentally restructure all of the working groups, although I don't have any suggestions right now about how.

Second, in regards to the deck, I believe it is premature to brief the Minister on what is a draft working set of guidelines that are not supported by FM in the region and have not been vetted by any senior (or other) body in the Region. The Minister should be briefed on the issues that are being addressed, possible implications and linkages with other initiatives (such as SARA) but that should be it for now. Furthermore, the DECK is a combination of current draft guidelines and Max's view of how things should work (i.e. reference to IFMPs which are not discussed in the guidelines).

Finally, as you could see Max and Marc seem to be working thru Rebecca, there seems to be a problem developing.

Steven

-----Original Message-----

From: Clemens, Marc
Sent: May 1, 2003 1:21 PM
To: Wright, Steven
Subject: RE: Draft WSP RM Guidelines Deck

This morning Max and I had a call with Rebecca and Mark. We've agreed to first do a shorter, overview deck along the line of Pat's suggestion that could be used as a first step in briefing the Minister and then work on a more technical

product, again as per Pat's request, as more information becomes available. I've sent a copy of the deck to Sandy and Jim for their information and when we were gathering information for it we sent a copy to the North Coast office. Parts of the deck may be used in the two new products but it's not going forward as is so I don't know if we need to ask the working group members to spent any time on it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Wright, Steven
Sent: April 30, 2003 5:36 PM
To: Clemens, Marc
Subject: RE: Draft WSP RM Guidelines Deck

Marc - Thanks for this. Is it appropriate to vet this through the working group?

Steven

-----Original Message-----

From: Clemens, Marc
Sent: April 30, 2003 1:49 PM
To: Wright, Steven; Reid, Rebecca; Saunders, Mark
Cc: Stanfield, Max
Subject: Draft WSP RM Guidelines Deck

Here's a copy of the draft deck we prepared for Pat on his request for a piece he could use to brief the Minister on the state of play of the WSP Resource Management Guidelines. We wanted Pat's feedback to see if we were in general agreement before sending it to members of the working group. His original request was to do a briefing the week of April 21. As you can see he wants changes. A new date has not been set.

Pat's comments on the deck

General Comments:

- Not clear who intended audience is?
- Not suitable to give Minister an introduction to Wild Salmon Management

Draft WSP:

- Principle 1 : Change "Conserve wild salmon" to "Manage wild salmon"
- Principle 2: What does it mean?
- Principle 3: Rewrite it in plain English, i.e., Develop operational guidelines for harvest, habitat, fish cultivation activities utilizing a risk management framework incorporating biological objectives, socioeconomic considerations and societal values.

Key Concepts:

- The meaning of DUs and CAUs are still unclear and I don't think I could explain them
- Why use the term Designatable Unit? Why not designated?
- I thought that DUs got aggregated into CAUs, i.e. built from smaller units into larger? Why would we disaggregate DUs? I thought DU was the smallest unit, a distinct population?
- "The WSP seeks to conserve genetic diversity at the same level as COSEWIC" - This is a policy choice. Do we want to commit to this? What are the consequences of doing so? We need to lay out the choices, assess the implications, to allow the Minister to make an informed choice. There are policy choices that need to be assessed and we cannot automatically state without understanding and debate that we will or will not adopt certain perspectives. Our job is to lay out the choices, assess implications to allow the Minister to make an informed choice.
- Why will the number of DUs for non-sockeye species stay basically the same as the number of

current assessment units for these species?

Overall Proposed Approach in Deck:

- We do not have a WSP and will not have one until consultation is done and a policy is approved by the Minister

Next Steps:

- Need two products, 1) DECK that provides an overview of current salmon management, highlights the problems that are being encountered, provides a general overview of the new approach, highlights the general consequences for conservation, for harvesting ; 2) DECK that provides a more focused technical presentation on WSP that allows senior staff to understand how this new approach will work in practice.
- David and John Davis and I need to be able to explain in understandable terms what the new policy may look like and how it will work, what it will cost, what effects it will have, so that we can talk intelligently to Ministers and stakeholders.
- We have a long way to go and need to make progress on this. This deck is not ready for prime time. This should be a major focus for the next 8 months.

Covering e-mail accompanying the deck

- The attached deck has been prepared based on participation at regional WSP working group and steering committee meetings, Science papers and discussions with regional Fisheries Management and Science staff.
- The deck sketches out a possible approach for presenting the Resource Management Guidelines and departmental approval processes. Underlying the approach is the notion that: 1) the Resource Management guidelines - conservation/assessment units, reference points, etc. - would be science based; and 2) the broader assessment of impact of application of the WSP guidelines and the approval process would be led by Fisheries Management as part of the IFMP process.
- At the current stage of work on the guidelines, it is not possible to develop a clear or complete idea of how the WSP would be implemented. We have attempted to describe the WSP guidelines as they are being developed by the Science and Fisheries Managers on the working group (although there is not consensus among Fisheries Managers on the working group), and how they could be worked into an IFMP process.
- Considerable uncertainty will remain until the model for Fraser sockeye is completed. In terms of workability and cost, Fraser sockeye is key.
- Work on the Skeena has some explanatory usefulness. A model and some preliminary work on WSP-type weak stock management has been done, and will be incorporated in this year's IFMP for ministerial decision. There are two stocks-at-risk identified on the Skeena, and requiring, if the objective is either maintenance or rebuilding, substantial cuts in tidal fisheries. The deck discusses the Skeena situation and provides a few hypothetical options that help illustrate the impact of taking or not taking conservation measures respecting these two stocks.
- Regional staff has not seen the deck. We would propose working with the region to further develop it once you have provided feedback.

<< File: wspRM2003_1.ppt >>