

**Proceedings of DFO Workshop
on Wild Salmon Policy
Strategy 4:
Integrated Strategic Planning**

March 2009, Nanaimo BC

**Prepared for
Paul Ryall, DFO
by
Julie Gardner, Ph.D.
Dovetail Consulting and
Dawn Steele**

May, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary: Proceedings of DFO Workshop on Wild Salmon Policy Strategy 4:

Integrated Strategic Planning	ii
WSP Strategy 4 in context	ii
Governance: integrated planning, pilot projects, collaborative initiatives	ii
Scales or units suitable for WSP Implementation	v
Other aspects of WSP implementation	vii
Priority ranking of planning units/initiatives	ix
Next steps	xi
1 Introduction	1
2 Welcome, overview	1
3 WSP Strategy 4 in context.....	2
3.1 Review of Strategy 4 by Paul Ryall	2
3.2 Presentation on scope of integrated planning and questions regarding DFO's role by Wilf Luedke.....	3
4 Governance: integrated planning, pilot projects, collaborative initiatives.....	3
4.1 Overview of policies and principles by Wilf Luedke	3
4.2 Examples of collaborative initiatives	4
4.2.1 Puget Sound Partnership.....	4
4.2.2 Collaborative Watershed Governance Initiative	4
4.2.3 Cowichan	4
4.2.4 WCVI Aquatic Management Board	5
4.2.5 FRSSI	5
4.2.6 Skeena Watershed Initiative	6
4.2.7 Discussion of experience and lessons learned	8
5 Scales or units suitable for WSP Implementation	9
5.1 Presentation on operationalizing integrated strategic planning under the WSP by Sandy Fraser	9
5.2 Discussion of scale	11
6 Discussion of other aspects of WSP implementation.....	13
7 Priority ranking of planning units/initiatives	16
7.1 Matrix for prioritizing CUs	16
7.2 Discussion of ways of setting priorities	16
8 Next steps	19

SUMMARY: PROCEEDINGS OF DFO WORKSHOP ON WILD SALMON POLICY STRATEGY 4: INTEGRATED STRATEGIC PLANNING

An internal DFO workshop was held in March 2009 to review Strategy 4 of the Wild Salmon Policy (WSP), discuss how to aggregate conservation units (CUs) for planning and management, propose priority units for Strategy 4 implementation, and discuss how DFO should engage with others in implementing Strategy 4. This is a summary of the workshop proceedings, with links to relevant sections of the report that cover more details of the presentations and discussions.

WSP Strategy 4 in context

Paul Ryall began by reviewing progress in the implementation of Strategy 4, with an emphasis on the requirement for integrated strategic planning. He spoke of steps forward on various planning fronts, including IFMPs, and highlighted the importance of integrated planning that eventually encompasses harvest, marine and watershed planning.

The WSP states that the purpose of integrated strategic planning is to develop long-term strategic plans for CUs, groups of CUs and their habitat that are subject to common risk factors. A key question is at what scale the integrated strategic plans should be adopted. Implementation poses other interesting challenges as well, including the need to determine governance implications and set priorities. Efforts underway at different scales offer potential models and lessons.

Wilf Luedke then made a short presentation on the scope of integrated planning and questions regarding DFO's role. DFO only has jurisdiction in a subset of activities in the large number of integrated planning processes that potentially affect salmon, so the department needs to be clear as to which roles are relevant to its mandate. Given the spectrum of integrated planning-type processes underway on the coast, where does the WSP's integrated strategic plan fit in? A participant pointed out that DFO will not play the same role in the various planning processes, and we need to think through what a useful role is, what we can influence and what work products we need in order to participate effectively in a broad array of potential processes.

Longer summaries of these presentations are in section 3 of the report.

Governance: integrated planning, pilot projects, collaborative initiatives

Wilf Luedke provided a brief overview of policies and principles that help guide decisions as to how DFO should engage with other interests in planning management processes to implement the WSP. For example, the Oceans Action Plan outlined seven principles: ecosystem-based management, sustainable development, precautionary approach, conservation, shared responsibility, flexibility and inclusiveness. Luedke noted trends in processes such as the Integrated Salmon Dialogue Forum towards more local/decentralized governance, more integrated (vs. expert) knowledge, a stronger

ecosystem orientation (vs. MSY), and more consensus-based approaches with multiple objectives. Governance will be influenced by other DFO initiatives, such as First Nations' bilateral and other obligations, as well as non-DFO collaborative watershed governance initiatives and existing local processes.

See section 4.1 of the report for more detail on this presentation.

Examples of collaborative initiatives

Workshop participants shared experience from many collaborative initiatives, regional to local. Examples that were reviewed in presentations and discussion included:

- Puget Sound Partnership
- Collaborative Watershed Governance Initiative
- Cowichan
- WCVI Aquatic Management Board
- FRSSI
- Skeena Watershed Initiative

Many lessons can be drawn from the experience of the above initiatives and others. These are summarized below. Note that these “lessons” were not discussed in depth, nor was consensus sought. In this light, they should be treated as building blocks for further work on frameworks and approaches to WSP implementation.

See section 4.2 of the report for more detail on the examples and related discussions.

➤ *First Nations and local participation*

Some possible lessons to draw from experience regarding First Nations and local participation include:

- Local buy-in and First Nations involvement are required for an effective planning process. Strong local support can make agreement on goals and implementation of results easier.
- Insufficient capacity in First Nations can pose a challenge.
- Within planning processes, DFO should be able to respond to issues in its jurisdiction that are relevant to First Nations and others, such as harvest levels and actions to address low stocks.
- Transparent information and a science base are important. Technical support from a body such as a science panel or a technical committee that is separate but connected can help garner support from First Nations and other participants in a planning process. Efforts are required to help participants understand technical issues, to ensure local participation is well informed.
- In processes with a technical orientation, incorporation of traditional knowledge has not yet seemed pressing. Nevertheless, the challenge of meshing traditional knowledge with science needs attention. Similarly, economic aspects, social indicators and related priorities need to be addressed, and participants from DFO with technical backgrounds may not be well suited to discussing these themes. Conservation has been easier to address than social and economic values.
- In some parts of the province First Nations will be better organized around fisheries interests and/or more interested in being involved than in other places.

➤ *Drivers*

Experience about what drives integrated strategic planning shows that:

- Factors driving the emergence of processes to date include:
 - the beginning of pilot sales, combined with strong local leadership from DFO;
 - linkage of the community to natural resources (e.g. a river);
 - economic development conflicts with environmental priorities;
 - an established relationship between DFO staff and First Nations or other interests;
 - investment of resources by various partners.
- Caution should be used in engaging in processes that are emerging reactively to drivers, but at the same time, a model should not be applied in such a prescriptive way that it leads to missed opportunities.

➤ *Goals*

Lessons from experience related to goals based on the examples shared include:

- In an integrated process the participants/partners will have differing goals and DFO might have to compromise along with others.
- Clarity around what is at stake, such as the question of shares in the fishery, is needed to help people move forward.
- Less attention to the details of management and greater focus on objectives can add to the success of a process.

➤ *Roles*

Lessons about roles in integrated planning from some examples are:

- The role of DFO will vary from one process to another, and the department will not always be the driver.
- More clarity about First Nations rights is needed.
- DFO should be willing to share some of its responsibilities with others who are willing to take them on (e.g. technical contributions).

➤ *Relation to IHPC, SFAB, etc.*

Experience relevant to involvement of stakeholder groups and links to integrated harvest planning includes:

- Having organized interests involved in integrated planning is an asset; e.g. as they hear one another's interests expressed it can dispel misperceptions. Integrated planning is a way to get interests into the room and encouraged to funnel into the IHPC as an alternative to seeking a direct line to the minister.
- Receiving advice from different advisory processes on a parallel track to integrated planning could be problematic for DFO and overlap is possible. Yet the relationships between processes can be complementary; e.g. integrated planning results can inform harvest planning committees. Tradeoffs may be worked out more easily at the local level than the IHPC level.

➤ *Coordination, communication, efficiency*

The examples lead to the following observations about coordination, communication and efficiency:

- Within areas, groups working in parallel, even when within a broader, defined process, are not always sufficiently coordinated. Inefficiencies and possibly confusion arise when local

processes are not tied to broader or neighboring processes.

- DFO cannot afford to be involved in many processes at a small scale, yet this can be the relevant scale politically.
- Some CUs are being affected by the same fisheries while being discussed at different tables.
- Process integration, facilitation, analysis and technical support can alleviate inefficiencies caused by fragmentation.
- To increase efficiency, a common model and perhaps a single technical group or support person could be applied to several processes across the region, recognizing that application will differ from one place to the next.
- As in Puget Sound, nested, local planning areas could roll up into a broader partnership, which in turn strives to influence local planning processes.

➤ *Process considerations*

Examples shared at the workshop demonstrate that processes work better if they have the right people at the table, and adequate technical, personnel and monetary resources.

- Right people at the table:
 - For structured decision making to be effective, credible people who are appropriate to making the required tradeoffs must be present.
 - An added benefit is that committed participants can help to raise funds and provide in-kind support to a process.
 - Too many people on the planning committee can mean a more time-consuming process.
 - Having all four levels of government involved can be an asset.
- Technical resources:
 - A strong science foundation is invaluable.
 - A technical committee separate from the management committee, as a destination for questions, is helpful.
- Personnel and monetary resources:
 - Good funding and a committed convener add to the effectiveness of a process.
 - Independent funding (rather than being controlled or funded by DFO) can be an asset. A society that can receive and hold money can facilitate access to a broader array of funding sources.

Scales or units suitable for WSP Implementation

Sandy Fraser gave a presentation on operationalizing integrated strategic planning under the WSP, based on a report he had written under contract. See section 5.1 of this workshop report for detail additional to that provided in the following summary.

In addition to considering CU status and habitat ecosystem status, strategic plans under WSP Strategy 4 must integrate social and economic interests, science and traditional knowledge and interests of other land, forest, water and marine area users. This raises major implementation challenges, so a practical, efficient and incremental approach to implementation is proposed. A key step is to select a manageable scale at which to develop plans and prioritize where to focus resources. Integrated planning for 420 CUs would take several decades, so there is a need to amalgamate into units that reflect geographically-adjacent and ecologically-similar units, while also resonating with First

Nations and the province's direction. Planning at the scale of freshwater adaptive zones (FAZ) seems the best fit. There are 32 FAZ province-wide.

Variations on the FAZ would be required to accord with fishery harvest planning in some areas (e.g. grouping a number of FAZ). Extending FRSSI to other species and other areas may be a way to conduct harvest planning at a broader fisheries production area scale and to help evolve the IFMP process towards long-term harvest rules instead of annual planning.

Pilot project experience should begin to identify pitfalls of integrated planning. An early example of a comprehensive strategic plan and development of FRSSI harvest plans will encourage development of local planning infrastructures.

Discussion of scale

Following Frazer's presentation, workshop discussions about scale ranged across a number of themes, as summarized below. A longer version of the discussion is in section 5.2 of this report.

➤ *Determining the right scale*

Factors that deserve consideration in the determination of appropriate scales include:

- stocks crossing CU borders,
- utility of a given scale for pulling information together and relating it to habitat and fisheries planning,
- the temporal aspect of fishery management planning,
- relation of a fishery management planning unit to individual CUs,
- the possibility of addressing individual CUs and then grouping them,
- starting from the general and moving to the specific,
- matching the activity (e.g. restoration) to an area where it will benefit multiple CUs,
- aggregations based on various factors for various purposes,
- the degree that stock status should drive investment of resources,
- ways of providing broader benefits rather than focusing on a small area,
- whether an overall plan, or pieces of a plan at different scales, is the aim.

➤ *Joint adaptive zones*

JAZ have the following advantages – they:

- line up well with First Nations linguistic areas,
- fit with the Province and their focus on freshwater,
- link to freshwater and marine production,
- become like building blocks (i.e. grouping the FAZ), which can be built up into collections that work for fishery planning.

➤ *Planning for chinook*

The question of whether a regional (coastwide) as opposed to an IFMP plan for chinook was explored, touching on the following themes:

- determination of driver stocks,
- comprehensive recovery planning for Fraser chinook,
- utility of a FRSSI-style process,
- relevance of a multi-species approach,

- nested linkages, rolling up smaller (e.g. technical assessments) into larger ones,
- using a pilot (Barkley) to illustrate coastwide issues (e.g. hatchery fish interactions, marine survival) through the example of a few stocks.

➤ *Integrated planning at the level of the Fraser*

Suggestions regarding integrated planning at the level of the Fraser River watershed as compared to smaller units included:

- Do integrated planning at this scale for a first cut. Then work through local processes to deal with problem species or stocks.
- Bring all stakeholders together to address component FAZ or CUs, then parcel out action plans.
- A local “shotgun” approach might not always be effective since local interests may not have a strong connection with salmon. Yet smaller watershed processes are useful too.

➤ *No single best level for planning*

Workshop participants agreed that there is no single best level for planning.

- Planning needs to be done at different levels since one scale will not meet all needs – planning currently exists at multiple scales and will continue to.
- Develop the plan at a scale that gives the best performance in terms of meeting the objectives. Use certain processes if they work for consultation and other purposes at one level and then jump to the next level for other matters. Technical work will still have to be done at both levels. Tradeoffs, balancing risks and benefits and engaging participants has to be done at the larger scale (IFMP), while production, habitat, can be taken down to a finer scale.
- There is also a temporal aspect to consider in deciding the scale for integrated planning, since stock composition in any area changes over time. The only way to conduct the fishery and conserve CUs is to consider what proportion of any CU is in the fishery production area at that time and what are the goals for it.

➤ *Need for coherence*

While different scales are appropriate, frameworks are needed to provide coherence.

- A co-management framework beyond WSP is needed to provide coherence because the WSP does not exist in a vacuum and guidance for the allocation of limited resources is needed. Address what initiatives to take on at a given scale and how those feed into other levels.
- Identify the points of intersection (e.g. between habitat and harvest planning). Each level must at least acknowledge other levels.
- The question remains, at what level of detail does a plan find its way into the integrated plan?

Other aspects of WSP implementation

A few topics related to WSP implementation other than scale were discussed. The more detailed account of this discussion is in section 6 of the report.

➤ *Harvest planning emphasis*

- Some participants questioned the focus on harvest planning, arguing that harvest depends on production, and that the WSP states harvest planning is an important human activity but not the only driver and in some cases not a driver. The focal point for integrated planning is more at the watershed level. Maintaining habitat and productivity is a “wicked” problem because DFO does not have sole authority for this but it is required for sustainable fisheries.

Continuing the weak stock management approach/focus, could neglect other aspects of WSP implementation. Better integration with all these activities is necessary for sustainable salmon in the long term.

- One response was that harvest planning is a practical focus, since a major challenge is managing fisheries and DFO authority is more complete regarding managing harvest. Another was that integrated planning at the level of freshwater adaptive zones (FAZ) would cover more than harvest management, including production planning. Yet another response was that, ultimately, planning must track back to CUs, it but should be at a scale that facilitates habitat planning and watershed work and tradeoffs relating to harvest and other activities.
- The lines between harvest and production are blurring with the shift from the traditional mixed-stock ocean fisheries approach. The option of moving fish surpluses upriver presents more opportunities, including better local engagement.

➤ *Social and economic benefits*

The following points were made jumping off from mention of the new federal focus on economic prosperity:

- The WSP is a sustainable development policy, and the fundamental shift that is in the WSP is not yet well reflected in the department.
- One benefit of the WSP is conservation; another is maintaining fisheries benefits and the latter provides the social and economic benefits.
- An integrated plan helps society manage human activities so that salmon remain sustainable into the future.

➤ *Outline for integrated plans*

Some discussion focused on the need for clarity on the contents of an integrated plan:

- An outline or table of contents could provide:
 - high level guidance based on the pilots,
 - directions on the desired level of detail.
- Once populated, the document would include:
 - contents that show progress,
 - a planning overview,
 - chapters for each area.

➤ *Benchmarks*

Issues identified around benchmarks included:

- an integrated approach within DFO in developing stock status and benchmarks is needed soon;
- the upper benchmark will require more discussion than the lower regarding tradeoffs;
- identifying lower benchmarks for all CUs might provide useful information but set high expectations of action;
- perhaps sockeye and chinook should be priorities regarding benchmarks.

➤ *Data collection and link with local groups*

Discussion of the interplay of IHPC work, data collection and local groups included the following suggestions:

- Explore ways of modifying the IHPC to link with local planning processes with regard to where to focus energy for data collection.
- Develop generic guidelines that would apply to all local groups, which would link up.
- Identification of priority CUs or FAZs could link to good data collection more explicitly.

Priority ranking of planning units/initiatives

Paul Ryall distributed copies of a planning matrix that was developed to provide a rationale for identifying and ranking priority CUs. Initial feedback on the matrix (prior to the workshop) included concerns about its complexity and some of the criteria. A workshop participant commented that developing the matrix illustrates the challenge of dealing with complexity across the department. Other discussion of the contents of the matrix included the following suggestions:

- aggregate upwards from the left-hand columns, or make the first column the FAZ and the second the CUs – particularly those triggering red;
- clarify where CUs sit relative to lower benchmarks (priority populations);
- re. stock status, start with outlook (more discussion on stock status follows);
- ensure clarity – e.g. some criteria can be interpreted two ways;
- consider the magnitude of impact on FSC if stock degrades;
- avoid double counting through overlapping criteria;
- consider weighting the criteria.

For more detail on the discussion of the above issues connected with the matrix for prioritizing CUs see section 7.1 of the report.

A general discussion of ways of setting priorities and clarifying criteria is detailed in section 7.2 and summarized here. In overview, participants agreed that a framework is needed to guide a proactive approach to setting priorities – for other DFO activities as well as integrated strategic planning for the WSP. However this should not preclude the ability to seize opportunities. Criteria for prioritization that received the most attention were likelihood of success (capacity), stock status and fishery impacts. The fact that DFO will not always be the driver was emphasized, and it was suggested that advisory processes might help in priority setting.

➤ *Need for a framework/rational approach*

The need for a framework to guide priority setting for integrated strategic planning was emphasized in various ways:

- A framework for making tradeoffs is needed.
- A group within DFO with a core of expertise could respond strategically to questions arising in connection with planning processes.
- Create a checklist; establish criteria; weight them; score them.

- A regional framework would guide decisions such as where proposed areas stand within the spectrum for the Province, other hotspots that need to be addressed, how to deal with emerging processes (e.g. whether to engage) and ways of bringing WSP interests to planning tables.
- There could be 25 Fraser watershed processes, so a tool for documenting them is required.

➤ *Link to existing processes*

Discussion suggested that decisions about which processes to engage in cannot solely be driven by a rational framework:

- Taking advantage of existing processes and/or local/regional support in an opportunistic way can be prudent, and a new framework should not eliminate this possibility – “Follow the money”; “Don’t push the rock up the hill.”
- BC’s Living Water Smart provides opportunity. A more water-centric approach makes it easier for DFO to engage effectively than in the past.
- Internal opportunities should also be harnessed.
- Focus on FRSSI, Somass and Skeena as existing planning tables, especially for the learning opportunities they offer.

➤ *Prioritization connected to other DFO activities*

Participants pointed out that prioritization is also needed to assist decisions on prioritizing various other activities such as

- PSARC requests,
- stock assessment,
- generation of forecasts,
- data collection of various types.

Some initiatives are underway such as:

- A group from groundfish management is trying to develop an approach to prioritization.
- A new federal framework for evaluating fisheries sustainability is being implemented, which is not stock or CU-oriented.

➤ *Likelihood of success*

Participants expressed views on how the criteria related to capacity – re-named “success factors” – should be applied, including:

- They should be a second tier, applied after looking at abundance, habitat/ecosystem, fishery issues, etc. Capacity helps to inform but should not be weighted equally. It should not drive where resources are focused.
- A contrasting view was to engage in processes where there is the greatest chance of success.
- In some cases poor performance on a success factor could be addressed proactively.

➤ *Stock status*

Comments on stock status, as a criterion, included:

- Stock status is one of the main categories for prioritization.
- We need to refine how use it to set priorities – e.g. those in Outlook Category 1 (rigorously determined), or those below the lower benchmarks and/or include consideration of exploitation rate.

- Aggregate CUs or FAZs “in the red.”
- There is also some overlap between SARA and stock status.

➤ *Fishery impacts*

Participants observed that:

- Low fishery impacts can mean that integrated planning is given a low priority in areas that could benefit from it.
- Ecosystem objectives and nutrient contributions should be important.
- There is also a “pecking order” issue with pink and chum.

➤ *Other considerations for setting priorities*

In addition to the factors discussed above, participants raised the following considerations for setting priorities:

- implications for people, taking into account priorities will vary;
- area priorities, or profile of a stock within an area is relevant.

➤ *DFO role*

Participants pointed out that:

- DFO will not always be the driver of the process. It will often have the role of informing participants in the planning process rather than leading the process.
- A technical assessment can begin to gather information even if key participants are not ready to begin planning.

➤ *Use advisory processes*

Opinions varied as to how advisory processes can affect prioritization:

- Use the range of expertise at the advisory tables to help decide.
- Go beyond the advisory processes recognizing that there are many others with strong interests, including First Nations.
- Consider the priorities of clients, but recognize that each may “want their backyard as the priority.”

Next steps

A suggestion was that Ryall, Luedke and Fraser revise this workshop report based on feedback from participants and then take it to the Operations Committee for discussion.

Other tasks highlighted by the workshop discussions were:

- Improve the matrix as it will help decide how to spend resources across a number of sectors. A better explanation of what is in the columns is needed and the issue of weighting needs to be resolved.
- Consult and get outside advice.
- Develop a table of contents or outline for strategic plans.
- Consider further how to use Sandy Fraser’s work on WSP implementation and the orientation of planning scale around FAZs.

1 INTRODUCTION

This document presents the proceedings of a workshop convened by Fisheries and Oceans Canada Pacific Region in March 2009 on Wild Salmon Policy Strategy 4: Integrated Strategic Planning. The contents follow the agenda of the workshop and record the discussions of the day.¹ Dawn Steele took notes at the workshop and Julie Gardner facilitated.

The workshop participants, all from DFO, were:

Paul Ryall	David Einarson	Shaun Davies
Kim Hyatt	Ron Kadowaki	Jeff Grout
Wilf Luedke	Sue Grant	Leroy Hop Wo
Sandy Fraser	Jennifer Nener	Carol Cross
Les Jantz	Mark Saunders	Ray Lauzier
Barry Huber	Amy Mar	

2 WELCOME, OVERVIEW

Following introductions, Ryall welcomed participants, outlining the meeting's objectives:

- Review Strategy 4
- Discuss how to aggregate CUs for planning and management
- Propose priority units for Strategy 4 implementation
- Discuss how DFO should engage with others in implementing Strategy 4
- Identify next steps and short-term priorities.

Julie Gardner noted presentations would cover a proposed science-based approach to grouping CUs for integrated management under Strategy 4, governance considerations, and examples from which to learn. A key question is the choice of scale or type of planning unit to focus on. Another is how to rank opportunities to do integrated planning and determining where to start; for example, should DFO involvement target priority units or build on efforts already underway? Without expecting to develop a complete framework for WSP integrated planning, the hope is to establish some priorities and an understanding of how criteria for priority setting should be established (a rational framework) so as to get started with implementation.

¹ Discussion points have been moved out of the sequence in which they were raised in several cases to amalgamate ideas under relevant themes.

3 WSP STRATEGY 4 IN CONTEXT

3.1 *Review of Strategy 4 by Paul Ryall*

While conservation is the first priority, the WSP also introduces other important obligations (e.g. First Nations obligations, sustainable use and open decision-making processes). The requirement for integrated strategic planning under Strategy 4 raises questions about what is driving decision-making. We have IFMPs, but only some parts are truly integrated. The hope is to reach a better common understanding of what integrated planning means and what should be integrated. The natural lifecycle of salmon highlights the meaning and importance of integrated planning that encompasses harvest, marine and watershed planning. If actions only address one part of the cycle, it won't work. There will be conflicting results and poor organization and outcomes.

We currently do a good job with harvest planning and the revamped IFMP template is another good step. Marine coastal planning is also moving forward but there is not a good link between marine coastal and harvest planning. There is little work on watershed planning in FRSSI, for example, so that needs to be strengthened. The Barkley Sound pilot perhaps offers better opportunities than the Fraser because it covers a smaller geographic area, with many of the same issues and work already underway on developing water use planning.

The WSP states that the purpose of integrated strategic planning is to develop long-term strategic plans for CUs, groups of CUs and their habitat that are subject to common risk factors. Sandy Fraser will propose one idea for grouping CUs that has a strong biological basis and that can help move this forward. The WSP states that such plans will account for the biological status and provide recommendations that reflect the interests of people, locally and regionally. The FRSSI project sought to do both these things.

The WSP states that Strategies 1 to 3 will provide information on the status of CUs, habitat and the ecosystem. An example of progress on strategies 1 to 3 is the recent workshop for DFO and external stakeholders on how to develop status benchmarks for CUs. Much work has been done on Strategy 2, including a recent habitat workshop. Another workshop in May will discuss ecosystems. All this information is to be integrated in strategic plans that specify long-term biological targets and benchmarks for CUs and groups of CUs that ensure conservation and sustainable use. These integrated strategic plans (ISPs) must include recommended management actions to protect and restore salmon to achieve those targets, and establish timeframes and priorities for achieving the targets.

A key question is at what scale the ISPs should be adopted. Having 420 CUs addresses biological aspects but not others. ISPs could be created at all or any of several different levels: watershed, CU, freshwater adaptive zone (FAZ) or region. One model may not be the best fit for all. Implementation poses interesting challenges, including the need to determine governance implications and set priorities. Efforts underway at different scales in the Fraser, Barkley Sound and Cowichan offer potential models and lessons.

3.2 Presentation on scope of integrated planning and questions regarding DFO's role by Wilf Luedke

What is the scope of integrated planning and what is DFO's role in it? Integrated planning may involve a large number of roles and activities that potentially affect salmon. Which are relevant? Which roles does DFO assume and which are for others? Integrated planning activities can be grouped under stock management planning, watershed management planning, coastal zone management planning and LOMA management planning – corresponding with different jurisdictional levels. DFO only has jurisdiction in a subset of these activities. Is the WSP's integrated strategic plan a discrete plan that DFO puts forward or does it amount to coordination of all these existing processes? Where should DFO focus its activities and how should DFO engage: as conveners or...?

Other key questions include: What are the planning units? What are the criteria for setting priorities? Where should we be doing planning to start – where do we focus limited resources?

Kadowaki appreciated the perspective offered by Luedke, as it causes us to think of what a useful role is, what we can effectively do and influence and what work products we need in order to participate effectively in that broad list of potential processes. DFO will not play the same role in all of them. DFO is charged with bringing information relevant to fish, and the fish perspective and constituency into the planning processes.

4 GOVERNANCE: INTEGRATED PLANNING, PILOT PROJECTS, COLLABORATIVE INITIATIVES

4.1 Overview of policies and principles by Wilf Luedke

If DFO can't do it all, better understanding is needed of how DFO should engage with other interests in planning management processes to implement the WSP. The Integrated Salmon Dialogue Forum, for example, is looking at how to shift governance to a more collaborative way of doing business. Part of that is a move to more local/decentralized governance, more integrated (vs. expert) knowledge, more ecosystem-based (vs. MSY), and more consensus-based approaches with multiple objectives.

Principles for integrated management planning already exist in DFO. The Oceans Action Plan outlined seven principles, which the RDG suggests may serve as a model to build on. These are: ecosystem-based management, sustainable development, precautionary approach, conservation, shared responsibility, flexibility and inclusiveness.

DFO also outlined the following governance principles to guide engagement in the collaborative watershed governance initiative: respect jurisdictional authority of all governments, clearly identify authorities in developing the governance process, respect First Nations' place at the table and recognize that the Minister's authority can't be fettered.

Governance will be influenced by other DFO initiatives, such as First Nations' bilateral and other obligations including AAROM, PICFI, EPMP and LOMA planning

(PNCIMA). DFO is starting to build watershed councils and there are extensive potential linkages to other initiatives, including non-DFO collaborative watershed governance initiatives and existing local processes.

4.2 Examples of collaborative initiatives

Various workshop participants offered the examples of collaborative initiatives, from regional to local. Local examples tend to focus more specifically on salmon, though they differ in spatial scale, stock complexity and planning activity. Examples include Cowichan, Barkley Sound and the Shuswap Lake Integrated Planning Process. There are many other watershed processes underway, for example in the Fraser. The Nisga'a provide an example encompassing a large watershed and a treaty.

Examples presented by various workshop participants follow. Later discussions of scale and planning units considered the challenges of connecting the various processes.

4.2.1 Puget Sound Partnership

In Puget Sound, one attempt to create an agency to coordinate the various parties failed. Approximately eight years ago a new agency was created with legislative authority for salmon recovery and restoration that was ecosystem-oriented. The Website indicates attention to other species, low-impact development and economic stimulus with minimal impacts on salmon. It shows nested zones and how they roll up into the broader partnership. The Partnership strives to influence local land-use planning, for example by setting targets for the ratio of impervious surfaces in new development (recognizing that local plans are all different). It has a "paper budget," since the activities are undertaken by other bodies.

4.2.2 Collaborative Watershed Governance Initiative

This is an example of WSP-related governance in BC. The Province's Living Rivers program organized a workshop for government and industry leaders (developers, forestry executives, ranchers, etc.), which agreed to begin developing an accord for watershed management. They are now establishing a leadership council, with the Province leading. The discussion document about the initiative does not overtly highlight salmon, although the initiative will be relevant to salmon. Challenges include industry suspicions that government might use the process to further regulate them.

4.2.3 Cowichan

The Province sees the watershed-level initiative for the Cowichan as a potential pilot and has invested in the Cowichan Basin Watershed Advisory Council. This Council has fishery and stewardship committees, plus a secretariat and a joint DFO/First Nations technical working group. Lessons include having the right members of the community involved, as this has allowed the Council to raise significant funding locally, plus in-kind

support. Also important is strong local support for a healthy river. Local First Nations capacity is a challenge.

4.2.4 WCVI Aquatic Management Board

The WCVI Aquatic Management Board has a very well-functioning technical working group and a society that can receive and hold money (funders include the Moore Foundation). Of the four proposed councils, only the Barkley Council exists so far, with four subcommittees that focus on the Henderson watershed, a coastal plan, Alberni salmon harvest and Somass water use. All four governments are at the table and the various tables are developing. Different people would participate in the various working groups and activities, but with much overlap. There is significant First Nations capacity and the spirit of local cooperation is a strength, as is the ability to raise funding. The group is now looking to hire a common facilitator to coordinate all the activities. This is a fish-friendly community so it is easy to sell the need for planning

4.2.5 FRSSI

FRSSI arose as an opportunity to review escapement strategy, recognizing that WSP would call for changes. Different people were invited to participate (not as sector representatives), with the goal of developing a product that would offer options for discussion. They test-drove the structured decision making process for Cultus with 40 people. While the process was useful, there were too many participants and not enough time. The process does provide value for money and forces a focus on what needs to be accomplished. The ability of participants to understand what their share of the fishery will be was an important factor.

There were four goals:

- Managing escapement to ensure conservation while considering social and economic values – Conservation was easier to address than social and economic values.
- Improving consultation by focusing on proactive discussion of targets and operational guidelines – The participation part worked well, as did folding the results into the advisory process.
- Developing management reference points and a long-term management strategy for Fraser sockeye – Reference points were developed; the model has undergone two PSARC reviews and several iterations. The initiative shifted management from a fixed spawning escapement to a harvest rate strategy, which was a big step, but there was a strong science foundation.
- Developing processes for reviewing and modifying harvest and spawner strategies – It was felt that there was adequate data to do stock recruit analyses for 19 of the 39 CUs, and two biological benchmarks were developed for each. The approach also identified “no fishing” and “fishing cutback” points along the abundance continuum (these are not the benchmarks), and a fixed cap on mortality.

Discussion of FRSSI example

➤ *First Nations and local participation*

- When some First Nations challenged the process recently, Mike Staley gave it strong support as transparent and science-based.
- It was a struggle to get consistent First Nations participation throughout the process. The model makes many assumptions about population dynamics and other technical issues that are not widely understood, so it is useful to have a technical workshop to explain these aspects. While FRSSI was integrated at a broader level, there was no informed, local participation.
- As a result of this experience, DFO expects First Nations and other stakeholders to ask about low stocks like Bowron at upcoming meetings. This model will allow DFO to respond that yes, it can take action, and to offer the options along with the consequences in each case for First Nations harvest and for others. Resolving such issues goes beyond harvest management, as there have been significant habitat changes in the watershed.

➤ *Traditional knowledge*

- First Nations aspirations and issues are not easy to resolve. There are technical challenges an obligation to engage in meaningful dialogue and to include traditional knowledge. Has the FRSSI process had any luck trying to mesh traditional knowledge with DFO science?
A: It hasn't come up much.
- The issue is how to do it. But if it hasn't come up, do you let it lie?
- FRSSI was a very technical process, which is why it hasn't been a big issue.

➤ *Social indicators and First Nations interests*

- It was also difficult to find social indicators that everyone including First Nations could agree on and to rank priorities.
- If the process only includes technical people who cannot speak about social and economic indicators for First Nations, it is difficult for them to comment. It may be that these issues are tackled at different levels.
- First Nations wanted FSC as a benchmark. We also talked about economic aspects, but more work is needed.

➤ *Right people at the table*

- The people present were not always the right people to make those tradeoffs, meaning that structured decision making was less effective.

4.2.6 *Skeena Watershed Initiative*

Einarson noted there is a steering committee (multisectoral, representing key players) and an independent Skeena Watershed Congress is being established. Groups involved include the federal and provincial governments, three Skeena First Nation tribal groupings, steelhead lodges, SFAB, MCC and commercial industry (union, gillnetters and processors). They would like to be a comprehensive group tackling everything that affects salmon. The broader issues tend to be easier to address than harvest strategy, which is the crux of the challenge. The group wanted to take on the harvest management function as well as habitat. How to spend the stock assessment budget lends itself to collaborative discussion, but the group has not yet come to grips with how to decide on harvest levels.

The group will look at different management scenarios and impacts on weak stocks. So it is a place where people are prepared to work together and they understand the need for tough decisions to preserve weaker CUs. We have tried to promote the WSP as a framework for resolving these issues, and the group's direction is consistent with the WSP. The importance of the independent science panel that kick-started the process and independent funding (rather than being controlled or funded by DFO) were among key lessons learned. Other lessons include the importance of a technical committee separate from the management committee, as a place to send questions to. There are also plans to form a habitat committee.

Lessons were also learned from the previous Skeena process, where they attempted for three seasons to micromanage the fishery. That process broke down in part because the pre-season plan took priority over objectives. So with the new process, DFO is encouraging less attention to the details of management and greater focus on the objectives.

The group is currently in the formative stage, and it is unlikely that there will be agreement in harvest discussions for 2009 (whether they will ever get to that point remains a question). It is working well at present but the more challenging discussions lie ahead.

Discussion of Skeena example

➤ *First Nations participation*

- First Nations seem to be better organized on the Skeena – what drove that?
A: It relates to the Skeena Fisheries Commission. When the commercial sector left the earlier watershed group, First Nations saw opportunity and were ready to jump in.
- They can also see fish being moved into their territory. The Tshimshian are not in the SFC. They are closely aligned with the commercial fishery. They have some commercial licences and are more aligned with the union in trying to maintain the coastal fishery. They were unsuccessful at initial attempts to do harvests in-river.

➤ *Involvement of IHPC, SFAB, steelhead organization*

- How do you address the steelhead group that exists separately from the SFAB? Does this require changes to the IHPC or NC SFAB?
- This was raised with the SFAB. The group consists of guides as well as lodge owners. They get political attention on their own and it has worked well for them so they don't see an advantage to merging.
- Their participation in the Skeena process seems tenuous, with the sense that if it does not go well for them, they will leave and go back to letter writing. Having them in the tent provides an opportunity for education. They are listening to other interests and this helps dispel misperceptions.

➤ *Relation to harvest planning committee and organized fishing interests*

- In terms of where the process is going, there are now two processes and questions about whether this process informs the harvest planning committee. Is there a way to rationalize this?
- This is informing the harvest planning committee, not replacing it. They can develop ideas and do technical work. There is a lot of overlap but the IFMP is just one part of what they do. It is very complementary.

- That is the danger of having two tracks. Most of the players are the same. We want to ensure we don't take advice from two sources. We have made it clear that they are a local planning process.
- Is that a good vehicle for co-management? A: It is complementary and opportunistic and a way to get groups like the steelhead group into the room. You need to ensure they funnel into the IHPC vs. suggesting they get a direct line to the minister.
- Would the FRSSI model be useful in the Skeena? If they don't want to participate, engage them in something like FRSSI where they can give input that goes back to the formal process.
- They are very similar. The reason Skeena worked is the local buy in. You got local tradeoffs that you couldn't get through something like the IHPC.
- Instead of going up through the IFMP, they are working the sticking points out locally (e.g. they worked out a local sharing formula that worked for them.)

4.2.7 Discussion of experience and lessons learned

➤ Inefficiencies

- One of the issues is everyone is wearing themselves out. Fragmentation causes huge inefficiencies. We need process integration, facilitation, analysis and technical support. People who deal with process have different skills. Each group keeps tasking technical groups – we need one technical group that serves all of them and we also need prioritization and coordination, which is a process role – not via a leader or decision maker, rather a person who ensures decisions are made and who sits at all the tables. A common model would help support a common approach across the entire region.
- So we need affordability and efficiency in application, which may be different in different places.

➤ Right people at the table

- It is important to have credible people around the table.

➤ Goals and roles

- DFO does not have to be the driver all the time; we can steer or let others take on that role. So we need to identify the characteristics and then how to apply them.
- A key question is governance and whether DFO is willing to let go of some of its goals. Otherwise it is very difficult to have an integrated process because other partners may have different goals.
- Clarity around ownership of shares of fish and First Nations rights is also missing. It is difficult for people to move forward and to make decisions unless they clearly understand what shares are at stake (FRSSI experience).
- It is important to start including these things. A person with the Skeena Fisheries Commission stressed the need for DFO to give up some of its technical responsibilities to the AFS and AAROM, so that they can start “technical harmonization” and better appreciate each other's contributions.

➤ Drivers

- What drove the emergence of these processes and how did that influence the shape of the model?
- It was in the early 1990s when pilot sales started, and it was DFO, with strong local leadership, given the economic opportunity. We had to go through what FRSSI went through, though it was on a smaller scale and many years ago. The linkage of the river to

the community was the key driver. It was a heritage river and it was being dewatered in the summer.

- They almost shut the mill to save the river and this was an important local employer. It was also because of Cowichan chinook. First Nations voluntarily reduced their fisheries.
- There was also the relationship between First Nations and DFO staff, based on technical harmonization.
- There is need for caution regarding engaging in processes that are emerging reactively to drivers.
- They have emerged for various reasons. Some are funded by other players and we can't afford to do it all ourselves, so we need to capture opportunities. It may be about a range of approaches and balance, instead of trying to apply one model in a prescriptive way.

➤ *Coordination, communication*

- The Barkley Sound example highlights a challenge for WSP integrated management. The working groups tend to be stand-alone initiatives and there is a desire locally to see better coordination/integration of activities, providing opportunities for efficiencies regarding the technical work. Otherwise there are asynchronous urgent requirements – it is like trying to drive the truck down a highway while changing the wheel. Within the groups there is a lot of irritation with the lack of coordination and communication, and it is very difficult to make progress on the ground.
- The Puget Sound Partnership is using new Web technology to allow the various groups to communicate more easily.
- It is not a very effective use of our resources: Henderson and Somass have very similar issues and the same people sit at both tables, so it is not efficient use of our time and it will lead to problems for us. Some CUs are all or partly in Barkley and some cover a wider area, which raises issues about local decisions that will have effects elsewhere. So I don't think this governance framework leads to a good use of resources or that it is the right scale – it is too small. But how best can a process mesh with the political reality of the players? Some CUs are being affected by the same fisheries while being discussed at different tables.

5 SCALES OR UNITS SUITABLE FOR WSP IMPLEMENTATION

It was noted that this presentation addresses questions about how to move forward at an appropriate scale as well as other aspects of implementing Strategy 4. While integrated planning processes have arisen organically to date, this presentation discusses a rationale for a consistent approach to the scale question.

5.1 Presentation on operationalizing integrated strategic planning under the WSP by Sandy Fraser

This analysis is intended to facilitate discussion on how best to implement Strategy 4 and to address three issues: the appropriate scale for planning efforts, how to manage the resulting workload and expectations, and how to move forward in the short term.

The WSP was established in 2005 as a high-level strategic plan for conserving salmon. Strategy 4 is a central element that calls for information on salmon status to feed into

comprehensive and integrated strategic plans for salmon and habitat management. It is important to DFO's credibility to show some progress on implementing Strategy 4.

Strategic plans need to address conservation of genetic diversity, components of which were identified in development of 420 CUs. In addition to considering CU status and habitat ecosystem status, these plans must integrate social and economic interests, science and traditional knowledge and interests of other land, forest, water and marine area users. This is a very big task. Integration is to be achieved with a new planning structure that encompasses local area planning committees, local stakeholders and region-wide forums to resolve inconsistencies.

This raises major implementation challenges. Such local committees do not exist in most regions. There are data gaps for many small CUs. DFO lacks authority over many of the identified areas and cannot oblige others to participate. As well, there is limited capacity to participate (internally and externally) in the detailed planning called for.

These challenges cannot be met overnight, so a practical, efficient and incremental approach to implementation is proposed. A key step is to select a manageable scale at which to develop plans and prioritize where to focus resources. An effective strategy should also seek to evolve existing efforts underway to more closely conform to the intent of the WSP

Regarding the appropriate scale for planning, integrated planning for 420 units would take several decades, so there is a need to amalgamate units for this activity. Amalgamation should reflect geographically-adjacent and ecologically-similar units. Given the need to engage First Nations and the Province, aggregations should be chosen that resonate with First Nations and the province's direction.

Planning at the scale of freshwater adaptive zones (FAZ) seems the best fit. There are 32 FAZ province-wide, 23 excluding trans-boundary areas. However, that scale of planning does not always accord well with requirements for fishery harvest planning. For example, the Fraser has nine such zones. If there were committees for each FAZ, overarching groups for some areas would still be required (e.g. for the Fraser) and detailed planning for 32 areas still represents a significant challenge that may not be supportable.

The WCVI and QCI FAZs do, however, match existing fishery planning zones and these are proposed as priorities for advancing implementation. An existing planning structure for WCVI closely aligns with the WSP, and a pilot has already been initiated for Barkley.

For other parts of the coast, the Fraser and Skeena require harvest planning at a broader fisheries production area scale. Extending FRSSI to other species and other areas may be a way to do this and to help evolve the IFMP process towards long-term harvest rules instead of annual planning.

An early example of a comprehensive strategic plan and development of FRSSI harvest plans will encourage development of local planning infrastructure in all areas. The appropriate level for planning in each case could be left to local areas to decide, but in some areas broader committees may better reflect local needs.

A comprehensive, integrated planning pilot will begin to identify pitfalls and problems and demonstrate DFO's commitment to the WSP through an early example of comprehensive integrated planning in at least one area. This could be supplemented by

some progress in many other areas through extension of FRSSI-type planning for other species and areas.

5.2 Discussion of scale

➤ *Determining the right scale*

- On whether the scale of planning matters, some Barkley stocks do cross the planning area boundary. An aim in determining the right scale is to minimize crossing CU borders.
- Clarity is needed regarding the use of FAZ vs. CUs. Is the FAZ the appropriate scale for pulling information together and relating it to habitat and fisheries planning?
- There should be three columns: CUs, then FAZ, then fishery production areas. You need to protect every CU but you do not need an integrated plan for each. Management action is prescribed for a fishery management planning unit. Then you look at how that affects individual CUs. This involves the temporal aspect relating to the proportion of the CU in the area that week. So CUs inform fishery plans.
- You could also do it by CU, then group CUs and look at the range of CU status in the group, but you don't want to be too prescriptive.
- Start with the general and move to more specific.
- If you're planning a restoration activity, you want to do it in an area where it will benefit 10 CUs instead of one.
- Look at them from different perspectives. Look at all the different factors and aggregate them different ways for different purposes.
- Cowichan is not even a CU. Is there a better way or scale for dealing with something like Cowichan? Cultus is another example, with significant resources being spent due to its status. But is that the best way to spend those resources? Is there a way that would provide broader benefits in which Cultus is a subset of the work?
- Do you do an overall plan or pieces of the plan at different scales?
- The model for oceans planning includes different components and timeframes that come together.

➤ *Joint adaptive zones*

- How do joint adaptive zones fit with provincial steelhead management? The joint adaptive zones lined up very well with First Nations linguistic areas, and elicited a very positive response from First Nations.
- Freshwater adaptive zones were used instead of marine zones because it provides a better fit with the Province and their focus on freshwater. We haven't looked at joint/marine adaptive zones (JAZ).
- We should look at joint adaptive zones for integrating different kinds of planning. These link to freshwater and marine production, plus they resonate with First Nations. They become like building blocks (i.e. grouping the FAZ), which can be built up into collections that work for fishery planning. These may also work for the Province in terms of their need to articulate the health of watersheds. It could be a powerful solution to have these building blocks for linking things.

➤ *Planning for chinook*

- We need a chinook plan: a regional plan that is then broken down to individual stocks.
- If we already have an IFMP, why do we need a chinook plan? Maybe we are not doing a good enough IFMP.

- The IFMP indicates driver stocks. How did we get to those driver stocks? If instead you start coastwide, you may not come to the same driver stocks.
 - We are grappling with how to do comprehensive recovery planning for Fraser Chinook. It begs for integrated planning, but how do you get that started? It doesn't make sense to start with a new process for Fraser Chinook. Do you tackle it with a similar process to FRSSI or...?
 - In FRSSI, the recreational goals are not just about sockeye but about opportunity over a broad time, so it should be a multi-species approach with all user groups for the Fraser.
 - Develop a coastwide chinook plan and within that, more detailed plans are nested. Various drivers nest it down to a smaller scale – not just harvest, the other pieces too. Consider how to deal with First Nations bilaterally. Nested linkages are required, rolling up smaller (e.g. technical assessments) into larger. Encompass the watershed.
 - Starting with a Barkley pilot and just a few stocks will deal with all the issues encountered for chinook coastwide: e.g. Robertson Creek hatchery vs. wild fish, other drivers from outside the area, marine survival and the unknown issues regarding habitat. Deal with all these things in Barkley Sound so it provides a template for moving out and dealing with the same issues elsewhere.
- *Integrated planning at the level of the Fraser*
- You can do integrated planning at the level of the Fraser for a first cut. Start at the broad level, identify the crunchy bits and then dive down to which species or stocks are the problem. Then work through local processes to deal with those. The local shotgun approach, it may or may not get you where you want to go. Local interests may not have much to do with salmon.
 - The Fraser is the planning table. Bring all stakeholders together to deal with component FAZ or CUs, then parcel out action plans. It is the same people involved for FRSSI, chinook and other issues, so if you can get them all around the table fewer times, it is a benefit.
 - Smaller watershed processes are useful too.
- *No single best level for planning*
- There is no single best level for planning. It needs to be done at different levels and we need to identify the points of intersection (e.g. between habitat and harvest planning).
 - I agree we have to plan at multiple scales – there is no one-size-fits-all. For example, the Nass or the Skeena could be another local integrated planning point. I agree this is central.
 - I don't think there is disagreement regarding scale; we acknowledge that planning must be done at multiple levels since one scale will not meet all needs. There are plans at the proposed scale but there will also be others above and below that – the kind of planning we have exists at multiple scales and will continue to. You may be able to use these processes if they work for consultation and other purposes at one level and then jump to the next level that includes Clayoquot etc. for other matters. Also, technical work will still have to be done at both levels. Even if CUs are aggregated, assessment will still be required at the CU level. Then develop the plan at a scale that gives the best performance in terms of meeting the objectives. WCVI provides a scale appropriate to dealing with many of the activities that need to be managed. (The core is at the level best for shaping human activity for the future of wild salmon.)
 - Earlier we discussed the importance of tradeoffs, balancing risks and benefits and engaging participants. We can't do all that at a very small scale; we need to do it at the larger scale (IFMP). On production, habitat, etc., we can take it down to a finer scale.

Then at what level of detail does it find its way into the integrated plan? The ecosystem is much larger, so it could encompass a number of these units.

➤ *Need for coherence*

- There is need for planning a co-management framework beyond WSP. You need coherence – the WSP doesn't exist in a vacuum. Address what initiatives you take on at what scale and how those feed into other levels and parts. That allows people see where it is going and lets DFO see if it has the resources needed.
- Each level must at least acknowledge other levels.
- At the Aboriginal SARA workshop a common theme was the need for integrated plans, encompassing the reserve plus adjacent areas. Developers could use such plans to guide their own initiatives.

➤ *Temporal aspect*

- There is also a temporal aspect to consider in deciding the scale for integrated planning, since stock composition in any area changes over time. The only way to conduct the fishery and conserve CUs is to consider what proportion of any CU is in the fishery production area at that time and what are the goals for it. It is complicated but doable and it is the level of detail needed for planning.

6 DISCUSSION OF OTHER ASPECTS OF WSP IMPLEMENTATION

➤ *Harvest planning emphasis*

- Why is harvest planning the lens?
- This was approached from the perspective of being practical. One of the biggest challenges is managing fisheries and DFO authority is more complete regarding managing harvest.
- Harvest is not our major challenge. The appropriate focal point is production planning. Harvest depends on production. The WSP states harvest planning is not the only driver and in some cases not a driver. Sustainable production is the driver. If harvest is the driver for integrated planning, it will be seen as “business as usual.” Harvest planning is an important human activity but not the only one. The focal point for integrated planning is more at the watershed level. Maintaining habitat and productivity is the “wicked” problem because DFO does not have sole authority and that is the problem that must be solved in the long run to have sustainable fisheries. Looking at production does not imply an arbitrary scale for integrated planning.
- Much of the focus is on harvest. I would like to see another meeting focused on habitat and the role of other governments, learning from Living Rivers, etc. If we continue the weak stock management approach/focus, we will miss other aspects that are supposed to be part of WSP implementation. We have to be better integrated with all these other activities if we want sustainable salmon in the long term.
- My vision of integrated planning at the level of freshwater adaptive zones (FAZ) would cover more than harvest management, including production planning.
- Ultimately, it must track back to CUs, but planning should be at a scale that facilitates habitat planning and watershed work and tradeoffs relating to harvest and other activities.
- Some way of moving fish around is needed – a share-based approach/tool to move surpluses into different areas to avoid mixed-stock fisheries.

- Experience in the 1990s showed the challenge of getting people to engage in land-use planning because they didn't see the benefits. But if you are prepared to move fish upriver, it presents more opportunities. The lines between harvest and production are blurring with the shift from the traditional mixed-stock ocean fisheries approach. There is better local engagement.
- *Social and economic benefits*
- How does the new federal focus on economic prosperity change things?
 - The WSP is a sustainable development policy – integrated planning looks at people and the resource. It is about a FRSSI type process. It is about Science and FAM and the fundamental shift that is in the WSP is not yet well-reflected in the department. Everything is on the table with the WSP, based on an iterative process and dialogue.
 - One benefit is conservation; another is maintaining fisheries benefits and for clients, the latter provides the social and economic benefits.
 - Under the WSP, an integrated plan is supposed to help society manage human activities so that salmon remain sustainable into the future.
- *Outline for integrated plans*
- What is the WSP trying to produce/achieve? Are we clear about what the integrated plan looks like? We need to show progress, and that is less likely if we aim for a plan that shows everything at a high level of detail. The WSP is a high-level policy. We need to think of a scale that works and take advantage of processes that exist. We should have an outline or table of contents that indicates the desired level of detail. Then populate the plan to show progress.
 - The suggested need for a “table of contents” is an important point. Some guidance is provided by work that Fraser did last year at a high level. Work being done in Barkley Sound will also help. An upcoming meeting to develop a work plan for Barkley will provide a table of contents, which can be circulated to see if it is on track. This work is currently being done internally, but it will go to other stakeholders later.
 - The table of contents would call for a planning overview, followed by chapters for each area. It is a living document that is populated constantly.
- *Benchmarks*
- With stock assessment there is need for immediate engagement in developing stock status and benchmarks. This requires an integrated approach right now, so there are questions regarding timelines. DFO needs better internal integration as well.
 - The lower benchmark can be based on science; the upper one will require much more discussion regarding tradeoffs. It would be helpful to have a discussion document that shows where all the CUs stand relative to a first cut at the lower benchmark.
 - The lower benchmark will have some tradeoffs, in terms of the buffers required.
 - If you identify benchmarks for 420 CUs, it sets expectations that we will be doing something about them. I would rather do that as part of a larger process.
 - Brian suggested that sockeye and chinook should be priorities regarding benchmarks.
 - FRSSI identified some lower benchmarks. It took much discussion.
- *Data collection and link with local groups*
- It is about stock assessment, but also where to focus energy regarding data collection and how this relates to governance and scale. Some work may be needed on how to modify the IHPC to link with local planning processes.

- The IHPC has done some work on that for Barkley and Cowichan, regarding terms of reference for local groups and how they link up and communicate. The idea is to develop generic guidelines that would apply to all such groups.
- If there was a way to identify priority CUs or FAZs, it could link to good data collection more explicitly.

7 PRIORITY RANKING OF PLANNING UNITS/INITIATIVES

7.1 Matrix for prioritizing CUs

Paul Ryall distributed copies of a planning matrix that was developed to provide a rationale for identifying and ranking priority CUs. It was based on 2007 data for each stock, plus opinions regarding habitat status (rated 1 [good] to 3 [poor]), and impacts on fisheries, along with a formula for adding these values up, taking into account whether planning was already in place (1= yes), and then assigning an overall ranking. Initial feedback on whether this template was informative and whether these were the right criteria included that it was a complicated table, with concern about some of the criteria. It was suggested that a pilot would provide information to inform the development of the framework.

Saunders commented that developing the matrix illustrates the challenge of dealing with complexity across the department and that complexity is continuing to grow. Other discussion leading off from the matrix is included under the headings below.

Discussion of matrix contents

- Some criteria on the list regarding fishery profile (e.g. FSC impacts) can be *interpreted two ways*.
- It is important to clarify what is meant.
- The important question is what is the *magnitude of impact on FSC* if the stock degrades.
- Some items on the list are *double counting* [under profile?]. The key points relate to status of stock, impact of fishery and potential benefit of action.
- Are these *weighted*? Some would be more important than others.

7.2 Discussion of ways of setting priorities

- *Need for a framework/rational approach*
 - A framework for making tradeoffs is needed.
 - For any planning process, there will be certain questions that arise. We need a group within DFO with a core of expertise to respond strategically, instead of building it ad hoc.
 - A checklist is important.
 - Establish criteria, score them, then use weighting. Do some work to find criteria close to something we want – if we can find something existing that addresses human and biophysical aspects [weighting involves people and biology]. Score the criteria.
 - A DFO regional framework is needed to guide decisions [including the following].
 - Be able to explain where proposed areas stand within the spectrum for the Province so that DFO can respond if asked. And there may be other hotspots that need to be addressed as well.
 - How do we deal with emerging processes, such as the Okanagan water board?
 - Have something on hand that we can bring to put our WSP interests to the table.
 - You might have 25 Fraser watershed processes; you need something that documents them.
 - If something comes along that is not on the list, how do you decide whether to engage?

➤ *Prioritization connected to other DFO activities*

- The Salmon Working Group made requests to FAM, which has a long list of requests for PSARC – so how do you prioritize? You need a long-term plan where you start knocking something off every year and that also offers ways of grouping issues where possible. Another question is whether we need to continue spending so much time doing forecasts. What is the best use of time and money? If we can get agreement on what needs to get done, then we develop a decision framework.
- A group from groundfish management is trying to develop an approach to prioritization as well. There is also a new federal sustainability framework for evaluating fisheries. It would be useful to discuss this with these other groups. This same prioritization can also inform other DFO activities serendipitously (where to invest).
- Criteria for prioritizing PSARC work, Fisheries Sustainability Checklist
- Stock assessment, data collection, enforcement and habitat – several activities connect to prioritization.

➤ *National sustainability checklist*

- We are being asked to assess fisheries against a national sustainability checklist.
- If we are doing this anyway, could we use it as part of the prioritization? It depends on how well the national checklist matches up with what you need.
- The checklist is fishery-centric, not stock or CU-centric.
- The challenge for salmon is that any fishery could impact on many CUs.
- It could provide some ideas, but it is the wrong focus.
- It might offer incentive for participants to improve the sustainability score.

➤ *Likelihood of success*

- Planning capacity – internal vs. external resources and whether external stakeholders have the ability to participate could be grouped under success factors (likelihood of success instead of planning capacity). But that is a second lens/tier, not how you choose priorities. Look at abundance, habitat/ecosystem, fishery issues, etc., assign a score for the health of each FAZ and then test that against success factors. If some are high priority, but do not meet the success test, shift resources.
- A prioritized list should drive where we focus our resources. This list is the opposite – we focus on where we already have capacity.
- Initially, habitat profile and capacity were weighted equally. That is not a good idea. Capacity helps to inform but should not be weighted equally.
- Factors affecting likelihood of success include: affordability, efficiency, credible reps, technical support, facilitation, DFO open/willing to acknowledge the goals of others at the table.
- Go where you have the most information and the greatest chance of success. The WCVI has people, interest, data and resources.
- Effort can also be made to target some success factors (e.g. First Nations capacity), and where we might be able to improve them proactively.

➤ *Stock status*

- Stock status is one of the main categories for prioritization. We just need to refine how to arrive at it.
- The list of species and stocks were generated by those that were in Outlook Category 1. You need a column that includes the Strategy 1 status. But people will also be concerned about those in Category 2 and how those ratings are derived. It would be good to have a list of stocks below the lower benchmarks, which would probably include more than 90

stocks. It must be clear that the list of stocks being ranked is the appropriate list, or some emergency will come up unexpectedly and divert most of the budget. (And FAM's ability to ask always outweighs the ability to answer.)

- Stock status is important. There is also some overlap between SARA and stock status.
- Strategy 1 will challenge us to report on that anyway.
- Holtby proposed a list that included exploitation rate. If there was a low ER, there was nothing you could do, so the focus would be on those with high ER. He intended more rigour in how Outlook Category 1 was determined, because those would get more resources.

➤ *Fishery impacts*

- Participants suggested the following places where integrated planning is needed but is not happening: Rivers Inlet Chinook (important to stakeholders up there), Central coast chum (especially in Bella Bella), Broughton pinks, Fraser chinook. The explanation is likely low fishery impacts in these areas.
- Ecosystem objectives and nutrient contributions should be important.
- There is also a 'pecking order' issue with pink and chum.

➤ *Link to existing processes*

- Processes that are familiar to people are useful. It comes down to how much do you want to move the rock up the hill. Given fiscal challenges, take advantage of existing processes and be opportunistic where possible instead of trying to establish one scale for all.
- Part of the reason we went to Cowichan is they wanted to do it anyway.
- BC's Living Water Smart is another opportunity. A more water-centric approach makes it easier for DFO to engage effectively than in the past. To what degree is the WSP being considered in oceans work? We must also harness internal opportunities.
- Focus on FRSSI, Somass and Skeena as existing planning tables. Follow the money. These groups are trying to wrestle with the same questions and to build a plan. They are going to learn by doing, addressing questions of scale, etc.
- There are numerous projects. As long as it is consistent, it can be a chapter or section. As long as we have capacity and it is in accordance with the WSP.
- With regard to heterogeneity, within the regional district, we asked if you could address Barkley and Clayoquot together and First Nations rejected that. The regional district promised money for Clayoquot so they want to go ahead but the WCVI AMB is not ready to go there. So you do have to be opportunistic regarding trying to bring everyone together.

➤ *Other considerations for setting priorities*

- Implications for people are important (there is a weighting issue regarding which are most important, since different things are more important to different people).
- Include area considerations. There is some additional work needed by someone who coordinates the priorities picked per area to help focus area resources.
- Einarson: Area profile is valid (e.g. Kitwanga sockeye, which has huge area profile).

➤ *DFO role*

- DFO is not going to be the driver all the time.
- You can begin the technical assessment to gather information even if the regional district is not ready.
- That is the big question: Do we create the plan or do we just inform the people who do the plan?

➤ *Use advisory processes*

- There are advisory processes we can use. DFO should not decide alone – use the full range of expertise at those tables to help us decide. Set priorities according to where the clients want advisory processes or other input (including First Nations)
- How to do that: everyone wants their backyard as the priority?
- Go beyond the advisory processes – there are many other people with very strong interests, including First Nations.

8 NEXT STEPS

Gardner will draft a report based on the notes. Ryall, Luedke and Fraser will revise it based on feedback and then take it for discussion with the WSP committee.

The matrix/table for setting priorities is important. It will help decide how to spend resources across a number of sectors so it is important to get it right. It needs to be revised to provide a better explanation of what is in the columns. There is also the weighting issue.

It is important to consult and get outside advice and there are various ways to do that.

Another task is to develop a table of contents or outline for strategic plans.

Fraser's work is also important in terms of proceeding with how to use it. But the next step is to draft a workshop report and ensure that it tapped the views of the participants, and then take a package to the Operations Committee.

Every time we look at this, we see that a lot of work has already been done, so there has been progress.