

**Strategic Directions Committee (SDC)
2011 Action Log**

Date assigned	Item	Action Required	Responsibility Deadline	Status
April 14 th	WSP Strategy 4	<p>Issue: The purpose of today's presentation is to provide an overview of WSP Strategy 4, context and strategic considerations. An update was provided on the progress, work to-date and lessons learned. In addition key gaps, challenges and opportunities were identified. FAM is seeking SDC guidance on an approach, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies to address gaps, challenges and opportunities; and • Overall strategy for advancing Strategy 4 over the short, medium and long-term <p>Next Steps: It was agreed there has been lots of work completed on the pilots and foundational work under WSP but how do we move forward? There was agreement to move forward with the general approach outlined in the presentation, with the following guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's important to go back to WSP (Strategy 4) and review what we've done and what we've committed to do - WSP provides fairly clear guidance around Strategy 4; • Need to clearly identify roles and responsibilities as a Department and a Region, as well as how we (DFO) plan to move forward in this; • Lots of work is underway within the pilots but needs to be more coordinated and strategic. Also need to give 		

		<p>thought to expanding work beyond the pilots over the medium and long-term (Action Step 4.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Cohen Inquiry report and recommendations will be released next year and we need to build this into the equation - recognition that work done now will help the Department in preparing to respond to Cohen findings and recommendations;• We need to consider opportunities to build Action Step 4.1 into our current work and move it along without stakeholder fatigue;• What approach are we taking to identify priority CU's? General agreement that we need to identify priority CUs consistent with Action Step 4.1. Also a question of what level of consultation will be required?• Need to be more strategic moving forward. Identify where other partners can take on roles where appropriate.• Regarding internal coordination and integration of WSP and Strategy 4, it was agreed the Operations Committee will provide the guidance required from senior management as opposed to setting up a new system or committee.• We're not giving ourselves sufficient credit on work done to date. We need to reprofile the work done to date and see how it fits into the planning unit context. What's already done, what can we build on and where do we want to go.• At a later date, we need a discussion at SDC on the identification of priority CU's (and planning/management units) building on work underway by FAM and Science to develop draft list of priority CUs (e.g. Science "synoptic assessment").• FAM will also lead work with the Areas and other sectors to develop a template / tools to support integrated		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>planning under Strategy 4 (e.g. common agreement on the DFO deliverable(s) for the pilots and future WSP planning processes).</p>		
April 14 th	SEP Revitalization	<p>It was agreed that the right priorities for fish production have been set. With respect to the question around production of steelhead and cutthroat for the Province of B.C at SEP facilities, it should be considered that it' is not just about the operational cost of the steelhead being produced. We also need to take into consideration trade offs (water licence, tenures, recapitalization, harvest impacts) and aspects such as the secondary benefits B.C. receives via tourism with steelhead. In order to determine whether DFO would save by the reduction or elimination of steelhead production, it is important to do full costing for steelhead production. The scope of the analysis must also be considered as well as the new emerging policy and WSP context. Further analysis and a communications strategy is required.</p> <p>The analysis of Community Economic Development Program sites as presented is primarily a biological assessment. We need to provide a more comprehensive analysis including an economic analysis and a risk analysis to inform the decisions on which facilities continue to operate. It is challenging to make these decisions and we need to determine what permissions we already have to proceed and what new policies need to be taken into consideration. We need to review the new fisheries and habitat policies to see if they can assist SEP. Communications is again important.</p> <p>It was noted that we are reviewing SEP from the lenses of "where we are at it with today" but it is important to look at the future. We need to be clear on whether SEP needs to be proactive about species that may be listed under SARA.</p>		

		<p>The SARA piece is very distinct. How are we managing stocks of concern in general? How does SEP work get impacted by the conservation mandate? This is not clear and needs to be addressed going forward.</p> <p>One of the challenges around discussions with SEP is that DFO is constrained on funding and the public outcry on changes. There has to be a new vision for the program marketed around changing conditions and links to WSP and SARA. Our messaging should be along the following lines - focus SEP on the new Strategic Outcomes and align it with departmental priorities and what's needed for implementation of WSP.</p> <p>It was agreed that more analytical work reviewing the implications of decisions in the context of the new policies, PAA structure and budget needs to be undertaken but that there needs to be a new story line as suggested above. Communications to assist with developing a new story line. Internal staff communications were also highlighted as important.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Last updated: 5/9/2011 10:20 AM