



FIRST NATIONS TECHNICAL WORKSHOP: Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI)

*held September 17-18, 2007 at the
Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel
Richmond, British Columbia*

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

Proceedings Prepared By:



RAINCOAST VENTURES LTD.

8495 143rd Street, Surrey, BC V3W 0Z9
Tel: (604) 507-0470 Fax: (604) 507-
0471

raincoast@telus.net

www.raincoastventures.com

FIRST NATIONS TECHNICAL WORKSHOP: Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative

held September 17-18, 2007 at the
Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel
Richmond, British Columbia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY: FIRST NATIONS TECHNICAL WORKSHOP (PICFI)	1
DAY ONE – SEPTEMBER 17, 2007	2
OPENING OF WORKSHOP	2
<i>Welcoming Remarks and Opening Prayer</i>	2
<i>Introduction to the Forum Agenda</i>	2
OPENING REMARKS	2
<i>Paul Sprout, Regional Director General, Fisheries and Oceans Canada</i>	2
<i>Bud Graham, Assistant Deputy Minister, BC Ministry of Environment</i>	3
PRESENTATION	3
<i>Introduction to Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative and Fisheries and Oceans Engagement Strategy 2007/2008</i>	3
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD	3
GROUP DISCUSSION ONE: “CO-MANAGEMENT”	6
<i>Introduction to Group Discussion Topic</i>	6
<i>Summary of Working Group Discussions</i>	7
GROUP DISCUSSION TWO: “ENHANCED ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES”	7
<i>Introduction to Group Discussion Topic</i>	7
<i>Summary of Working Group Discussions</i>	7
GROUP DISCUSSION THREE: “ACQUIRING COMMERCIAL FISHERIES ACCESS”	7
<i>Introduction to Group Discussion Topic</i>	7
<i>Summary of Working Group Discussions</i>	7
CLOSING REMARKS	8
DAY TWO – SEPTEMBER 18, 2007	10
REVIEW OF AGENDA	10
SUMMARY OF DAY ONE GROUP DISCUSSIONS	10
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD	11
PRESENTATION	13
<i>John G. Paul, Executive Director, Atlantic Policy Congress of First Nation Chiefs</i>	13
GROUP DISCUSSION FOUR: “DISTRIBUTING ACCESS”	16
<i>Introduction to Group Discussion Topic</i>	16
<i>Summary of Working Group Discussions</i>	16
GROUP DISCUSSION FIVE: “CAPACITY BUILDING”	16
<i>Introduction to Group Discussion Topic</i>	16
<i>Summary of Working Group Discussions</i>	16
SUMMARY OF DAY TWO GROUP DISCUSSIONS	17
<i>Group Discussion Four: “Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations”</i>	17
<i>Group Discussion Five: “Capacity Building”</i>	18
POTENTIAL NEXT STEPS	19
CLOSING REMARKS	19
ACRONYM LIST	21
ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO PARTICIPANTS	21
LIST OF APPENDICES	22

Summary: First Nations Technical Workshop (PICFI)

The objective of the September 17-18, 2007 First Nations Technical Workshop on the Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) was to support an initial dialogue that provided workshop participants with an opportunity to: receive information on the current status and expected outcomes of PICFI; provide input on technical design options; identify substantive issues to be discussed further at the fall 2007 regional community dialogue sessions and other processes; and contribute to identifying key next steps including follow-up processes.

The workshop was held at the Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel, in Richmond, British Columbia and was attended by approximately 120 participants including: First Nations representatives, commercial fishermen, and organizations with an interest in the fishing industry. Also in attendance were a number of representatives from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and other government agencies.

Presentations and group discussions facilitated at the workshop were generally structured around five key elements of the PICFI program: Co-Management, Acquiring Access, Delivering/Distributing Access, Capacity Building, and Enhanced Fisheries Accountability. Additionally, an informative presentation and discussion was offered by a representative from the Atlantic Policy Congress of First Nation Chiefs, regarding fisheries in Atlantic Canada. The Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, DFO, welcomed and responded to numerous questions and comments presented by workshop participants, and offered comments regarding additional opportunities to provide input into the PICFI process.

Group discussions relative to “Co-Management” generally focused on the importance of equal and respectful representation, participation, and decision-making opportunities. Many questioned “what was left to co-manage,” and discussed collaborative conservation and restoration efforts.

Group discussions relative to “Acquiring Access,” suggested various alternatives to the existing licensing system, such as communal licences, shared licences and quotas. Participants recognized that it was unlikely that commercial fishing licences from the more lucrative sectors of the industry, would be transferred.

Group discussions relative to “Delivering/Distributing Access” included conversations regarding river and coastal fisheries, First Nations rights, territories, protocols, cultures and stewardship. Unanticipated costs associated with acquiring a licence were also discussed.

Group discussions relative to “Capacity Building” recognized that many First Nations currently lacked the vessels, gear and knowledge required to expand into the commercial fishery. Many participants noted that the industry was quickly becoming less and less viable, due to various industry impacts.

Group discussions relative to “Enhanced Fisheries Accountability” recognized the importance of accountability at all levels. Challenges and inconsistencies in catch monitoring requirements between each sector of the industry were referenced.

Overall, workshop participants recognized the need to collaboratively manage the existing fishery. Benefits of transferring licences within an unviable industry were questioned, and fair and equal accountability measures between all sectors of the industry were supported. The need for additional funding for the west coast fishery was repeatedly stressed. Prior to the workshop’s conclusion, participants were invited to leave behind a list of suggested “Next Steps” which DFO staff agreed to examine and follow-up on, during subsequent PICFI consultations.

Day One – September 17, 2007

OPENING OF WORKSHOP

Welcoming Remarks and Opening Prayer

Victor Guerin and Bob Guerin, Musqueam First Nation, welcomed workshop delegates and recognized the opportunity to work together towards a common goal.

The “Paddle Drum Song” was presented by Victor Guerin.

Introduction to the Forum Agenda

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, provided comments regarding his professional background and facilitation experience. He recognized his role as part of an independent facilitation team, One World Inc., which had been contracted by DFO to collect information and advice, prior to the fall scheduled dialogue sessions. Additional members of the One World Inc. facilitation team were introduced to the workshop: Jacquie Dale, Sue Cass, and Cole Rheaume.

Participants were referred to the information contained in their agenda packages, which were uniquely designed to assist workshop discussions. He recognized the intent of the workshop to collect ideas relative to the PICFI initiative. He added that efforts would be made during the discussions to capture participant’s comments, noting that professional note-takers, from Raincoast Ventures Ltd., would be compiling the workshop proceedings.

OPENING REMARKS

Paul Sprout, Regional Director General, Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Paul Sprout, Regional Director General, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, recognized that the workshop was being held in Musqueam territory. He agreed with the comments of an earlier speaker, that to be successful in the implementation of the PICFI initiative, efforts were needed to “paddle together in the same canoe.” It was noted that advice and views would be sought towards putting together a program, with the objective of an integrated fishery, which would increase First Nations participation in the fisheries. The importance of collaboration and cooperation in the process, was emphasized.

Mr. Sprout added that tracing the starting point of the PICFI initiative goes back to some key reports (including the First Nations Panel Report on Fisheries and the Joint Task Group on Post Treaty Fisheries) which raised some important recommendations and subsequent direction from DFO on Pacific Fisheries Reform.

In considering the initiative, Mr. Sprout noted that it was important to be frank regarding the present situation. He referenced current environmental uncertainties, noting that sockeye salmon returns were only one-quarter of the predicted estimates. Also impacting the industry were shifting market demands and European requests that BC’s products be certified. Public confidence in fisheries management had been described by many as “tenuous.”

He also recognized some important gains. Many fisheries in BC were sustainable, viable and were based on healthy fish populations. There were examples of successful efforts and commitments to work together. On the Cowichan River, native fishermen, non-native fishermen, industry and government worked together to address critical habitat issues. Mr. Sprout discussed recent progress at the treaty tables and advances in the First Nations Fisheries Action Plan.

He recognized the opportunity afforded by the workshop to listen, converse, speak respectfully and consider the future; a future where working together was essential for positive gains. He concluded by thanking participants for attending, and welcomed advice and views regarding the implementation of the initiative.

Bud Graham, Assistant Deputy Minister, BC Ministry of Environment

Bud Graham, Assistant Deputy Minister, BC Ministry of Environment, extended gratitude for the opportunity to speak to the workshop. He added that the workshop demonstrated an improved relationship between provincial and federal government on fisheries issues. Mr. Graham referenced: the aspirations of First Nations people; the Fisheries Action Plan; the need for increased economic opportunities for First Nations; and First Nations' interest in fisheries involvement.

In conclusion, he offered his support for the federal government in their efforts, noting that he looked forward to discussions regarding future directions.

PRESENTATION

Introduction to Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative and Fisheries and Oceans Engagement Strategy 2007/2008

Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled "OVERVIEW - Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI)" (*see the attached "List of Appendices"*)

Slide presentation:

Context: Efforts have been proceeding towards fisheries reform. It was further noted that requests to consider the recreational fishery had been heard.

Background: Discussions were held with those involved in the fisheries, prior to Pacific Fisheries Reform in 2005. A flexible management regime is needed to gain improved value from the fisheries.

Integrated Commercial Fisheries: A viable fishery is important and those participating in the fishery need to abide by the rules of the fishery. Those involved in the industry need to understand their role in the fisheries, as their collective efforts are required.

PICFI – Components: Year One of the PICFI program will conclude in March 2008. DFO supports First Nations working collaboratively, and First Nations' participation in multi-interest processes is essential. The funding available for the First Nations communal commercial access (i.e. approximately \$115 million), represents approximately 2/3 of the total funding (\$175 million). The need to enhance capacity building efforts was discussed, particularly on the business management side. Movements towards certification requirements were also referenced.

DFO's PICFI Design Principles: The long term objective of reconciliation was acknowledged, while working with First Nations and with others to manage the fisheries resource. A finite amount of funding for the five year period was acknowledged.

Potential Outcomes: Outcomes anticipated by the end of the five year period were highlighted. A focus on resource sustainability, fisheries viability and collaboration was emphasized.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, invited participants to introduce themselves to others at their table. He further requested that each table group discuss, consider and write a list of questions and/or issues to be addressed by DFO representatives.

Participants were then invited to ask some of the key questions they identified through this process. DFO representatives Paul Sprout, Regional Director General, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, and Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, provided the subsequently indicated italicized responses below.

(Lists of questions were left on the table, and were later collected. Please refer to the attached “List of Appendices” to locate a detailed compilation of these questions.)

<p>Question and Answer Period: <i>the following abbreviations are used throughout this section: Q=Questions, A=Answers, C=Comments.</i></p>
--

- Q: I have been a fisherman for 40-50 years. How do we understand what is going on or have any faith in a government that refuses to recognize First Nations rights? I define co-management as us sitting at the table with equal rights and an equal voice in decision making.
- A: *I appreciate that First Nations have a different view on Canada’s position with respect to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This workshop provides an opportunity to seek advice on how we can implement the PICFI initiative, which emerged from First Nations and non-First Nations advice on how to proceed in the future.*
- C: It is not just discussions we’re trying to encourage; we want to encourage engagement with other interests in the fisheries. We need to discuss how we can have more effective First Nations’ participation in the integrated Commercial Salmon Advisory Board (CSAB), for example. We’re considering how to promote First Nations participation, and need to seek ideas on how to make improvements.
- C: My community has been at the treaty table for about 12 years. We have fished in the same manner since the beginning of time. Although we have intentions to enter into the commercial fishery, we’re not prepared to invite commercial fishing into our territory.
- Q: What does “accountability” mean? We haven’t witnessed “accountability” from the DFO in terms of dollars and numbers of fish, particularly with the sport fishery. How do we ensure the fishery is viable after PICFI? Given recent reductions to First Nations participation in the commercial industry, principles of operation needed to be clear. How can shares be defined in light of area licensing? For the industry to be viable, some things need to be simplified and functional.
- A: *Improvements may be required in terms of catch monitoring in the recreational fishery. We agree that there should be accountability across all fisheries. “How” and “what” we do, and “over what period of time” needs to be considered. We need common standards that do not discriminate between fisheries. We have not achieved the objective of all fisheries being viable or profitable. There is some significant environmental uncertainty, and we’re unsure of the future. Salmon are now returning at a fraction of what they did in the past. Warmer temperatures and reduced fresh water flows have affected salmon returns, particularly in the south. We can try to control what kind of fishery we want to have, but we cannot control the environment. In spite of these challenges, we need to consider how to adapt and be flexible. It is challenging to define shares that can be transferred from non-native to native fishermen, in a fair and reasonable manner.*
- A: *The challenge to a share-based approach to access, is how to make an economically viable business enterprise. Flexibility in harvesting, marketing, and matching product to the marketplace are key considerations. A share-based approach could define an allowable catch.*

Flexibility could then be defined around that share, and could provide the best opportunity for economic viability to emerge. With the Commercial Salmon Advisory Board we could consider how we see the commercial salmon fishery moving forward. We need to consider providing opportunities for everybody.

- C: Consider the history of Rivers Inlet and what it's provided to BC's economy. There used to be a hatchery in our lake that was operated naturally. It provided economic benefits for all of BC and beyond. Those were direct results of a plan to keep the resource alive, which local members were a part of. Although our rivers had multiple salmon species, we're now down to one or two. This has impacted the economy and wildlife. Although over a million salmon eggs were transplanted in Rivers Inlet in 1902, it has been closed for fishing for many years. Efforts have been made to restore the hatchery, and to help restore salmon stocks to their natural state.
- A: *Hatcheries do have a role to play. The Rivers Inlet Hatchery contributed to salmon numbers. Local knowledge is also important, particularly in the context of this workshop. We want to get your comments about co-management.*
- C: We have tried many different ways of working with promises for partnership over the past thirty years, which we've yet to see developed. First Nations need to define co-management with First Nations. We have a difficult time around conservation, especially if it's at the Minister's discretion. Due to pollution, fish farms and other impacts, the fish numbers have been greatly reduced. It is important to develop a strategy on management in our areas, especially if our rights are not respected. This season, many families didn't get any fish. There should be a disaster fund for commercial fisherman and First Nations harvesters. Our history on the mainland is a disaster – we have grizzly bears moving out, as there are no fish for them to eat. We're in a mess now that we did not create.
- A: *We know from prior conversations and experience that the future has to be about working together. Some have criticized the commercial fishery as being "too expensive." There are diverse opinions in BC about the fishery, but our department recognizes the value of a viable commercial fishery. We need to reconcile differences of opinion that keep us from moving forward. How can non-native and native management opinions converge? By working together towards consensus, we can develop a united view. I take the point regarding pollution's impacts on fish stocks, however from Washington to the Alaska borders, sockeye populations are significantly less than they should be. There is something broader happening to the environment that is impacting fish numbers.*
- Q: Our question revolves around Musqueam fisheries. We have negotiated with government over many years. We are proceeding with a court case, regarding commercial fishermen who cast their nets during a native fishery. Crab, prawn and other fisheries are important to us. There is no point having a Musqueam Fisheries Department if there are no fish to catch. In our community, our creeks no longer have coho; one of our main goals is to rebuild the coho streams. The words "coho" and "sockeye" originated from First Nations traditional words. We have a fish monitoring and enforcement program which has worked for over fifteen years. Fishing is a communal decision. A top down approach won't work for us. Do you have room for a well-managed communal fishery to fit into this initiative?
- A: *Musqueam should be acknowledged for their efforts to rebuild the coho population. Sockeye salmon have returned to the Alouette system for the first time in 50-60 years. There is room for a communal fishery. We are focused on a commercial fishery, and understand that access for food and ceremonial purposes is a priority. Whatever we move forward on, we will be mindful of this. Any further elaborations in this regard would be welcomed and considered.*

-
- Q: I understand that two-thirds of the funding has been set aside for buy-backs. What other types of benefits will there be for First Nations people? Will there be opportunities in processing, marketing, and/or co-management in the commercial sector? What is the department's view of the integration between Aboriginal fishers and non-Aboriginal fishers who remain in the industry?
- A: *Of the \$175 million, it was discussed that two-thirds would go towards the retirement of licences. These numbers haven't been nailed down precisely. Funding would also need to be available for additional DFO staff that may need to be involved. What are the elements that would be part of accountability and co-management? Funding for accountability measures, catch monitoring and co-management would be roughly equal. What about Aboriginal commercial fishers in the existing industry? The idea is that we're trying to promote the same rules for everyone. The Aboriginal fishers would need to operate by the rules of that fishery.*
- C: Regarding the definition of "co-management," I'm from Campbell River; the city has been given authority to manage the river and the estuary. Why will this initiative take five years? If federal government is giving \$175 million, the province should double or triple this amount or more. Consider the forest practices code. This is a voluntary buy-back process. I own my own Category-A licence, and won't voluntarily go into this process. Our people aren't 100% reliant on the fishery for food, however based on the current management of the fishery, we may not have fish for food in the future. Currently, First Nations are outside of the Integrated Harvest Planning Committee (IHPC) . The board should be 50% First Nations and 50% non-First Nations.
- A: *During the five year time period, the money would be used to retire and transfer licences to First Nations. I understand that the \$175 million, is not as much as you'd like, however it is a significant amount of money, which provides an opportunity to make change, and reflects the advice of First Nations and non-natives. Regarding the IHPC, representation will be discussed during the workshop's co-management discussions. It is important to make this process as efficient as possible. In the end, "we're all in the same canoe; native and non-native fishermen need to paddle it together".*
- C: I'm here to find out how to work together. It is difficult to get a meeting with Paul Sprout, so I'm glad he's here. In 1975 there were 500 people in my reserve; in 2007 there are 1,800. We have five seine boats. I see a meeting of coastal and river fishermen. I would have preferred a separate meeting of the coastal people one day, the river people one day, and a merged meeting on the third day. I am a commercial First Nations fisherman who has fished for 52 years; at treaty discussions I talk about the fish. Does anybody recognize my territory? We have a right to fish in our territory. I want to know how we're going to do this, when we're all speaking from different tables.
- A: *You have reminded us about why we're here. We're here because it's the fishery that is a livelihood and a way of life for many people. You've made some suggestions about meetings that we can consider in the future, particularly to meet coastally, in the interior, and then again together.*

GROUP DISCUSSION ONE: "Co-Management"

Introduction to Group Discussion Topic

Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled "Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Co-Management" (*see the attached "List of Appendices"*).

Summary of Working Group Discussions

Participants divided into four separate facilitated discussion groups to consider the topic “Co-Management.” The discussions generally focused on the importance of equal and respectful representation, participation, and decision-making opportunities. During conversations regarding the definition of “co-management,” participants suggested that approaches could vary depending on geography, scale, and existing resources. Many questioned “what was left to co-manage.” The importance of collaborative conservation and restoration efforts were discussed.

(Please refer to the facilitator’s “Summary of Day One” for further information regarding the discussions. See the attached “List of Appendices” to locate a detailed compilation of the comments provided by each of the groups.)

GROUP DISCUSSION TWO: “Enhanced Accountability Measures”

Introduction to Group Discussion Topic

Colin Masson, DFO Coordinator for Fisheries Monitoring, led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled “Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Enhanced Accountability” (*see the attached “List of Appendices”*).

Summary of Working Group Discussions

Participants returned to their separate facilitated discussion groups to consider the topic “Enhanced Accountability Measures.” Group discussions recognized the importance of consistent accountability at all levels. Challenges and inconsistencies in catch monitoring requirements between each sector of the industry were referenced. Participants suggested that some current accountability measures were “costly” and could only be improved through streamlining, rather than expansion.

(Please refer to the facilitator’s “Summary of Day One” for further information regarding the discussions. See the attached “List of Appendices” to locate a detailed compilation of the comments provided by each of the groups.)

GROUP DISCUSSION THREE: “Acquiring Commercial Fisheries Access”

Introduction to Group Discussion Topic

Jennifer Nener, Policy Analyst, Treaty and Aboriginal Policy Directorate, led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled “Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Acquiring Commercial Fisheries Access” (*see the attached “List of Appendices”*).

During a review of the slide titled “Proposed Design Principles,” she added that efforts would be made to use one process to address the acquisition. It was noted that the Aboriginal Fisheries Strategy (AFS) and Allocation Transfer Program (ATP) would likely carry on as programs, but would be harmonized as much as possible to simplify requirements.

Summary of Working Group Discussions

Participants returned to their separate facilitated discussion groups to consider the topic “Acquiring Access.” Group discussions suggested various alternatives to the existing licensing system, such as communal licences, shared licences and quotas. Business plans were suggested by a number of participants, which could be uniquely designed for different regions. Questions were raised regarding the implications and costs related to the transfer of licences. Participants recognized that it was unlikely that commercial fishing licences from the more lucrative sectors of the industry would be transferred.

(Please refer to the facilitator's "Summary of Day One" for further information regarding the discussions. See the attached "List of Appendices" to locate a detailed compilation of the comments provided by each of the groups.)

CLOSING REMARKS

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, acknowledged the complexity of the issues identified by participants during the group discussions. He further noted that the facilitators would be examining the issues raised, in preparation for Day Two of the workshop.

Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, expressed appreciation for the workshop's productive discussions, and offered the following italicized responses to the questions submitted in writing, by workshop participants earlier in the day:

<p><i>Question and Answer Period: the following abbreviations are used throughout this section: Q=Questions, A=Answers, C=Comments.</i></p>
--

- Q: Is PICFI species specific? What about non-treaty groups?
- A: *This is not just about salmon. We are trying to emphasize viable fisheries enterprises. Eligibility goes across all First Nations in BC where DFO manages the fisheries. It encompasses all treaty and non-treaty groups, and will apply broadly to all First Nations.*
- Q: To what extent will the Aboriginal Aquatic Resource and Oceans Management (AAROM) play a role? Will First Nations not interested in becoming an AAROM body be recognized?
- A: *We would like to promote First Nations coming together to work on fisheries matters; to coordinate activities; including acquiring and managing commercial access. However, PICFI will be flexible and responsive to the extent possible to the needs of all First Nations, whether they are in AAROM or not.*
- Q: We don't belong to a group, and we're not eligible for AAROM.
- A: *That would not exclude you from being eligible for PICFI. However, we do want to encourage First Nations to come together to take advantage of the diversification and economies of scale that would be afforded by aggregates.*
- Q: Regarding licence retirement – will licences be purchased for First Nations to access?
- A: *Yes, this is about retiring licences and transferring access to First Nations.*
- Q: Over what period will licences be retired?
- A: *This is a five-year program. From past experience, having an even distribution will give us the best value in terms of the kinds of licences we can retire. We will discuss tomorrow some next steps regarding distribution. A committee could develop a framework or criteria.*
- Q: What happens to PICFI when the government changes?
- A: *Governments do change. However, funding has been booked in the fiscal framework, and has been set aside.*

Q: If the transfer of access is based on willing seller / willing buyer, how can First Nations get access to more lucrative sectors?

A: *We will discuss distribution plans on Day Two.*

Q: What are the aspirations of First Nations in the commercial fishery, in terms of assertion of rights and title, and what is available in the fishery?

A: *We need to identify areas where First Nations believe that additional commercial access is needed. That is all part of the discussion we want to have around business planning.*

Day Two – September 18, 2007

REVIEW OF AGENDA

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, welcomed participants back to the workshop, and reviewed the agenda for Day Two. He acknowledged that group discussions would focus on “Distributing Access” and “Capacity Building.” Participants were reminded to submit their completed “Evaluation Forms” prior to leaving the workshop.

SUMMARY OF DAY ONE GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Jacque Dale, Facilitator, led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled “Summary of Day One, Facilitator’s Summary of Themes and Ideas that Came Up In More Than One Group” (*see the attached “List of Appendices”*).

During a review of the slide titled “Overall Themes,” Ms. Dale acknowledged that participants recognized past grievances and current inconsistencies which created a backdrop for their concerns. They also suggested that:

- PICFI appears to be a “done deal” that doesn’t recognize First Nations rights and title;
- there is both a relationship and clear distinction between Aboriginal and Treaty Rights/Section 35 fishing and commercial fishing through the licensing system;
- key parts of an overall strategy should include: aggressive goals for “rebuilding the stocks,” a holistic approach (e.g. forestry, employment, etc.), and multi-sector conversations;
- consideration is needed regarding the overall viability of the fishery;
- further consideration should be given to how to reconcile the application of science with the value of local traditional knowledge;
- Aboriginal knowledge should be respected, and decisions made need to consider on-the-ground knowledge not just statistics; and
- trust and improved communications are needed between DFO and First Nations.

During a review of the slide titled “Co-Management,” it was noted that Working Group conversations ensued regarding equal representation and participation, decision-making authorities, and the definition of “co-management.” Participants also suggested that appropriate and adaptable measures could be determined through co-management, and that co-management approaches could vary depending on scale, issues and geography.

During a review of the slide titled “Principles,” discussions occurred regarding the recognition of First Nations territories and leadership, the use of stewardship and balance, and the importance of transparency at multiple levels. She added that participants discussed the importance of consistency in the approaches negotiated at treaty tables. They also stressed that resources would be required to support and enable PICFI participation. During discussions relative to regulations, participants noted that consistent accountability measures were required in the sport fishery. Changes to the *Fisheries Act* may also be necessary.

She added that DFO was urged to streamline current processes and committees, where capacity to participate had previously been limited. The development of inter-tribal protocols and opportunities for First Nations to meet at different levels, were suggested. Participants noted that implementing a defined share approach to management would help to create a balanced integration between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal fisheries.

During a review of the slide titled “Enhanced Accountability Measures,” Ms. Dale added that Working Groups recognized some costly accountability measures already in place that needed to be streamlined rather than expanded.

It was noted that participants requested information relative to stocks, and further suggested that options for counting fish be considered. Opportunities for monitoring and data collection by First Nations were discussed. She added that participants suggested fish monitors be given appropriate training and an enforcement mandate. Fishers should not be required to cover monitoring costs.

During a review of the slide titled “Acquiring Access,” it was noted that participants explored possibilities for licences, including: licence banks, bundled licences, communal licences, and shares.

During a review of the slide titled “Value for Money,” she added that participants recognized a need to “control” inflation. Conversations also occurred regarding principles of fairness, and a market value approach (i.e. a licence/quota not being used would be de-valued).

During a review of the slide titled “Expertise/Process,” Ms. Dale reported that some participants suggested a First Nations body (e.g. a geographically-based development corporation) could make decisions regarding licences based on business plans, uniquely suited to their region(s). Participants requested that expertise required in the process should be “the kind DFO would listen to.” It was further suggested that sub-committees comprised of First Nations Technical Workshop participants, be tasked with focusing on specific elements (i.e. the distribution of access), to continue efforts with DFO.

During a review of the slide titled “Other Ideas,” it was noted that participants offered a variety of suggestions, including:

- develop a “disaster fund,” retroactive for 15 years;
- consider the fact that there is nothing left to fish after conservation, food, social, ceremonial (FSC) purposes;
- examine the feasibility of a commercial fishery on the coast, and a communal/FSC fishery upriver; and
- tradable conservation credits could increase inter-tribal collaboration.

During a review of the slide titled “Conclusion,” Ms. Dale noted that participants generally were looking for something “fresh” through PICFI, based on concrete lessons learned in prior efforts and processes. The need to support capacity to manage the resource was also discussed.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, welcomed the following comments from participants relative to the preceding presentation. Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, provided the subsequently indicated italicized responses.

*Question and Answer Period: the following abbreviations are used throughout this section:
Q=Questions, A=Answers, C=Comments.*

- C: Salmon, crab, and prawn licences would work best in a communal approach. In Musqueam, we want to work as our own community - through a communal approach. The importance of a ceremonial and societal approach also needs to be recognized. I understand that a communal approach relative to halibut quotas was raised as a potentially effective alternative.

-
- C: Canada did not support the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Article J represents the customs and values of First Nations in BC, which BC and Canada have signed onto. The United Nations Convention on Bio-Diversity needs to be implemented to benefit Indigenous peoples in BC.
- C: We are always going to need food fish, and may need to address the conduct of food, social, and ceremonial fisheries. We are here to talk about access to the commercial fishery and should remain focused on commercial opportunities.
- C: We need to consider value for money. Too often when a species becomes licenced, there are limited opportunities for First Nations access. It is hard to get licences for black cod and halibut. We don't have the ability to do our own research. I'm hesitant to say "We'll get a geoduck licence for the community," because they cost \$2 million.
- C: We need to look at restoring this home to its natural state. There are 14 rivers in Rivers Inlet which once had multiple species – there are only three species now. Our ancestors used to look after our rivers. Our wildlife is being affected by climate impacts – changes in the local bear's behaviour and territory were referenced recently in the local newspaper.
- C: If we're going to buy salmon licences, the industry will be in trouble. DFO says there are too many fishers chasing too few fish, and they keep getting rid of boats. They will buy up the licences but we'll still have the same problem. Communal licences should be considered. Buying a number of gillnet licences for systems that are in need, would be meaningless.
- A: *Is your question "Why would First Nations fishermen want licences in a fishery with so many problems?" We need to fix the fisheries. Until changes are made to the commercial fishery it will be difficult. I have asked CSAB to provide advice on how we might move towards a share-based management approach for salmon. First Nations and non-First Nations fishermen need a fishery that is more viable than it currently is.*
- Q: Are you talking about moving towards quotas?
- A: *The Minister talked about a share-based approach for managing salmon at the fleet level. First Nations have indicated that they are looking for harvest shares in their treaty negotiations. They have also discussed flexibility in how they can fish their shares to maximize value to their communities. Some fleets have decided to move forward in this direction.*
- C: Have we learned anything from the first buy-back? How many of our First Nations members jumped at that and sold out? When it was first announced, it was directed towards fishers that were ready to retire. We need to be careful when defining "share"; it is important to bring the government to our level. It's hard enough to survive without imposing quotas; we should postpone quota discussions for now. Many that sold their commercial licences are suffering because of their decision; some want to return to fishing but can't afford it. I want to teach ten young people about the fishing industry. I quit ten years ago, but I'm back and want to do it right.
- C: There is history in the Johnstone Straits area. Before we look at training our youth to participate in some kind of a future in fishing, we need to have a say in what's going on. I'm leery about small quotas. I think we need more money to rebuild the stocks. We have a hard time in Area 12 with all the new policies going on; DFO seems to ignore our cries for conservation of species.
- C: I don't want to get bogged down in imaginary issues such as treaties. We need to focus on economic development opportunities.

PRESENTATION

John G. Paul, Executive Director, Atlantic Policy Congress of First Nation Chiefs

John G. Paul, Executive Director, Atlantic Policy Congress (APC) of First Nation Chiefs, led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled "Past & Future Directions, Fisheries in Atlantic Canada 1990-2010" (*see the attached "List of Appendices"*) Mr. Paul provided the following additional commentary on the slides in his presentation.:

"APC Secretariat," - membership of the Chiefs of Atlantic Canada extended south to the State of Maine.

"Where we have been: Fisheries," - acknowledged the importance of the Supreme Court's decision relative to the turmoil created in response to the Marshall decision. He added that communities required sufficient knowledge and capacity to participate in the fisheries. Mr. Paul referenced the importance of transferring valuable knowledge from older experienced fishers, to young people entering into the fishing industry.

"Marshall Decision," - reviewed relevant components of Burnt Church, St. Margaret Bay and other critical events. He acknowledged that it was important to continue to communicate with the public, fishermen and politicians regarding the APCs efforts and fishery objectives.

"Population," - noted that a study was done in APC communities, which examined membership rates, employment levels, and population rates (both on and off reserve).

"Unemployment," - discussed the displayed chart which recognized differences in employment rates between First Nations communities and non-First Nations communities.

"Employment Related to Atlantic Fishing," - a graph outlining anticipated fishing employment rates was discussed.

"Impact of the Expected Additional Jobs on Unemployment" and "Impact of Existing and Additional Fishing Licences on First Nation Incomes," - acknowledged the need to reduce the gap between First Nations and non-First Nations incomes.

"Perceived Barriers to Future Fishing Employment" and "First Nations' Interest in Developing Fishing-Related Opportunities," - noted that further consideration was needed in different fisheries areas (i.e. smoked crab, etc.)

"Focused Attention," - recognized the dangers involved in the fishery. He added that all fishermen needed to maintain a certain level of training and expertise. Some communities had little or no experience in the fishery, and went from having 18 to 80 boats in a matter of one year. The importance of working quickly but safely was acknowledged.

"Training Collaboration," - noted that fisheries training schools were encouraged to provide training in First Nations communities. On-going training of fishers and staff had been maintained through certified mentors, some of which were non-First Nations. He acknowledged initial challenges related to language barriers between the trainers and the students. It was noted that it was the responsibility of the community to select which trainers they wanted to teach their fishermen how to fish. He added that many of the new First Nations fishermen in the industry were carpenters, prior to the Marshall decision. It would take many years for new fishermen to become good fisherman, as knowledge was gained through experience.

“Fisheries Management System,” - noted that the fisheries database system was designed by a group of fisherman, and tracked details related to the management of a vessel (including inventory, insurance numbers, days fished by each fisherman, fishermen’s certification, etc.) He added that this assisted communities in tracking their fishing vessels’ activities.

“Business Approach,” - added that after a drastic decline in the lobster and snow crab, efforts had been made to support a business plan.

“Fisheries Knowledge Network” and “AAROM Links” - noted that fishermen and fishing coordinators in the community compiled a website where scientific, economic and other information in laymen’s terms could be accessed.

“Key Accomplishments to 2004” and “Key Accomplishments,” - relationships created between fishermen were the basis of many community processes.

“Key Learnings (Communication and Decision Making)” and “Training and Education,” - noted that efforts were made to ensure everyone remained informed at all levels. Efforts were also made to focus on the entire fisheries operation, as every detail was important.

“Sustainable Fishery” and “Fishery Diversification” - noted that efforts were proceeding towards a First Nations seafood company that could include the participation of all communities in Atlantic Canada.

“Where we want to go,” - added that it was important to build on the resources in the community. He added the APC supported communities developing their own approach to fisheries. He noted that it was important to build on existing capacities and networks, to enable fishers and communities to get where they wanted to be.

In concluding commentary, Mr. Paul invited participants to contact him or anyone in his office, regarding the APC fishery. Participants were invited to ask questions regarding the preceding presentation. Mr. Paul provided the subsequently indicated italicized responses below.

Question and Answer Period: *the following abbreviations are used throughout this section:*
Q=Questions, A=Answers, C=Comments.

Q: Are you talking about numbers of licences that were transferred? What percentage was that? Are the licences communal? How can First Nations capture revenues? Are they self-sufficient?

A: *In terms of Atlantic Canada, First Nations fishermen currently comprise at least 10% of the lobster, shrimp, scallops and snow crab fisheries. We have other licences but they are not large percentages of the bigger fisheries. Communities are provided licences through agreements. Some communities run everything – they tell the fishers what their share is, and allocate specific amounts to each boat. One community has 75 boats for snow crab. The band helps them out in terms of maintenance.*

Q: Is there a way to capture surplus revenues and pay for training costs?

A: *In the communities that run the fishery, they have invested portions of their profits directly to training. Because of the nature of the skills and expertise required, fishermen need to go through an ongoing training process. Communities have created training plans that include fishermen. Sometimes fishermen pay for their own training, and sometimes the communities do. In Atlantic Canada, the average age of a fisherman is approximately 58. I always remind the new young fishermen to be patient, as the current group will soon be retiring.*

Q: Describe challenges with funding in relation to the package, relative to housing and infrastructure. Given that you had the “Marshall instrument,” what is the approach for the Atlantic Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (AICFI) in relation to PICFI?

A: *People began to realize that investments were needed in training and development, as fishing licences could benefit the community for many years. Some Atlantic fishermen earned significantly less this year; those dedicated to the industry are sticking to it. With AICFI, we're using an Aboriginal capital corporation who is working on business plans that make sense for the communities, based on their governance, management, and structure. They can provide technical expertise and support towards a development that is unique to the community. Some communities have been through some difficult and some good times, and are coming up with ways for dealing with these fluctuations. Our communities are working towards something useful for the long term that will create capacity for the next decade. We need strong capacity, expertise and a long term vision of First Nations' future role in the fishery.*

Q: Musqueam is interested in crab and prawns. I'm interested in your Fisheries Information Management System. We have a crab monitoring system that counts crab traps. When the trap comes up, does your system record the number of crabs kept and crabs released?

A: *We're trying to get people to convert from paper to electronic data. Although it's important to know what's going on in each trap, it's hard to convince people about the importance of collecting data.*

Q: Once a crab trap comes up, you may get five legal crabs, and 50 illegal ones. No information is kept on those released. When we go fishing we count every fish. Most fishermen in BC are doing voluntary monitoring.

A: *Our information management system is designed by fishermen; elements can be added or adapted as required. We're recording data because we believe it is important, not because we've been directed to do it. I could compare it to a screwdriver, with different bits built in.*

Q: Do you know how much was spent since the Marshall decision on implementation?

A: *I know data will soon be confirmed. I understand the amount spent was likely \$500-600 million.*

Q: We know it's cheaper to protect what's in good shape, rather than to recreate what's been destroyed. I recently visited the Macaw Nation, a community of 1,000 people, of which 150 work in the fishing industry. The community earns a significant income from fishing. How can PICFI help build the west coast First Nations commercial fishery?

A: *You need to determine how best to achieve this. Our future is ours to make for ourselves. Those committed to the fishing industry will stay in it. We are only now beginning to look at habitat issues. We need to diversify to ensure we're involved for the long term.*

Q: What can we learn from your experience regarding acquiring access and distributing access?

A: *The biggest lesson learned was that you need to do what makes the most sense for communities based on long term objectives. Take some time to think through clearly what you want to accomplish, and be clear on how you want to help communities fairly. Set parameters regarding your outcomes.*

Q: You're talking about getting licences back to your community. Of the \$500-600 million spent by government post-Marshall, how much was spent to purchase licences?

A: *Most of the amount was used to buy licences.*

Q: The First Nations on the west coast are not treated the same way as First Nations on the east coast. What helped you make changes? We have different tribal bands, coastal and river bands. It would be helpful to form an organization that spoke for all of us. Where did you get money for your mentoring program? How much of the \$500-600 million did you have to pay back?

A: *The government responded to the Marshall decision and bought up licences on the market, plus other licences that had been created through the tax program. There are good and bad aspects to this; some communities took boats and gear, some took boats and licences. Less experienced communities helped each other. A community on the St. John River, which is far from the ocean, bought five boats. They set up a coastal base where other communities in similar situations now work from. We need to make sure that what we do makes sense. Funding for the training and mentoring programs was negotiated. The programs established some good relationships between native and non-native fishermen. Food, social and ceremonial fisheries still exist. Nothing had to be paid back to government.*

GROUP DISCUSSION FOUR: "Distributing Access"

Introduction to Group Discussion Topic

Jennifer Nener, Policy Analyst, Treaty and Aboriginal Policy Branch, extended thanks for the preceding presentation, and led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled "Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations" (*see the attached "List of Appendices"*).

Summary of Working Group Discussions

Participants returned to their separate facilitated discussion groups to consider the topic "Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations." Group discussions included conversations regarding the different needs and elements of the river and coastal fisheries. First Nations rights, territories, protocols, cultures and stewardship were also discussed. Participants recognized that start up costs and other issues related to acquiring a licence needed to be taken into account, before transfers could be made.

(Please refer to the facilitator's "Summary of Day Two" for further information regarding the discussions. See the attached "List of Appendices" to locate a detailed compilation of the comments provided by each of the groups.)

GROUP DISCUSSION FIVE: "Capacity Building"

Introduction to Group Discussion Topic

Robert Lamirande, Senior Analyst, Aboriginal Policy and Governance Directorate, led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled "Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Capacity Building" (*see the attached "List of Appendices"*).

Summary of Working Group Discussions

Participants returned to their separate facilitated discussion groups to consider the topic "Capacity Building." Discussion groups recognized that sufficient vessels, gear and knowledge were required to expand the First Nations commercial fishery. Many participants noted that the industry was quickly

becoming less and less viable, due to declining stocks, fish farms, and various other industry impacts. As such, very few young people were interested in pursuing a future in fishing.

(Please refer to the facilitator's "Summary of Day Two" for further information regarding the discussions. See the attached "List of Appendices" to locate a detailed compilation of the comments provided by each of the groups.)

SUMMARY OF DAY TWO GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Group Discussion Four: "Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations"

Each of the facilitators offered brief reports regarding the key themes identified during their group's discussions relative to "Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations."

Sue Cass, Facilitator, reported that the Working Group she facilitated focused on a number of issues including:

- eco-system concerns and the restoration of habitat;
- stewardship and clarity around community needs and cost considerations;
- First Nations' ability to work collaboratively, and to guide the distribution of access;
- the need for business plans;
- the importance of a stewardship role; and
- PICFI as an incentive for communities.

She added that participants also encouraged DFO to:

- take time to consider a holistic balance through a long term ecosystem lens;
- enable further dialogue towards the continued collaboration and utilization of resources;
- engage in more in-depth research and analysis;
- make decisions in a more transparent manner;
- consolidate licences and resources, while the PICFI dialogue continues;
- create a trust as a holding tank for licences, to allow proper processes to be put in place; and
- prevent PICFI from instigating 'a race' for limited resources.

Cole Rheaume, Facilitator, added that Working Group he facilitated questioned:

- if PICFI was suggesting giving out new licences to supplement existing licences;
- how many strings would be attached to PICFI; and
- whether or not licences could be split up into smaller components.

He added that participants also:

- raised concerns regarding insufficient resources available;
- discussed differences between the coastal and inland fishers; and
- suggested a business case study looking at challenges in turning youth into "five year fishermen."

Jacque Dale, Facilitator, added that the Working Group she facilitated encouraged DFO to:

- abolish the management fee intended for co-management costs;
- engage in lengthy discussions about what should be decided at the community levels, and at more aggregate levels; and
- consider the idea of a First Nations/DFO trust, with a governing body comprised mostly of First Nations people, who would make distribution decisions relative to licences.

She added that participants also:

- expressed varying opinions regarding proximities of species, current fleet capacities and current licence opportunities;
- recognized the importance of a viable business plan and government-to-government conversations; considered factors that could be used to help distribute access; and

-
- discussed equity between the east and west coasts, in light of arrangements negotiated in the Atlantic.

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, added that the Working Group he facilitated focused on resolving broader issues, such as policy barriers and prior buy-backs. Group participants also encouraged DFO to:

- recognize that a number of communities had been harder hit than others and should be considered accordingly;
- do something to benefit the communities licences will be transferred to;
- clarify the percentage of total allowable catch which PICFI could provide access to; and
- provide a concrete proposal to consider.

He added that group participants also:

- recognized opportunities to increase First Nations participation in the fishery, through the PICFI initiative;
- discussed the flow from “acquisition” to “distribution” of access;
- recognized the quality of information needed to promote solid business relationships; and
- stressed that progress on PICFI could not be achieved until there was greater comfort on where it fit into “the bigger picture.”

Group Discussion Five: “Capacity Building”

Each of the facilitators offered brief reports regarding the key themes identified during their group’s discussions relative to “Capacity Building.”

Sue Cass, Facilitator, reported that the Working Group she facilitated focused on a number of issues and provided the following suggestions:

- a holistic approach should be applied using First Nations expertise;
- training and learning should be First Nations-focused;
- DFO should be sensitive to cultural issues, within the PICFI objectives;
- money should be invested for vessels, gear and training;
- vessels will be needed before fish can be caught;
- long term, consistent and sustained funding should be made available to support infrastructure;
- youth could be enticed into the industry through hands-on experience and “community teams of professionals”;
- efforts should be made to promote the development of community business plans;
- communities should focus on streamlining;
- a core infrastructure owned by First Nations, could be developed to support capacity building;
- local partnerships should be considered (i.e. with eco-trust, etc.); and
- improvements should be made to the Employment Insurance system to benefit fishermen.

She added that participants also:

- requested further consideration regarding the need for governance and board training;
- suggested that governance responsibilities should “support upwards”;
- expressed concerns regarding pay equity for expertise;
- indicated that efforts should be made to prevent people from leaving their communities; and
- asked “when it comes to capacity building – let First Nations do it,” as First Nations have the capacity to assess their own needs and determine the best means for meeting those needs.

Cole Rheaume, Facilitator, reported that the Working Group he facilitated discussed existing programs and institutes within communities. He added that participants also:

- suggested that skills related to fisheries should be transferable;
- requested partnerships with multiple organizations be encouraged;
- noted that individual communities could provide capacity for a business plan;
- supported the need for greater scope on the project;
- questioned the logic in making significant efforts on a proposal for licences that won’t be viable;

- promoted initial consideration of licences with the greatest promise of business development;
- noted that the process created multiple questions regarding where the funds would go;
- stressed the need to avoid competition as the process moves “out of the gates”; and
- encouraged DFO to consider partnering with itself, and leveraging or matching funds for training or capacity building.

Jacque Dale, Facilitator, noted that the Working Group she facilitated recognized that only one institution offered training that was relevant to the communities. As such, she reported that conversations were supportive of increased opportunities for fishing education. Additionally, participants discussed leveraging the \$175 million to promote involvement from the federal government (i.e. INAC). Efforts to contribute to capacity building were also discussed.

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, reported that the Working Group he facilitated noted that:

- PICFI has a role to exercise sovereignty, control and management; it should also provide opportunities that enable direct community benefits from the fishery;
- the design of PICFI appears to have a “socialist nature”;
- there may be other economic ventures to consider;
- profitability, and a sense of ownership and pride should be considered;
- licences could be used in different ways; decisions regarding the use of a licence should be made by the community;
- beyond getting the fish, there is a need to develop and support a business plan;
- processing and marketing opportunities should be examined;
- DFO should use language that reduces confusion;
- capacity supports will be required; and linkages to build capacity and marketing should be considered;
- efforts should be made to examine case studies, lessons learned and pilot projects; and
- DFO’s capacity relative to timely decision-making should be questioned.

POTENTIAL NEXT STEPS

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, noted that in addition to the Workshop Report, a Facilitator’s Summary would be developed prior to the PICFI discussions scheduled in October and November 2007

Participants were then requested to work in their table groups to identify and list some concrete “Next Steps” to enable follow up on the PICFI discussion. Lists left on the table, were later collected and compiled. (*Please refer to the attached “List of Appendices” to locate a detailed compilation of the “Next Steps” provided.*)

CLOSING REMARKS

Ronald Kadowaki, Pacific Fisheries Reform, extended thanks for his involvement at the workshop, and noted that the advice received regarding “moving forward” was appreciated. He acknowledged the workshop’s productive discussions, and offered the following italicized responses to the questions submitted earlier by workshop participants:

Question and Answer Period: *the following abbreviations are used throughout this section:*
Q=Questions, A=Answers, C=Comments.

Q: How will you make sure PICFI is viable? Why would First Nations want to get engaged in the fishery if it’s not viable from an economic perspective?

A: *There is a need for broader reforms to make sure the fishery is more economically viable, particularly in light of the direction work is headed. This isn't just about transferring commercial access, but improving the way we do business, and marketing the fishery process to make the industry more viable.*

Q: Is PICFI the beginning of a larger program to improve access to First Nations?

A: *We are looking at PICFI as a significant addition to the current allocation transfer program (ATP) in building on the foundation towards viable First Nations fisheries enterprises. Additional access through Treaty negotiations and other means in future provide other avenues for growth.*

In concluding commentary, Mr. Kadowaki added that PICFI represented an opportunity to make progress on greater commercial access and a greater role in decision making for First Nations. He recognized that First Nations were at different places in terms of readiness to take on additional access. It was clear that the commercial seafood industry was competitive, and participation was something that had to be carefully considered.

He discussed a broad range of suggestions received at the workshop, noting that participants' advice to "take time to plan" rather than "rushing in" had been well received. Mr. Kadowaki also acknowledged suggestions for a "holding mechanism" which would enable a deliberate matching up of access with First Nations who were ready to become involved in the commercial fisheries. He added that discussions also recognized the need for more effective co-management. Participants expressed that many First Nations were feeling they were uninvolved in co-management, particularly relative to fisheries management and catch monitoring.

Mr. Kadowaki added that the ideas and suggestions raised at the workshop would be compiled and consolidated, before being further analyzed by DFO staff. Participants were reminded that community sessions were scheduled at various locations within the province during October and November, at which PICFI would be further discussed. He added that a follow-up forum is being considered for late November or early December. He referenced the intent to develop some basic design principles by December 2007. He concluded by thanking all attendees for their keen participation at the workshop.

ACRONYM LIST

The following acronyms have been used throughout these proceedings and related appendices.

AAROM:	Aboriginal Aquatic Resource and Oceans Management
ACICFI:	Atlantic Canada Integrated Commercial Fishing Initiative
AFS:	Aboriginal Fishing Strategy
APC:	Atlantic Policy Congress
ATP:	Allocation Transfer Program
BCSA:	BC Safety Authority
CSAB	Commercial Salmon Advisory Board
DFO:	Department of Fisheries and Oceans
ENGO:	Environmental Non-government Organization
FSC:	Food, Social and Ceremonial
IFMP:	Integrated Fisheries Management Plan
IMB	Integrated Management Board
NFA:	Native Fishing Association
NTC:	Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council
RDG:	Regional Director General
TAC:	Total Allowable Catch
UI:	Unemployment Insurance

ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO PARTICIPANTS

The following items were provided to participants at the September 17-18, 2007 First Nations Technical Workshop, Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative:

- *Agenda for the First Nations Technical Workshop, Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative, scheduled September 17-18, 2007;*
- *Printed copy of the overhead presentations titled:*
 - *“OVERVIEW - Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI)”;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Co-Management”;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Enhanced Accountability”;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Acquiring Commercial Fisheries Access”;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations”;* and
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Capacity Building”;*
- *Fisheries and Oceans Canada Information Sheets titled:*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Co-Management” ;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Enhanced Accountability”;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Acquiring Commercial Fisheries Access”;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations”;*
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Capacity Building”;* and
 - *“Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Engagement Process.”*

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Overhead presentation titled “OVERVIEW - Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI),” delivered by Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform
- Appendix 2: A compilation of “questions” and “issues to be addressed,” which participants developed and submitted in writing, during the Questions and Answer Periods of the Workshop.
- Appendix 3: Overhead presentation titled “Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Co-Management”, delivered by Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform
- Appendix 4: Overhead presentation titled “Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Enhanced Accountability,” delivered by Colin Masson, Advisor to the Associate Regional Director General
- Appendix 5: Overhead presentation titled “Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Acquiring Commercial Fisheries Access,” delivered by Jennifer Nener, Policy Analyst, Treaty and Aboriginal Policy Branch
- Appendix 6: Overhead presentation titled “Summary of Day One, Facilitator’s Summary of Themes and Ideas that Came Up In More Than One Group,” delivered by Jacquie Dale, Facilitator.
- Appendix 7: Overhead presentation titled “Past & Future Directions, Fisheries in Atlantic Canada 1990-2010,” delivered by John G. Paul, Executive Director, Atlantic Policy Congress (APC) of First Nation Chiefs
- Appendix 8: Overhead presentation titled “Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Distributing Commercial Fisheries Access to First Nations,” delivered by Jennifer Nener, Policy Analyst, Treaty and Aboriginal Policy Branch
- Appendix 9: Overhead presentation titled “Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI) Capacity Building,” delivered by Robert Lamirande, Senior Analyst, Aboriginal Policy and Governance Directorate
- Appendix 10: A compilation of “Next Steps,” which participants developed and submitted in writing, during the Workshop.
- Appendix 11: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussion One on “Co-Management” (September 17, 2007)
- Appendix 12: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussion Two on “Enhanced Accountability” (September 17, 2007)
- Appendix 13: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussion Three on “Acquiring Commercial Fisheries Access” (September 17, 2007)
- Appendix 14: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussion Four on “Distributing Access” (September 18, 2007)
- Appendix 15: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussion Five on “Capacity Building” (September 18, 2007)