



MULTI-INTEREST TECHNICAL WORKSHOP: Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI)

*held September 19, 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

MULTI-INTEREST TECHNICAL WORKSHOP: Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative

*held September 19, 2007 at the
Delta Vancouver Airport Hotel
Richmond, British Columbia*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY: MULTI-INTEREST TECHNICAL WORKSHOP (PICFI)	1
INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS	2
<i>Jacquie Dale, Lead Facilitator, One World Inc.</i>	2
<i>David Balfour, National Director General of Aboriginal Policy and Governance</i>	2
PRESENTATION	2
<i>Introduction to Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative and Fisheries and Oceans Engagement Strategy 2007/2008</i>	2
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD	3
DISCUSSIONS ON PICFI PROGRAM ELEMENTS	6
<i>Introduction to Group Discussion Topics</i>	6
REPORTING BACK AFTER GROUP DISCUSSIONS	7
<i>Group Discussions on Co-Management</i>	7
<i>Group Discussions on Acquiring Access</i>	7
<i>Group Discussions on Distributing Access and Capacity Building</i>	8
<i>Group Discussions on Enhanced Accountability</i>	8
<i>Potential Next Steps</i>	9
CLOSING REMARKS / WRAP UP	9
ACRONYM LIST	10
ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO PARTICIPANTS	10
LIST OF APPENDICES	11

Summary: Multi-Interest Technical Workshop (PICFI)

The objective of the September 19, 2007 Multi-Interest 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 100 participants from a variety of sectors, including: First Nations representatives, commercial fishermen (both First Nations and non-First Nations), 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 structured around five key elements of the PICFI program: Co-Management; Acquiring Access; Distributing Access and Capacity Building; and Enhanced Fisheries Accountability. 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.

Separate group topic-specific discussions were held relative to the key elements of PICFI. 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.

(Please see the "Reporting Back After Group Discussions" section of these proceedings for a more detailed summary of the group discussions. Refer to the attached "List of Appendices" to locate a detailed compilation of the comments provided by participants during the group discussions.)

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Jacquie Dale, Lead Facilitator, One World Inc.

Jacquie Dale, Facilitator, One World Inc., introduced herself as one member of the facilitation team. She welcomed participants to the Multi-Interest Technical Workshop on the Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI), and recognized the Musqueam First Nation territory.

Ms. Dale acknowledged First Nations representatives and others in attendance, who could offer a mix of perspectives. It was noted that the simultaneous discussion groups scheduled for the workshop, were intended to engage participants and identify diverse perspectives. Participants would also be encouraged to discuss 'what to achieve and how to proceed'. She added that the discussions would assist in laying groundwork for the community discussions scheduled in October and November 2007.

Background information provided in the workshop agenda packages, designed to support the day's discussions, was referenced.

Ms. Dale led the meeting in a brief review of the workshop agenda, noting that the day would begin with an overview of PICFI and its' key elements. She introduced members of the facilitation team, who would assist group discussions throughout the days. Participants were encouraged to be respectful of each others' comments, and to enable everyone to voice their issues.

David Balfour, National Director General of Aboriginal Policy and Governance

David Balfour, National Director General of Aboriginal Policy and Governance, Fisheries and Aquaculture Management, informed that the workshop was intended to discuss increasing First Nations participation in fisheries and improvements to the co-management of the fishery. Reports published in 2004 were referenced, which prompted the support of the Minister to move ahead with PICFI. The intent to use the \$175 million to its maximum potential was acknowledged. Mr. Balfour added that it was important to consider the design of the initiative, and how PICFI could respond to environmental changes, conservation concerns, and the state of public confidence. He concluded his comments by stressing that efforts to move forward in the advancement of PICFI needed to be collaborative.

PRESENTATION

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

Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, extended thanks to participants who had also participated in the September 17-18, 2007 First Nations Technical Workshop. He welcomed other participants and acknowledged the opportunity to move towards a viable and more sustainable fishery on the west coast. Mr. Kadowaki then led the meeting in a review of the overhead presentation titled "OVERVIEW - Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative (PICFI), Multi-Interest, September 19, 2007" (*see the attached "List of Appendices"*).

Slides:

Context: Acknowledged interest in working towards the sustainability of the resource and noted that efforts were proceeding with Fisheries Reform and PICFI towards more collaborative management.

Background: Referenced extensive discussions held in 2004 and 2005 relative to the Pearse McRae Report, and a First Nations Panel Report on Fisheries.

Integrated Commercial Fisheries: Recognized that the salmon fishery had not been performing well for a variety of reasons. He added that the collection of good data was an essential element of a commercial fishery. Improved collaboration was a key element of PICFI.

PICFI – Components: Referenced various roundtable processes proceeding in the province, where harvesters were working through fishery issues.

Co-Management Objectives: Called for ideas on how to improve co-management efforts.

Acquiring Access Objectives: Outline of PICFI's objectives to retire existing commercial access and transfer them to First Nations, noting that a diverse approach on the coast, inclusive of multiple available species, was being considered.

Distributing Access Objectives: Review of the intent to establish a clear mechanism for moving quotas or licences to First Nations. There was reference to the 'assistance' role of Aboriginal Aquatic Resource and Oceans Management (AAROM groups), and discussion on linkages between distributing access and capacity.

Capacity Building Objectives: Note that a representative from the Atlantic First Nations fisheries presented information at the First Nations Technical Workshop regarding recent advancements and progress in the east coast fishery.

Accountability Objectives: Markets are demanding product certification, within a short time frame.

DFO's PICFI Design Principles: Participants were encouraged to keep the seven presented design principles in mind during their subsequent discussions. There is a recognition that there are various levels of understanding and interest relative to access, noting that different First Nations may be ready at different times. Advice relative to the elements presented was welcomed and it was noted that the program developed would need to be adaptive during its term.

Potential Outcomes: There is the need for balance with First Nations and commercial interests. Many First Nations had expressed concerns regarding benefits of receiving licences in an unviable industry. Efforts of the Commercial Salmon Advisory Board were referenced, noting that multiple interests needed to remain involved.

Participants were reminded that community discussions regarding PICFI had been scheduled for October and November 2007, which would allow further opportunities to provide additional input. A wrap-up workshop was also a possibility to consider a range of options developed based on advice received at the various workshops. It had been suggested at the First Nations Technical Workshop, that smaller discussion groups work together through some of the details of PICFI.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Jacque Dale, Facilitator, invited participants to take a few minutes with their table groups to develop questions to ask the DFO representative in attendance. Participants were welcomed to ask some of the key questions they identified through this process. DFO representative 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.)

Question and Answer Period: the following abbreviations are used throughout this section:

Q=Questions, A=Answers, C=Comments.

Q: The \$175 million suggested, isn't a lot of money for this initiative. Has the department compiled a budget based on proposed outcomes?

-
- A: *This concern was also raised at the First Nations Technical Workshop. We acknowledge that this is a start, which we can build on. With respect to how it would be broken out, 2/3 of the amount (i.e. \$115 million) would go to 'access', while the remainder would support the other elements and DFO's implementation of the program.*
- Q: I'm curious about addressing co-management. Is it DFO's policy to keep things separated? I support a regional approach. An Aquatic Management Board has been established on the west coast of Vancouver Island.
- A: *First Nations involvement in a number of processes has been inconsistent, for a variety of reasons. It is often difficult for a First Nations representative to speak on behalf of their entire geographic area and/or their nation. It is important to focus on inter-tribal collaboration, and First Nations involvement in multi-interest processes.*
- Q: Given the sports fleet has a right to fish, how does DFO plan to hold them to a set allocation so we can move forward?
- A: *Sports fishers are licensed to fish. When we talk about share-based approaches, do we need to extend this to accommodate the sports sector? The division of salmon between sport and commercial isn't currently explicit, in terms of percentage. We're talking about a share-based approach in the commercial fishery. Although we've discussed a share-based approach with halibut, we're currently guided by the existing allocation policy for salmon.*
- Q: Mr. Kadowaki keeps referring to a share-based approach, without prior consultation with First Nations. Who owns the salmon? Many First Nations people feel 'pushed aside' and 'stepped on'. We need to start caring for and listening to other people involved in our industry. We were taught to get along with our neighbours, rather than fight with them.
- A: *The purpose of this meeting is about sharing ideas, expressing views, and listening to others. We were opened two days ago by representatives from the Musqueam First Nation, who referred to "being in the same canoe and learning to paddle together." There are many First Nations and non-First Nations people who are concerned about the future sustainability of the resource. I hope there is a common realization later that we're more in the "same canoe" than "separate canoes." I appreciate the prior comments, and expect that these views may be shared by others, both native and non-native.*
- Q: In order for First Nations to be eligible for PICFI do they need to be in the treaty process? Will this be open to everyone?
- A: *PICFI will be open to all First Nations in treaty, with treaty, or not in treaty. Part of the challenges discussed at the First Nations Technical Workshop related to distribution and what criteria would be used in sharing.*
- C: First Nations need certainty and access. This bit of money may be just enough to cover some of the problems in our area. We should receive the same funding (\$500-600 million) that First Nations on the east coast received for their fishing industry, which they did not need to repay. We didn't get to set our nets this season, although the sports fishery was open daily. It's costly to monitor the sports sector, however local people with a knowledge of the fish and data in the area should be authorized to issue sports fishing permits.
- A: *The level of funding on the east coast after the Marshall decision has been significant. In terms of a strategy and west coast First Nations' aspirations, PICFI funding is a start. The suggestion that First Nations collaboratively apply pressure to get additional funding, is certainly open to you. We will be working with the sport fishery and will be talking about PICFI with others,*

particularly regarding monitoring efforts. A collaboratively managed fishery with space for commercial, environmental and sports interests is our ultimate objective.

Q: We haven't been firm enough on the sports sector. In our area, there was a troll fishery which had a quota system. Some fishermen who finished their quota bought more. Some were stuck with 300-400 fish and waited for an opening, while the sports sector continued as usual. Nothing is done in response to complaints that the sockeye are being intercepted. The quota for halibut for the sports sector, I understand is 300,000 pounds. If they don't fish their quota, they can sell to the commercial sector. First Nations don't have the same opportunity, and would be charged for selling halibut. Does the sports sector have a seat on the Commercial Salmon Advisory Board (CSAB)?

A: *The sports fishery does not have a seat on the CSAB. Representatives from the sports fishery and First Nations fishery do have a seat on the Integrated Harvest Planning Committee (IHPC). We have a commercial industry that is facing a lot of difficulty, and some believe that the sports fishery is a significant part of that problem. I understand that efforts are needed for improved collaboration among all harvesters.*

Q: I have a problem with the consultation process. Is this our only day to contribute to this? I think we need a forum where we can all have accountable representation. How many people were involved in developing the policy we're offering advice to? Consider establishing an advisory process, comprised of members who are paid to represent their people.

A: *The Pearse McRae Report and the First Nations Panel Report on Fisheries were based on discussions with many of the participants in this room. We received advice based on the reports, and heard pleas for a sustainable resource, viable fisheries, improved co-management, self-reliance, and the ability for self-adjustments. We recognized that First Nations access was a key part of the fishery reform, and agreed to work with INAC to secure additional funding to address this. This summer, the Minister announced that PICFI would focus on improving co-management, and would include access for First Nations. The PICFI approach is based on the input we received.*

Q: Most processes are advisory, and don't encourage ownership of issues. Is DFO willing to share decision making with First Nations through co-management? Will DFO make changes to integrated management processes to accommodate those relationships?

A: *There is a matter of the Minister's role in decision-making. We want to work towards a special relationship with First Nations. Whenever possible, consensus or agreement is the desired outcome. We are open to ideas that can support First Nations participation in integrated management.*

Q: The Native Brotherhood left the CSAB process about eight months ago. We want to see a more structured approach for First Nations' input into the co-management regime. There are no policies relative to communal licences. What is the incentive for First Nations to take over licences and boats which will not bring in any income? The food fishery in Johnstone Strait has been treated as an opening, although we were informed four years ago that we would never fish there for sockeye again. Some First Nations aren't getting allocations for roe-on-kelp. Is there a lack of participation from First Nations upriver? Bill C-45 will have huge implications on PICFI. There may be concerns about PICFI being a precursor for quotas on salmon. Government assured us that there would be economic viability in the fishery. Fishermen now pay for surveillance, which DFO should be looking after.

A: *The Native Brotherhood represents Aboriginal commercial fishermen and should be participating at the CSAB table, particularly as they are working towards improving the sustainability and*

viability of the fishery. The CSAB membership isn't 'cast in stone'. Advice regarding funding for co-management is welcomed. The DFO remains committed to renewing the Fisheries Act, and is considering how the Act should look. This workshop is an opportunity to provide input at a fundamental level. The Minister talked about moving towards a share-based approach, which could be implemented on a fleet basis. There is intent to look at more flexible ways of managing within the fleets. CSAB will be discussing this in small groups. We don't want to transfer access that is unsustainable or unviable.

Q: We all need to be healthy team players to make this work beneficial. Regarding the \$175 million over five years, how will the process identify priorities? Who determines methodologies relative to species, abundance or assessment? Are they guided by First Nations traditional knowledge or DFO's best assumptions? How will the priority list for capacity building funds be developed? A master plan is needed before delivery. From a conservation perspective, a First Nations assessment plan should be conducted to determine a national plan.

A: *We asked questions relative to 'priority' at the First Nations Technical Workshop. The small group idea was suggested; further advice on shaping this concept would be welcomed. We don't currently have a master plan. We welcome input from First Nations, industry and environmental groups regarding a better plan. Stock assessment is important, as a healthy resource is essential. The wild salmon policy includes an assessment process. Eco-certification requires a rigorous science base. Ideas are welcomed regarding a more sustainable approach to resource conservation.*

C: As a commercial First Nations fisherman, I want to remain in the industry for some time. I need to know how we will be better off from this process. Many young people have been given an opportunity to make a livelihood out of the fishery on the east coast. I don't want to buy a lot of licences in an area, when there are no fish. We need to learn how to work together. Right now I haven't got a livelihood. Our community has only two boats left.

DISCUSSIONS ON PICFI PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Introduction to Group Discussion Topics

Jacquie Dale, Facilitator, informed participants that topic-specific group discussions would be held in separate rooms. She added that the facilitated discussions would focus on the topics:

- "Acquiring Access,"
- "Distributing Access and Capacity Building,"
- "Co-Management," and
- "Enhanced Accountability".

For further information regarding the topics to be discussed in the group discussions, participants were referred to the printed information and overhead presentations included in their information packages.

After the presentation, participants moved into four separate topic-specific discussion groups, for the duration of the day, before reconvening for a concluding summary of the discussions held.

REPORTING BACK AFTER GROUP DISCUSSIONS

(Please see the attached “List of Appendices” to locate a detailed compilation of the comments provided by each of the topic-specific group discussions.)

Group Discussions on Co-Management

Jacque Dale, Facilitator, outlined some of the suggestions and advice received during the group discussions on “Co-Management”. Ms. Dale reported that group discussion participants suggested:

- shared decision making could include recognition by a final authority,
- more dialogue was needed relative to decisions;
- mandates should include “Policy Development”; and
- management should seek and consider local knowledge.

Regarding principles, outcomes and objectives, it was noted that participants suggested:

- shared accountability and multi-directional accountability;
- recognizing community-based management wherever possible;
- that consistent language be used in co-management efforts; and
- effective working relationships should include clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and should also include sharing of information.

It was further noted that participants requested that DFO re-organize to reflect a more holistic co-management approach. They also supported further discussions around design considerations related to dispute resolution, resources to pay for participating, clarity on mandate, and authority.

Next steps identified during the group discussions included:

- looking at co-management opportunities in other areas;
- the establishment of a steering committee to design and oversee change;
- a test process for specific areas; and
- the continued involvement of multiple participants in the process.

Group Discussions on Acquiring Access

Harold Tarbell, Facilitator, acknowledged highlights from the group discussions on “Acquiring Access,” including:

- PICFI as it is currently designed, may not address a number of broader / fundamental issues;
- PICFI outcomes may be overstated;
- there are considerable frustrations with DFO within the industry;
- DFO may be in a conflict of interest situation, as a seller and buyer;
- increased funding is required, as the \$175 million simply isn’t enough;
- a clear plan and a proposal from DFO is needed;
- a national strategy is needed for the transfer of licences to First Nations, similar to the strategy in the Atlantic (which occurred in response to the Marshall decision);
- there is interest in joint Aboriginal / non-Aboriginal processes including:
 - combined efforts to lobby for more money;
 - strategic approaches to common concerns;
 - the development of commercial business plans; and
 - a publicly accessible database;
- adjustments could occur within the existing commercial industry to respond to this acquisition/delivery process; and
- support may be needed for the First Nations that do not have sufficient access to commercial fishermen and expertise.

Mr. Tarbell concluded by recognizing the differences in perspectives and communication styles he observed during the group discussions, which were assisted by an overall willingness to engage in conversation.

Group Discussions on Distributing Access and Capacity Building

Sue Cass, Facilitator, reviewed the group discussions on “Distributing Access” and “Capacity Building”. Regarding the topic “Distributing Access” she acknowledged the following suggestions raised by the group discussion participants:

- deal with eco-system based management so First Nations have a good sense of stock and what they are buying into; the restoration and protection of the environment is important;
- First Nations need to have input into regulations and changes (this ties into co-management);
- increased input into policy development is important;
- everyone needs to be on the same page relative to accountability and responsibility;
- First Nations need to be able to use what they’ve bought (i.e. if you have a halibut quota it may need to be accompanied by a by-catch quota);
- research is needed regarding what stocks are available; access must be tailored to the available stocks to promote sustainable fisheries;
- build ‘flexibility in shares’ into business plans;
- include a feedback mechanism on the application process;
- develop some small scale opportunities;
- provide access to local species in traditional areas;
- include the watershed equation as part of the overall process;
- design a regional process that enables First Nations to provide advice on how to best distribute access; and
- region-specific processes should be developed.

Regarding the topic “Capacity Building” she acknowledged the following suggestions raised by the group discussion participants:

- more opportunities are needed between industry and First Nations to build capacity and work together; environments which foster partnerships are required;
- a lens towards marketing is essential;
- industry has the capacity and can provide a mentoring role; there are hubs of knowledge and expertise in regions which should be researched and explored;
- don’t just buy back licences without ensuring there is an available fishery and someone to fish it;
- this goes beyond money-making; it’s about resources and ensuring biological support.

Group Discussions on Enhanced Accountability

Cole Rheaume, Facilitator, reviewed the group discussions on “Enhanced Accountability” and acknowledged the following suggestions raised:

- there should be a focus on conservation;
- counting was needed of the ‘catch that didn’t make the table’ (i.e. by-catch);
- confidence and trust issues need to be identified;
- DFO should share their list of monitoring programs;
- self-reporting and monitoring processes should be examined;
- as you increase traceability the costs increase;
- an ‘ocean-to-plate’ initiative is needed;
- some First Nations are not aware of existing accountability measures;
- “we are all two-legged otters” - we eat what’s available;
- there is a value-added opportunity in using tracking systems; and
- sell branded fish that are identifiable as “BC Fish”.

In concluding commentary, Ms. Dale acknowledged community dialogues scheduled in October and November 2007, relative to the PICFI initiative. She added that a Facilitator's Report and a Workshop Report of the Multi-Interest Technical Workshop would assist in moving towards the next discussions.

Potential Next Steps

Participants were encouraged to discuss the question "What next steps could occur to help the initiative move forward?" with their table groups, and to leave their written responses on the table for DFO's consideration. *(Please refer to the attached "List of Appendices" to locate a detailed compilation of the "Next Steps" provided.)*

CLOSING REMARKS / WRAP UP

Ronald Kadowaki, Director, Pacific Fisheries Reform, extended thanks to participants for their contributions during the group discussions. Views expressed by participants relative to the objectives of PICFI, the sustainability of resources, and the viability of fisheries were acknowledged. He added that the viability of fisheries was a critical objective of PICFI.

Mr. Kadowaki recognized concerns raised by participants regarding monitoring and growth of the sport fishery. The transfer of licences from the commercial sector to First Nations was also discussed. He further recognized interests in forming smaller groups to discuss specific elements, in support of broader processes.

He added that ideas raised at the Multi-Interest Technical Workshop would be discussed during the fall consultation sessions. It was noted that a subsequent Multi-Interest Technical Workshop could be held in December 2007 to consider a narrower range of ideas and options. He added that many participants had been involved in dialogues with the department, and would hopefully continue to discuss PICFI elements in the scheduled dialogue sessions.

He concluded by thanking participants for their views, and expressed hopes that the foundations established could be built on.

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 19, 2007 Multi-Interest Technical Workshop, Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative:

- *Agenda for the Multi-Interest Technical Workshop, Pacific Integrated Commercial Fisheries Initiative, scheduled September 19, 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 Backgrounders 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 Period of the workshop.
- Appendix 3: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussions on Co-Management
- Appendix 4: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussions on Acquiring Access
- Appendix 5: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussions on Distributing Access and Capacity Building
- Appendix 6: A compilation of comments provided during Group Discussions on Enhanced Accountability
- Appendix 7: A compilation of “Next Steps,” which participants developed and submitted in writing during the workshop.