

*Kamloops Towne Lodge, 1250 Rogers Way, Kamloops
Wednesday & Thursday June 23rd & 24th 2010
Both Days Tier 2 (FNs & DFO)
0900 hrs – 1600 hrs
Meeting Record Keeper – Sharmyne Owen
Meeting Facilitator – Marcel Shepert*

Background & Purpose of the Meeting

This session is the latest in a series of “Roadmap” workshops bringing First Nations from the Fraser River and Approach areas together with DFO with the aim of designing a **durable and mutually agreed to collaborative management process and structure to address issues related to management of Fraser River salmon.**

The purpose of this meeting is to **seek input from workshop participants on work done to date on Roadmap elements and discuss next steps in the process.**

Specific Objectives:

- Update participants on what the “**Roadmap**” process is about, the relationship of the Roadmap compared to **Forum**, and how it relates to FNFC fisheries co-management initiatives being undertaken in BC.
- Summarize recent work on the Roadmap, and seek input from participants on key outstanding questions and next steps.
- Continue to clarify vision, objectives and desired outcomes of the Roadmap work.

This session will focus on **working together to design a process.** Specific proposals for the management of Fraser stocks will be noted, but will not be addressed at this session.

Meeting Summary – From Dialogue Related Specifically to the Agenda

This two day workshop, the first of four anticipated this fiscal year, was aimed at organizing and advancing preparations for a durable and mutually agreed to collaborative management process that many expect to lead to an agreeable structure in which to engage on issues related to management of Fraser River salmon.

There was good participation with approximately 50 people on day one and 40 on day two. This included a good cross section of individuals from the marine approach areas and the Fraser watershed.

REVIEW THE FORUM, ROADMAP, AND FRAWG (purposes)

FORUM: FORUM (or Forum on Fraser Salmon) is short for Forum on Conservation and Harvest Planning for Fraser Salmon. The FORUM is an annual Fraser salmon management process that engages DFO and First Nations from the marine approach areas and the Fraser Watershed. The FORUM process was initiated in January 2008. It has a Tier 1 & Tier 2 component and is still developmental and as such changes can be expected. The process to date has resulted in four two day meetings per year (January – June). There was a suggestion that there should be a post season review (FORUM or FRAFS technical forum – issue for FRAWG to address).

Roadmap: The “Roadmap” is a developmental process (an offshoot of the FORUM process) whereby First Nations and DFO come together on a broad geographic basis (Fraser River watershed and Marine approach areas) to work together and work towards agreement on a coordinated and collaborative engagement planning process on a broad suite of fisheries related issues. This includes agreement on issues such as roles and responsibilities (e.g., Tier 1, sub-regional AAROM bodies, Regional organization); technical support requirements; communications, funding and co-management. This process will evolve slowly and will likely take several years or more to get the building blocks in place.

FRAWG: Fraser River and Approach Working Group – This working group’s origin was from the first FORUM meeting (January 2008). The role of the working group is to organize FORUM and Roadmap meetings including venues, agendas, content preparations, and communications; and generally assist with moving the Roadmap and FORUM processes forward. Initially participation was on a volunteer basis. As the FORUM and Roadmap processes have advanced there is interest in new participants (Murray Ned recently joined this working group). Better geographic representation was raised as an issue at the June 23-24 Roadmap workshop. The FRAWG team will want to work with Roadmap participants to consider how best to accommodate growing interest in participation on this working group. The FRAWG will be reviewing recommendations made at the FORUM & Roadmap meetings and will consider how to provide an effective response.

FIRST NATIONS FISHERIES COUNCIL PRESENTATION

Deana Machin, on behalf of the First Nation’s Fisheries Council updated participants on the work they are doing to support First Nation’s interests in BC, including:

- Drafted a discussion document on First Nation’s view of co-management
- Preparing an analysis on legal issues associated with co-management arrangements, and
- A document that looks at the capacity that FNs can expect will be needed to work effectively at a co-management level.

Deana was kind enough to agree to a shorter time allocation for her presentation and follow up discussion in order to accommodate a Maori presentation, which was a late addition to the agenda.

MAORI PRESENTATION: “Maori Customary Fishing Rights in the Modern New Zealand Context”

A highlight of the workshop was a presentation on New Zealand’s Maori Fisheries provided by **Tanya McPherson & Sam Tamarapa**. Tanya and Sam were very experienced and well informed with their subject matter. They made their PowerPoint presentation during the day and contributed their time for an evening dialogue session on the New Zealand Maori fisheries experience. This was very interesting and informative for participants. Tanya and Sam kindly provided a copy of their presentation for posting in the FRAFS web site. Their presentation was very well received, and appeared extremely beneficial in showing a concrete example of aboriginal people working collectively to resolve treaty and rights issues, and building effective collective capacity and governance to be effective co-managers of fisheries resources..

BREAK OUT SESSIONS–Based On Themes Developed at the Dec. 10, 2009 Roadmap Workshop

The opening Agenda (below) was modified (to accommodate participants that did not want to separate into break out groups) in favour of addressing themes and associated questions by the participants as a whole. The themes were as follows. Suggestions were recorded on flip charts and are noted in the detailed meeting record.

Session #1

- Developing a **“Common Vision with goals/objectives”**
- **“Mandate & Scope”**

Session #2

- **“Accountability”**
- **“Structural Options/potential models”** – with linkages

Session #3

- **“Steps to Co-management”** (background)
- **“Communications”**

Session #4

- **“Principles: Guiding & Operational”**
- **“Support & Capacity”**

This session was not completed; however, the First Nation’s Fisheries Council is preparing a document for First Nations that addresses the capacity issue with respect to participation in co-management.

WERE MEETING OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED?

- Regarding objective one: “*Update participants on what the “Roadmap” process is about, the relationship of the Roadmap compared to Forum, and how it relates to FNFC fisheries co-management initiatives being undertaken in BC*” There was discussion regarding whether holding large bilateral forums for both the “Roadmap” process work and the “Forum” process was effective. This will need to receive additional discussion by the FRAWG and other participants.
- Regarding objective two: “*Summarize recent work on the Roadmap, and seek input from participants on key outstanding questions and next steps*”. Though the meeting did not adhere strictly to the agenda laid out in advance, a wealth of substantive questions were raised and next steps proposed that will help guide future development of this initiative.
- Regarding objective three: “*Continue to clarify vision, objectives and desired outcomes of the Roadmap work*”, it became clear at the workshop session that there are still many differing views of what form an eventual collaborative management relationship regarding Fraser salmon would look like. FRAWG members will need to continue focused work around defining possible options for co-management that could accommodate the areas of difference between participants.

NEXT STEPS

- There was a strong request from the First Nations to convene some form of pre-season discussions with C&P to discuss FSC enforcement approaches
 - a fair and consistent application of enforcement measures
 - consideration of alternative approaches to promoting compliance, such as bringing in elders to help resolve disputes.
- The current plan is for Four “Roadmap” workshops this fiscal year plus a special workshop this fall that will look at management of all sectors’ salmon fisheries (commercial, recreational and First Nations) with a focus on catch monitoring. The FRAWG will assess the structure / format of future Roadmap sessions to ensure most effective use of time and resources to achieve progress. Need to consider, also, linkages to other processes, such as those led by the ITO, FNFC and other AAROM groups.
- Two FORUM planning sessions are expected during the period January to March 2011. A fall post season Fraser salmon fisheries review meeting has been suggested as well.
- For First Nations getting a functional Tier 1 process in place is priority before getting to any agreement on a structure for management of Fraser salmon. A suggestion was made that the next Roadmap workshop be two days of First

Nations only for Tier 1 development and that the Inter-tribal Treaty organization be invited to host the workshop. Members of the FRAWG team will follow up on this with ITO representatives.

End of summary

AGENDA

June 23rd – Day 1

- 9:00 a.m. Welcome & Opening Prayer (TBD)
- 9:05 Introductions
- 9:15 Opening comments – Marcel Shepert
- 09:30 Questions & Answers Pertaining to the Roadmap, Forum and FRAWG
- 10:00 Presentation from the First Nations Fisheries Council – Deana Machin
Update on FNFC's co-management work and how this relates to the "Roadmap" process
- 10:30 Break
- 10:45 Snapshot of various co-management structures – Pat Mathew
Discussion in relation to Roadmap
- 11:15 **Break out Groups based on themes developed at the Dec 10, 2009 Roadmap Workshop.** Questions to guide breakouts on each theme:
1. Is the documentation related to this theme correct / relevant?
 2. Are there gaps?
 3. Key unresolved Issues?
 4. Opportunities / suggestions for resolution?
- Break out Session # 1:
- o Developing a **"Common Vision with goals/objectives"**
 - o **"Mandate & Scope"**
 - o includes a listing of priority activities to be addressed through the collaborative structure
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Reports from Break out session # 1
- 1:45 Break out Session # 2:
- o **"Accountability"**
 - o **"Structural Options/potential models"** – with linkages
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 Reports from Break out session # 2
- 3:45 Facilitator summary of day 1 and preparation statement for day 2
- 4:00 Close

June 24th - Day 2

- 9:00 a.m. Welcome [& opening prayer] – Elder
- 9:05 Introduction to new participants only
- 9:15 Break out Session # 3:
- o **"Steps to Co-management"** (background)
 - o **"Communications"**
- 10:15 Break
- 10:30 Report back on Session # 3:
- 11:15 Break out session # 4:
- o **"Principles: Guiding & Operational"**
 - o **"Support & Capacity"**
- 12:15 Lunch
- 1:15 Report back on break out session # 4
- 2:15 Review highlights of four Break out sessions
- 2:30 Break
- 2:45 Group Session (all participants)
Preliminary planning for three more Roadmap Workshops this fiscal year
- 3.15 Next meeting date
Closing prayer

DETAILED RECORD OF DIALOGUE**June 23rd – Day 1**

9:00 a.m Welcome & Opening Prayer (TBD)

- Peter Michell – Welcoming Song
- Cliff Arnouse – Welcoming Prayer
- Maori Opening – Tanya & Sam

9:05 Introductions

9:15 Opening Comments – Marcel Shepert

09:30 Questions & Answers Pertaining to the Roadmap, Forum and FRAWG

Establishment of FRAWG – a collaborative DFO-FNs relationship in place since January 2008..- one of the successful items.

◆ Forum Process:

- Key activity has been to improve operational planning around FSC fisheries and Fraser Salmon.
- Meeting regularly since winter 2008.
- Has examined a range of issues related for FSC planning and impacts of other fisheries.
- Key accomplishments:
 - Recommendations related to Fraser Chinook and sockeye fisheries.
 - Significant strengthening of relationships among FNs, and between DFO and FNs.
 - Better mutual understanding of the diverse cultural considerations and fisheries interests throughout approach and watershed areas, better basis for collaborative and respectful fisheries planning discussions.
 - Growing technical capacity among participants.
 - Increased engagement of FNs in fisheries planning issues, both locally and at a watershed/approach level.
 - Widespread interest and participation.
 - Development of the Road Map Process to consider long term relationships, and a potential formal structure.

◆ Roadmap Process:

- Meeting regularly since fall 2009 [Four Roadmap workshops in 2009-10 fiscal year, including one dealing specifically with consultation.]

- Has focused on building durable collaborative management arrangements and structures related to Fraser stock management at the Watershed/Approach area level.
- Key accomplishments:
 - Action plan to move forward on two fronts:
 - the Road Map process formalization phase
 - and the Forum on Fraser Salmon which is the yearly operational phase.

◆ **Discussion on the Work to be done today:**

- Is there agreement on moving forward with the two concurrent streams (Forum and Road Map) ?:
- To what extent do we need to formalize the process and what does process formalization look like?
- What are the key constraints and considerations for moving forward, e.g.,
 - Resources
 - Capacity
 - Concerns about consultation
 - Level of participation
- Discussion:
 - Some First Nations are dealing with treaties and governments not recognizing the section 35(1) interest at the level required by the First Nations.
 - First Nations are worried when they get the information to bring back to the communities that this will be seen as by-passing the bilateral process between DFO and the individual First Nation.
 - Identify where work needs to be done to involve individual First Nations. If DFO wants co-management, then they need to sit down and negotiate an agreement.
 - Need to negotiate an agreement on FSC only.
 - Chief Ivan Morris: Douglas Treaty groups already have a Treaty and do not recognize the Roadmap process since it could potentially undermine their own Treaty.
 - Chief Robert Hope – DFO needs a formal agreement with the leadership something that would bring the Chiefs to a room for open negotiation, but this agenda doesn't reflect that. There also needs to be some sharing arrangements in place in low abundances. This is only a technical forum with a mixture of technicians and leaders therefore you cannot negotiate anything really. Within a Treaty, you can negotiate allocation. The Fraser Watershed covers a vast area, to make a working arrangement over these regions is almost impossible, people have different ways

of fishing. The only thing we share is an Aboriginal right. Should consider smaller sections of the river, for example like Lower Fraser to Yale, and Upper Fraser Fisheries Conservation Alliance. The department needs to share authority, they need to consult and go from there.

- Tony Roberts Jr. – We didn't come here from the Island to make an agreement with DFO, we came here to talk with DFO on how FN's are going to share sockeye in low abundances. We came here to try to discuss how we can share, and share conservation of these fish. The last thing we want is to get into a fish war with the Sto:lo. I don't and nor do I want the mandate to negotiate a treaty. It's unprecedented having [First Nations] from the headwaters [of the Fraser downriver and marine approach areas] come to these meetings to talk about fish. The Spring 4₂ is a perfect example on how we can work together. There is no money to go towards enhancement for the Vancouver Island [salmon stocks] and we've been calling for that for many years. All our allocations are forced on us, so what is left for us? We need our FSC to feed our people. All of our problems are falling on deaf ears with DFO. The continued development of relationships and understanding between First Nations remains a powerful incentive to continue participating.
- Greg Wadhams – One of the reasons the Island came to the table is because of the impacts with fish farms. We can't come here to negotiate a formal agreement; we need to do a lot of things on the Island first that reflect our needs. We came to this Forum because other nations are hurting, all our fish are hurting, and we come here out of respect and for unity. We have never had any say regarding consultation. We are close to a treaty, and we are negotiating, to deal with our identity. Our identity relates to our resource. We're here to talk about things that are important to us and to start working for a better tomorrow for all the First Nations. We have to work collectively. There are only band aid solutions so far, and no funding to make solutions possible. We're here to rebuild some of our island stocks which have been decimated and to reduce pressure on Fraser fish.
- David Loewen – A lot of the comments were well spoken, they echo about FSC only, Takla only had 20 fish last year. There are a couple of concerns, when we look at the draft document it's a focus on FSC fisheries, there are a lot of nations that can't sit here if that's the agreement we're going to work for. We need to start looking at habitat restoration and rehabilitation. All of these groups (AAROM, PICFI, etc) get funding of \$90 million dollars a year [PICFI is scheduled to ends 2011, AFS & AAROM ongoing with a combined total of approximately \$22 million a year for agreements in the Pacific Region] and we struggle getting a representative to come to these meetings. I'm curious to hear how you work with a

cross watershed or with folks who are not even in the watershed, Takla Lake is run in from the Arctic, Skeena and Fraser Watersheds and we get zero funding. We're disappointed that we didn't find the meeting minutes from the last meeting. Also can't keep up with how many organizations are working with this issue. It is tough having all the meetings in the south, we need to balance the funding throughout the Watershed. Funding is needed not only for these meetings but field work.

- Sharolise Baker – I am from the Upper watershed. I'm surprised to see visions, goals and objectives for the FN's are so different from the DFO vision, goals and objectives. Last year because of the low abundances we did not even fish. Our fish techs are training, but the highest we can pay them is \$15.15/hour, DFO entry wage is \$19.02. The first objective is to be treated as equals, how can we feel equal when our fish techs are doing the same job but getting the lower wage?
- Ken Malloway – I looked at the words from Fred Sampson [and what he] wanted from DFO, there's discussion about a watershed agreement and the likelihood for it to happen. We used to have a watershed agreement; there are over 90 FN's on the Fraser Watershed and more on the approach tribes. We've come a long way. We're here because of sockeye salmon, and to learn how to share those salmon in low abundances. We had an agreement to talk about FSC fish, but some want to talk about economic opportunities and some about commercial fisheries. FSC fisheries includes habitat, because if those fish are spending two years in habitat and not doing well, and the fish spending one year in habitat are doing well, then maybe it has something to do with their habitat and this should be investigated further. You have to be in the room or you will be planned out of the plan - that is why we all have to be here. It's tough to listen to some of the prior comments which make it seem like the FRAWG, and the Forum processes are part of an elite group making decisions for everyone else, but that's not true, we're doing these meetings for the nations.
- Marcel Shepert – Reminder that DFO is currently concerned about the Chinook [stock] situation and will be [developing] and implementing some kind of response to be put in place in the near future.

10:30 Break

10:45 Presentation from the First Nations Fisheries Council – Deana Machin

Update on FNFC's Co-management work and how this relates to the "Roadmap" process.

- We've put together a discussion document based on research on potential management options that FNs could look into co-management with DFO. It's a FN view on co-management.
- The need to define the process, the engagement of co-management.
- Discussion of co-management at tiers.
- Co-management at different scales, local, sub-watershed, watershed, BC, national and international scales and how they link to each other.
- Types of co-management activities, and policy and process barriers that are standing in the way right now of having successful co-management processes.
- Looking for feedback and discussion on this document.
- Also working on two other papers that will be released within the next week or two. One is from Ratcliff to do an analysis on legal issues of co-management arrangement issues. Such as arrangements with the Crown, creation of bodies and Boards, regulation and legislation level. The other is looking at capacity that FNs may need to work effectively at a co-management level.
- Sharolise Baker – Did this group look at funding or lack of funding for co-management? And is it a more political body?
- Deana Machin – It will be in another paper and will be released in a week or two. FNFC has representatives from 14 regions and is not a political body.
- David Loewen – I was encouraged to see rights and title in there. Does FNFC have in its mandate to go out to these communities, and [if so] when might this be happening? Is FNFC working outside the Fraser watershed?
- Deana M – FNFC is constrained by funding as well, we've tried to engage in various process. The FNFCouncil has an annual assembly that moves around every year. The FNFCouncil does not have that extra funding to do engagement types of activities. We also have an open teleconference every week [for FNs].
- Jeff Thomas – We need habitat restoration, there needs to be an emphasis on that issue. We need some group to take on habitat restoration to work with DFO. We need to take the pressure off the Fraser River [salmon stocks].
- Greg Wadhams – We're not keeping all FNs in the co-management plan, we do have representatives on FNFC to deal with these impacts, This just indicates the Fraser River, and everything else needs to be included.
- The document is intended to be broad so that it could apply to any FN in BC. It could be used as a tool that the FRAWG and Roadmap are getting into.

“Maori Customary Fishing Rights in the Modern New Zealand Context”

- We flew to Sapporo, Japan on June 6th and did our presentation there. The indigenous peoples in Japan are just getting on their feet on how to start and progress.
- A third of our area is too deep to fish.
- Harvest 570,000 tons each year of all species.
- The tribes – 57 individual tribes make up 10 tribal kinship waka groupings.
- A single Maori language but many unique tribal dialects.
- Each tribe is recognized for its uniqueness and autonomy.
- Maori have traditionally defended their tribal areas.
- Treaty includes 3 articles, article 1 talks about the British that came to New Zealand, article 2 talks about sole and exclusive rights to our people, and article 3 talks about our people becoming citizens of the British Empire. There are now 3 different versions put out since the first one that was released in 1840.
- In 1986 we needed to change the treaty as the issues then came up again from 1840.
- As part of the law making, they made decisions around fisheries. We had started to feel uncomfortable about what the government was doing with our fish. And there were then complaints of breaching the original treaty.
- The tribes took on a [court] case to implement the quota management system, and effectively got the crown to stop and to come to [terms with] a settlement.
- The first thing they did was develop an organization that would take agreements about the settlement and develop a model of all the agreements and put them together.
- Then 10 million NZ dollars were used to buy back quota for allocation. It wasn't until 1992 that a deal was struck, called “Sealord” deal in which New Zealand's largest private fishing company put up half of its shares for sale. Tribes were given 150 million dollars to buy 50% plus shares.
- Our settlement is quite different than what is here in BC as ours includes many different species, where here is mainly focused on salmon.
- How we manage our FSC in NZ is outlined on a map of the ocean where tribes can fish. A guardian issues a permit, they go fish and report back to the guardian on how many fish were caught.
- By the time we agreed on allocation with the tribes we had 700 million dollars in overhead, so a fisheries company was developed and the remaining was divided between the tribes.
- Our customary fishing is much like your FSC fishing as well, but legislation has divided it up into customary non-commercial and customary commercial fishing as well.

- 96 species in our quota management system, 628 individual stocks, and 585,685 tons total allowable commercial catch, 434,327 tons of actual catch.
- Government sets sustainability limits; sectors share extractions within those limits.
- Recreational fishers don't need a permit or anything but need to stay within the limits, use the correct fishing equipment, bag limits for each species, prohibited to use scuba to take abalone. 40% of the recreational sector is our own Maori people.
- We want to revise the non-commercial fishing areas, the lines were drawn by the government and caused tension between the Maori and the commercial sector.
- The proposal we put to the tribes is to have deep water zones and inshore water zones.
- We are going through a trial right now, where the commercial fishers have a customary permit to catch fish for Maori purposes, thus far there has been positive feedback on that.
- Government will be responsible for the commercial and recreational sector, and we will be responsible for our own sector.
- We are looking at local depletion not stock depletion.
- We are getting benefits of this too, owning the biggest fishing company is a big benefit.
- A very interesting evening dialogue session followed with Tanya McPherson & Sam Tamarapa.

12:00 Lunch

1:00 **Group Sessions based on themes developed at the Dec 10, 2009 Roadmap Workshop.** Questions to guide breakouts on each theme:

1. Is the documentation related to this theme correct / relevant?
2. Are there gaps?
3. Key unresolved Issues?
4. Opportunities / suggestions for resolution?

Note: Break out sessions continued to be modified to a single group session for each theme in the agenda

Break out Session # 1:

- Developing a “Common Vision with goals/objectives”
- “Mandate & Scope”
 - includes a listing of priority activities to be addressed through the collaborative structure

2:00 Reports from Break out session # 1

- **Vision:**

-
- Sustainability.
 - Shared vision between DFO & FNs.
 - Need to be well informed about each others fisheries.
 - Full FN participation into operational management (day to day).
 - FNs need the capacity and training.
 - FNs want fully integrated process to manage fish to meet FSC needs.
 - For both parties to meet as equals.
 - **Tony Roberts** – A lot of the process was understanding each other's pressures. When we talk about sharing these fish, us on the Island have a different point of view because of how we fish differently. Information needed on other FN's fisheries is important. FN management system to deal with the management of Fraser Salmon is needed.
 - **David Loewen** – As soon as I hear about the vision, goals and objectives I think it's just going to sit on the shelf and collect dust. We need implementation, then work backward from there. DFO's major focus will be on FSC. If we start limiting visions, goals and objectives, then when are we are going more towards a working strategic planning session?
 - What do we need to implement?
 - **Sharolise Baker** – I do see a complete difference between FNs and DFO's visions, goals and objectives. The First Nation's vision is to be treated as equals, and I don't think that is so. DFO keeps saying FNs need the capacity, but we have the capacity, how can we move forward?
 - **Jeff Thomas** – We've been meeting now for 5-6 months about FSC but haven't sat down with all groups to see what everyone's fishing plans are. Should we make another Forum session to discuss something like that, because we have no idea how everyone else fishes. If we're going to be working and planning together we should be having those discussions. We have a fishing season starting tomorrow, and we have no idea what to do, or what is happening throughout the watershed. Would methods from other areas be useful as another fishing tool?
 - A framework to make FSC decisions amongst FN groups.
 - **Brigid Payne DFO** – People want to clarify what this Forum is doing [**should have been referred to as Road Map**], it's almost the last element to find priority activities rather than wordsmith some magical vision statement. Where does this group really want to put its focus on?
 - Jeff Thomas - I want to see more hatchery programs, why can't we transfer fish from high abundance areas to areas of low abundance? Why can't we start doing that as FNs?

-
- **Pat Mathew** – Regarding enhancing a stream in your area, the problem is that DFO has a salmon hatchery program that has policies [including direction provided in the Wild Salmon Policy]. FNs objectives are not recognized in that policy, that's the problem with starting at the activity level. You will run into a DFO policy that will put your activity out of consideration. It's really about dealing with FNs and DFO as equals, if we start there as equals, how does that formulate to DFO's policy plans and FNs objectives move to the top of their agenda? Part of a co-management agreement, is to go back to policy changes. We have to define if we are equals and equals
 - We [FN speaker] have local aspirations as does everyone else, and we feel we could work with DFO to achieve those aspirations. We're also looking at fisheries that affect our fisheries on top of FSC. First Roadmap meeting this was discussed.
 - **Tracy Sampson** – Marcel read the letter that Fred sent out, it started with a question; doesn't DFO know what it wants either collaborative management or comanagement? Is this going to be co-management or collaborative management structure? DFO talks about collaborative arrangement, then also says co-management structure, so what is it DFO wants? We have to take into more consideration other than FSC. We haven't even gotten our food fish. All our needs are not being met. One stock after another is in trouble in serious decline. DFO mismanaged our stocks to this point, and now they're asking us how we want to manage the last fish. We have other stakeholders that are still benefiting and we haven't gotten our fish yet. We have a hatchery in the Nicola system, but our stocks have not been rebuilt they are still declining which might be the reason of DFO policy. I've been asking DFO where the data is from the recreational fishery. The gaps are so far apart. The United States court decision known as Bolt divided the fishery 50/50 - 50% for First Nations and 50% for the rest. I'm not asking for 50%, I'm asking for more, we've seen the fishery managed and how it's been handled so far, I want 51%.
 - **Tony Roberts Jr.** – We need to come to terms with ourselves and how we respect each other, you cannot manage in isolation. The stocks will fail if we don't know and agree with what's happening in-river. Unless we treat each other as equals when managing these stocks, it will never work. Conservation is foremost; we have to conserve the fish for the future. It's not about me right now; it's about my grandchildren and my great grandchildren. We have to take

the WSP and take a look at it again; it was developed to keep commercial fisheries out of the water. It was taken away from us on the Coast and brought in-river. On the enhancement side, it has to be reviewed; it stops everything we want to do regarding management on the Coast. The WSP has to evolve with us, it can't leave us behind. The presentation from the Maori may help us on the coast with a new way to manage fishing.

- **Greg Wadhams** – There was no thought given to coastal First Nations when developing the WSP.
- **Sharolise Baker** – The strength comes from FNs. An adequately funded process is needed, and we can't even achieve that.
- **Gord Curry DFO** – When I hear questions about the Minister and Regional Director General, the power is in this room. FNs coming together in this room have a lot of power. If the Minister walked through the door and said what do we need to do to make things right. There will be tons of potential strategies to make things right from this room. What are we capable of doing in this room right now? We need to be together, what is the vision of what we're going to do? As soon as you have a vision, then implementation follows. Right now everyone is in a state of confusion on what we're doing, we need a cohesive plan on what to do and get going on it. You need a unified voice to put out the message.
- Habitat is a sub-regional issue, and we should probably not talk much about it. Habitat is very specific. This table is very concerned with FSC, fish planning, etc.
- **David Loewen** – WSP has not been implemented since its conception. Since 1999 it hasn't done anything for wild salmon. The decision making still rests on the Minister with the best available information. A healthy habitat relates with social [??]. FNs are being subjected to processes such as WSP. We need goals and objectives that will get implemented and who will fund them?
- **Barry Huber DFO** – Views can get distorted. One reason the interest is high in being here today is because many salmon stocks are low. The weak stocks get hit hard when the large stocks are fished. WSP can help protect those weaker stocks. A WSP priority is to protect wild stocks by management actions. There are a lot of changes being implemented and many commercial salmon fisheries are closed. You can say its DFO mismanagement but we have no [should be limited] control over what happens to the fish in the ocean [prior to returning as adults], and what's

happened in the past. It's not a comfortable situation for DFO to be in. I think we can make improvements. Through this process, as we reach agreements on how we engage, there is more power to that process. The Minister does have the final decision making authority. We can't make decisions in isolation. I know that by working together we can be successful, but what is co-management? You can approach a problem from different ways and still get the desired outcome. We [DFO] provide a lot of money on AFS, AAROM, and PICFI agreements. How can we use that better and more efficiently? If we agree on a structure on how to engage, people are accountable for reporting back, with a lot less meetings and resources. Before we go for more money, we have to demonstrate to the government that we are making the best use of the money that is available, then we can talk about seeking additional funding.

- **Sharolise Baker** – We need a way to identify FN's issues, a lot of them are repeated issues. I'd like to know what is said when DFO talks to their higher ups. When we look at wage equality and capacity, the capacity is there now, but nothing is being done about funding.
- The idea is to be actively listened to.
- **Tony Roberts Jr.** – We've asked for debriefing notes from DFO and haven't gotten anything. We go back to co-management, DFO has co-managed with us for many years, they manage and we cooperate. The relationship we have with DFO and the management changing is nothing new to me. It's tough with the DFO turnover on managers, we have to re-educate those new managers every time and bring them up to speed on what's going on with us. How do we get the trust, how can we make sure DFO is bringing the higher ups exactly what we're saying. DFO can't do anything without our knowledge and traditional knowledge.
- **Brigid Payne DFO** – There are lots of things coming forward out of today's meeting. They have come up at other meetings and have come up for years, they are all complex things. DFO does take these things seriously; we have variable layers of bureaucracy. I would like to see the sense of everyone wanting to move forward.
- **David Loewen Takla** – By who's definition to conservation and sustainable. There would be a difference between DFO's definition to FN's definition. 2007 evaluation of AFS, internal evaluation stated there were a number of challenges, as well with challenges within the AAROM internal DFO evaluation. There are major issues within DFO to manage your own programs. There's a lack of

accountability within the department. I'd be curious to hear from DFO, if they would be willing to set aside money that will be managed by a third party organization to fund this group. So they don't audit themselves. That would allow this initiative to move forward. DFO should consider a third party to manage the funding for DFO is something that we can work with and support. Pick 5 of your top issues and bring them to the table tomorrow.

- **Greg Wadhams** – I'd like to see a National plan, we could have chosen 500 issues years ago, and if they were worked on then we might not be in the situation we're in today. We might be looking towards policy and not towards the scope of what we want to do. How we do this and where we go, but this process could be one of the most powerful processes. We need to see the results.
- **Barry Huber DFO** – [referring to David Loewen's comment above] When you look at the AAROM program review report, you need to look at the reasons why certain objectives weren't met. DFO made a commitment to FNs to allocate funds fairly to achieve a fairer distribution of funding, and manage funding and program development differently and take time to do so (compared to the way AFS was initiated). Part of the problem was and is the need for more time for FNs to build capacity to advance to readiness for AAROM collaborative management. It's not easy to move quickly. If we move too quickly, FNs will say we're too prescriptive, but I think we are at the point now where we can move forward.
- **Murray Ross** – I'm not seeing the level of progress I'd like to see with this FRAWG group. DFO has an agenda with making us come together and meet. I'm not seeing guarantees from DFO when it comes to FSC sharing. We need to have a FN fisheries panel structure with authority to make decisions and have funding to do so. I don't see that happening, we put a lot of staff time into this process. We need a recognized authority and a budget to make things happen.
- **Ken Malloway** – I was at an FNFC meeting recently, it's nice to blame DFO for our problems, but 100's of years ago Salmon runs were failing. It's hard to know what and why it's going on, why global warming is happening. The fish that are surviving, they might be the fish of the future if we can lay off of them. We can spend all of the time blaming each other, but we have to figure out a way to replace our fish. Stocks are disappearing, why? If we had the answer then we'd be able to sort it out. Cultus Lake Sockeye might disappear in my lifetime. We accomplished something, not

to fish the Early timed Chinook, we all agreed on that. And that's something. We do get a lot of Pinks in our area and would be happy to share them with other nations. I've always been told from our elders to respect our traditional knowledge.

- **Mandate, Scope and Priorities:**
 - DFO's policies and mandates need to reflect FN conservation and harvest priorities.
 - DFO's policies and mandates/programs need to reflect FN priorities related to environment and habitat protection.
- **Accountability:**
 - There needs to be a mechanism in the process where DFO describes how they have accommodated our interests.
 - Need an active listening mechanism – DFO describe what they heard and describe how they will respond in writing.

2:45 Break out Session # 2:

- **“Accountability”**
- **“Structural Options/potential models”** – with linkages

Issues

- **Ken Malloway** - People want to talk about fishing plans, but we need to talk about what to do if the fish don't show up.
- **Brigid** – We can look at different **working groups** to start working on this, not just the FRAWG.
- **Deana** – FNFC can definitely support the process at different levels. FNFC is building four working groups to work on four priority areas, one being co-management.
- **Charlie** – There is no nation to nation influence here. There has to be a tier 1 governance process to be linked to co-management.
- **Tony** – We need to develop something that we can bring back to our Chief and Council. A Sub-committee on FSC management for this year if the fish don't show up. We have the technical capacity to discuss how we can share our fish.
- Want our own FN test fishery, science, DNA collection program.
- **Sharolise Baker** – How will we manage if there are low returns and high water temperatures?
- **David Loewen** – It's concerning that there were no Northern reps at the FRAWG meetings, we need Northern representation. I'm concerned that isolated Northern communities are left out of so many plans.
 - [BH Note: Ken Malloway responded by explaining the initial volunteer nature of Fraser River & Approach Working Group participation and that this is not an exclusive group [Murray

Ned recently joined]. Sharolise Baker indicated an interest in participating on the FRAWG as an UFR representative [further discussion in this area warranted – consider having sub-regional AAROM bodies such as Upper Fraser River Conservation Alliance initiate representation to provide and orderly distribution of support]

- Allowing time for reconciliation.
- Need a Tier 1 FNs focus.
- Contingency plan in the event of low abundance for FSC sharing.
- Need improvement from FRAWG on the communications front.
- FNs not quite organized, FN needs a broader Tier 1 process.
- Need defined technical and political representation.
- Redundancies real or perceived in FN organizations.
- Can't keep repeating ourselves at a number of different processes.
- What does DFO perceive as co-management as opposed to collaborative management?
- Discussion information needs to be out well in advance of meetings to allow participants to read and absorb the material.
- Nations are segregated.
- What are the policy levels that need to be changed and how can they be changed?
- If there's a lack of food fish, enforcement needs to be considered.
- Outside FNs fishing in people's territories only DFO's consent.
- Sending in C&P when there are conservation closures.
- We don't have an understanding amongst ourselves.
- Lack of clear layout of potential enforcement actions in the event of a closure.
- At what point is conservation declared for FNs not to fish?

Solutions / Suggestions

- **Tony Roberts Jr.** – On the low abundance side, if we can agree to set the economic fishery aside and divide everything by 1/3, then we won't [need to?] focus on weak stock management. Let's try to set it up so we're not going to wipe out one of the weak stocks.
- Develop a detailed fishing plan with sharing mechanisms that clearly show how we will deal with weak stocks.
- **Howie Wright FNFC** – FN techs are reviewing the coho model developed by DFO regarding the 3% [harvest limit].
- Look at alternative data and stock assessment program what DFO has been doing, FN led.

- Need more Northern representation at Forum and Road Map meetings – who is the Northern rep on the FRAWG, the Joint DFO/First Nations Working Group that sets the agendas for these meetings?
- Need concise easily accessible information available to all interested FNs.
- Framework/process for reconciliation.
- Use FRAWG to keep the Tier 1 FN focus.
- FNs part of FRAWG to initiate talks about contingency planning. Set up Sub-Committee on FSC if needed.
- Open invitation to all First Nations to join/participate in the Forum and Road Map processes.
- Quicker turn around on Forum, Roadmap minutes, within 10 days.
- The Maori built a process, even though not all of their tribes were on board, and eventually the majority of the tribes bought into that process. They defined political and technical representation.
- Need to develop a Tier 1 process to apply to all FN's who use Fraser Salmon.
- Identify redundancies and become more effective as a whole.
- Get everyone from all the various processes together in one place to seek agreement on what needs to be done and who will be responsible for doing the work.
- See this [Roadmap] as a process to build co-management, and define what co-management is, the key thing is to work together.
- A formal negotiation is what we might need to go into to talk about DFO policy issues.
- Distribute draft material in at least one week in advance of meetings.
- Be beneficial to all groups to work together and share what everyone is working on, so there is minimal overlap.
- Pre-season discussions with DFO's C&P [Conservation and Protection staff] needs to occur.
- Have elders out to educate and enforce closures.
- [In-season] conference calls will help develop an understanding amongst FNs.
- Need to develop a clear arrangement and understanding of fishing plans and enforcement actions in the event of low abundance.
- Elderly advisory might be a good idea to help develop conservation standards.

Structural Options with Linkages

- Is there or can there be a linkage with ITO as the fishing season goes on?
- Part of ITO action plan was to develop a process to engage with other organizations, the forum process, FNFC, DFO, FRAFS, etc. The Secwepemc are presenting a resolution tomorrow to get ITO to move on that action point in regards to engagement.
- Island emerging technical committee needs to be linked with the Fraser technical group.
- Link Island and Fraser in season conference calls.
- Link between FNFC Snapshot and Forum on Fraser Salmon/RoadMap processes.
- Need to consider/link Douglas, BC Treaty and other processes in Tier 1 development.
- Need to develop strategies to engage FN that are not participating.
- Needs to be a linkage between Nations to develop management plans or identify issues of concern.
- Need a draft FN-FN and FN-DFO structure to present to their decision makers.

4:00 Close

June 24th - Day 2

9:00 a.m. Welcome [& opening prayer] – Elder

- Cliff Arnouse

9:15 Break out Session # 3:

- **“Steps to Co-management”** (background)
- **“Communications”**

10:15 Break

10:30 Flip-chart Session:

Steps to Co-Management

- Continue developing a co-management framework.
- Need a process to provide data to FN to ensure fishing plans can accommodate stocks of concern.
- Need a process for FNs to exchange conservation and harvest interests to help develop fishing plans. Use the “Forum” in the

interim, but look at something else for the long term. (use “Roadmap” process as a means to achieve this change?)

- Need a capacity building strategy – training, resources.
- Need a Tier 1 engagement developed that includes elements.
- Need a process for FNs to bring issues forward to a Tier 1 for all Fraser FN users...from their area.
- Need FN to define what their aspirations are related to co-management and collaborative management.
- Need FN & DFO to agree on what co-management is.
- DFO needs to define/clarify their definition of co-management.
- To change policy there has to be a formal negotiation between FNs and DFO, FNs will require proper representation.
- Development of collaborative arrangements can be informed.
- Co-management is about decision making at various levels and what guides decision making (policy).
- DFO has to change internal processes to accommodate FN interests.
- Need to reconcile roles/responsibilities of FN groups – FNFC, ITO, and Forum on Fraser Salmon/Road Map process.
- Co-manage structure needs an accountability measure to ensure FN needs are met.
- Structure needs to have accountability mechanism that describes outcomes – measure outcomes, conservation measures.
- DFO needs to define their consultation requirements in a co-management arrangement.
- DFO to identify where they can make changes internally.
- Much need for FNs to share fish.
- Consider development of an Elder’s Advisory Board for planning the summer fishing.
- Conservation closures must be explained by DFO – how does DFO determine what a conservation closure is based on in-season run size data?
- Island FNs should be doing test fisheries, and that test fish should go to meet FSC needs (comment about how many Test Fisheries are already being done by First Nations vessels?)
- FNs need to discuss at what point conservation closures should be declared.
- FNs need a process to identify various levels of harvest for times when runs are low.

Communication

- Need an effective communications strategy to ensure communities can be involved, informed and participate.

- A debriefing note describing decisions, and who will be responsible for administering this?
- Need quicker turn around on Forum and Roadmap meeting minutes.
- Need more time to go over meeting materials, not given the day of or the day before the meeting. Possibly the week before.
- Need to develop a process for in-season management – phone calls and meetings to discuss contingency planning – what to do if there isn't enough fish to share.
- Four Roadmap meetings are being planned for this fiscal year. This first one (of these four) was two day of bi-lateral dialogue. A suggestion made was to have the next one in the fall a two First Nations only session to work on development of the Tier 1 engagement plan. It was also suggested and generally supported that the ITO be given the opportunity to host this next Roadmap session. Secwepmc (Pat Mathew's) planned to table this suggestion at the ITO meeting the next day.

Note: Breakout Session #4 was not dealt with at this meeting.

- **“Principles: Guiding & Operational”**
- **“Support & Capacity”**

3.16 Next meeting date

- Fall 2010.

Closing prayer

 Attachement – Attendance List

NOTE: Missing day one attendance list and day 2 list below is incomplete.

In Attendance:

Murray Ned	Sto:lo Tribal Council
Dave Reedman	DFO
Tracy Sampson	Nicola Tribal Assoc.
Dominic Hope	Yale FN
Kelsey Campbell	A-tlegay
Howie Wright	Okanagan Nation Alliance
Deana Machin	FNFC
Saul Milne	FNFC
David Loewen	Takla Lake FN
Christina Ciesielski	CSTC
Kirby Johnnie	Tlazten Nation
Jim Webb	Tlazten Nation
Gary Albany	Songhees
Nick Albany	Songhees
Greg Wadhams	Namqis
Tony Roberts	Atlegay Fisheries
Daniel Billy	Cape Mudge FN
Jeff Thomas	Snuneymuxw
Susan A B	IMAWG
R. Morgan Wells	Lilwat/Mt. Currie
Chief Ivan Morris	Tsartlip FN
Lee Spahan	Coldwater FN
Wayne Paige Sr	Cowichan Tribes
Larry Nooski	Nadleh Whuten
Sharolise Baker	SFN
Brigid Payne	DFO-Vancouver
Gordon Curry	DFO-Nanaimo
Barry Huber	DFO – Kamloops
Charlie Andrew	ALIB
Cliff Arnouse	ALIB
Ken Malloway	FRAFS EC
Ernie Crey	FRAFS
Pat Mathew	Secwepmc