

**National Fish Habitat Coordinating Committee Meeting**

February 23, 2007

**Present:**

DFO – Patrice LeBlanc, Nicholas Winfield, Alwyn Rose, Ginny Flood, Michel Bourgnon, Kim Houston, Pierre Lemieux, Sue Kirby

RCEN – Martha Kostuch, Olga Schwartkopf, Cliff Wallis, Susanna Fuller, Olivier Bertin-Mahieux, Leela Ramachandran

**Action Items (Outside of Workplan):**

Activities	Actors	Timelines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Circulate updated presentations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RCEN</li> </ul>	-ASAP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Follow up with Ginny Flood re. Mining Caucus, Aboriginal Liaison Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RCEN</li> </ul>	-give contact info at Feb.23 meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Circulate info on Centers of Excellence, and changes happening at DFO Science (eg. expansion of peer review process to incorporate traditional knowledge)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kim</li> </ul>	-within two weeks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Keep Committee informed on work of DFO partnership with Conservation NGOs on integrated resource planning, cumulative assessment, Regional EAs, Watershed management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nick and Al</li> </ul>	-ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Circulate copy of ENGO paper on Habitat Compliance (DFO has a copy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nick and Pierre</li> </ul>	-ASAP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft workplan for Coordinating Committee to review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Leela and Al</li> </ul>	-circulate for review before next CC mtg
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Send out draft agenda and call-in details for next teleconference March 16.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Leela and Al</li> </ul>	-week of March 16

**Meeting Summary**

Agenda Item
<p><b>Opening Remarks</b>            Sue Kirby, Assistant Deputy Minister of Oceans and Habitat            - Welcomed the participants and emphasized the importance of partnerships like with the ENGO on helping DFO meet it goals and objective.</p> <p><b>Presentation on the Habitat Management Program / EPMP</b>            Patrice LeBlanc, A/DG Habitat Management            Kim Houston, A/Director Environment and Biodiversity Science            Pierre Lemieux, Director Conservation and Protection - Program Support &amp; Development            - (See DFO DECKs)</p>

## **Presentation on the RCEN**

Olivier Bertin-Mahieux, RCEN Outreach Director

- RCEN created by ENGOs to help build capacity among ENGOs
- made up of regional affiliate ENGO networks at provincial/territorial level
- RCEN non-partisan, non-advocacy, doesn't take position on issues; exists as forum to help ENGOs network and participate in public policy process
- Governed by Board of Directors and National Council; ten national caucuses coordinate activities by sector
- RCEN works with a range of federal departments
- RCEN expertise is in process, not content.

## **Priorities for 2007 – 2008 Workplan**

Martha Kostuch, Friends of the Oldman River, led the group in a discussion on priorities.

The results were as follows:

### 1. Role of Science in Habitat Management

- ENGO input into DFO Research priorities
- ENGO questions regarding DFO activities/research agenda
- Conducting primary research vs. collecting/reviewing/analyzing literature (provision of advice?)
- How is scientific info being used – to fill gaps/improve knowledge; to improve decision making; or to change management approaches (eg. ecosystem management, Risk Management)
- Review of science supporting Risk Management Framework, Pathways, and alternatives
- Science based decisions vs. precautionary principle
- role of traditional knowledge

### 2. Habitat Compliance and Enforcement

- ENGO input on Compliance policy (strategic and implementation) and stewardship
- Habitat Compliance Modernization: more strategic monitoring

## **Building the Workplan: Deliverables for the Priorities for the 2007– 2008 Workplan**

### 1. Role of Science in Habitat Management

- Healthy fisheries, fish habitat, and aquatic ecosystems
- List of priorities for research on habitat – especially for DFO Centers of Expertise
- Report from workshop on science basis of risk management approach and alternatives
- ENGO participation in DFO review of habitat impacts of fishing gear
- Better understanding of how science is used in DFO decision making (longer term)

### 2. Habitat Compliance and Enforcement

- Marine and freshwater fish habitat is protected
- Measures/indicators of success (biological, chemical, physical, social)
- Better understanding of compliance policy
- Better compliance/enforcement (99.999% compliance!)
- DFO report on compliance shared with ENGOs in a timely manner
- ENGO input/feedback to DFO on Compliance/enforcement policy
- Identification of regional priorities re. compliance

## **Next Steps**

- Leela and AI to draft workplan for Coordinating Committee to review.
- Plan for 2 more face to face NFHCC meeting in 2007-08. Try to coordinate with National Workshop
- Circulate minutes of this meeting to Regional Directors at DFO
- Next NFHCC teleconference: March 16th, noon ET.
  - Leela and AI to send out draft agenda and call-in details.

## Meeting Minutes

### Approval of the Agenda.

#### Sue Kirby, ADM of Oceans and Habitat:

Objectives of changes made @ DFO in last 3 years are to improve effectiveness and efficiency of work.

Need to find best way to bring these goals together in context of Risk Management. How to work with available resources.

Partnership an important element, hopes that this partnership will strengthen over next few years, that this workshop will produce some forward looking plans/steps for working together.

Need more emphasis on monitoring – DFO now spends lot of time avoiding, mitigating impacts, but lack time/resources to monitor, follow up on compensation/protection measures, evaluate whether they are meeting their intentions, gather feedback.

Hoping for enforceable conditions re. monitoring that will enforce policy changes DFO will make; also requirement to consider habitat impacts in fishing activities. Small but very significant step, as hasn't been recognized under current Act.

Federal Provincial Responsibilities – DFO has traditionally negotiated MOUs with provinces for habitat. Of proposed changes in current bill, fed/prov aspects are least understood. Feds not proposing to delegate habitat protection, Minister remains responsible. Rather, are trying to work out equivalency of outcome re. provincial regulations available for delivery.

Would like input of this group on this process, focused on outcomes. Also input on monitoring – what moves need to be made in this direction, how to work together?

Introductions – RCEN and DFO

#### Comments:

-ENGOS want to see C-45 much stronger esp. with regards to habitat management. Feel Canada is behind other countries in this legislation.

-ENGOS not opposed to emphasis on outcomes, but tools in C-45 are more helpful to government than to ENGOS. Public has huge role to play in making sure government does the right thing.

- Partnerships with citizens, stewardship groups are important – sometimes feel underappreciated. These groups are continuing to grow, very active.
- Important to engage fishing communities, have been left out of this process. Consultation typically occurs with industry. New Act doesn't ensure sustainable development from fishers' perspective.

DFO Presentation: Legal, policy and program frameworks for conservation and protection of fish and fish habitat in Canada – see handout in binder.

- Note distinction between fish, fisheries, fisheries resources, fish habitat – different jurisdictions (i.e. federal vs. provincial)
- DFO 'Stakeholders': include ENGOs, First Nations, industry, and other interested parties.
- In 2004 DFO invited CEN to participate in workshop on EPMP, with other organizations, CEN turned down invite.
- in the past, DFO lacked structure for outreach issues. Now trying to implement procedures, operationalize. But need to use lawful tools.

-DFO Science now having discussions with Patrice regarding establishing a Centre of Expertise for Habitat out of St. John's. Federal and provincial scientists would work with client groups to determine research priorities. DFO funds, but also get funding from NSERC and other funding sources.

- Fisheries C&P Officers: Habitat third largest area of activity (see p. 24), down in 2006 from 2004 as fewer officers for this area, but still significant. Biggest component of activity is monitoring, surveillance, followed by investigations, court time.
- C&P extremely supportive of Tribunals that are proposed under new Act – see as extremely effective, need a lot of work to set them up but see as a very useful tool.
- Need to start targeting efforts: some industries may not be in full compliance of the Fisheries Act – need more monitoring, forensic investigation, and training of field staff. Also more emphasis on taking advantage of available data.
- Biggest challenge now is to truly integrate programs within C&P, strengthen partnerships with other groups/programs.

-DFO can provide further detail, documents on these programs and policies on request.

Comments/questions:

- C&P Officers are spread too thin, should ask for more resources.
  - Can Science identify some of their challenges?
- Large Science renewal process underway, Science Management Board linking Science priorities with DFO priorities. Majority of Science activities directed towards Fisheries Management. But client base expanding dramatically – Habitat Management, Species at Risk, Invasive Species (includes international work), etc. Such a diverse portfolio, 7 NHQ staff and 2 working on Habitat – resources are limited. Clients have to identify needs to Science.

-Definition of “Client” – does this refer to internal or external stakeholders?

Science provides a lot of information to other stakeholders/groups within government, acts as an enabling function.

-Bill C-45 mentions Fishery Officers and Guardians – are Guardians distinct, will they have different training from officers? Does this transfer from existing act?

Existing act designates officers, guardians, and inspectors (Section 4). Some First Nations groups still have guardians. C&P has had problems with Guardians but have retained it, valuable program in Maritimes. Need better training. Have a lot of the powers of Fishery Officers.

-Does DFO have own hydrographic services? These have been cut federally and provincially.

Yes, for marine areas and Great Lakes, but work closely with NRCan and Enviro Can for inland waters. Also have hydrographic engineers who can provide services.

-Arctic and new territories – new fishing licenses granted in Arctic. Services/monitoring for large scale commercial fishing operators in Arctic?

Large focus on the North right now. Lack of DFO presence, but has been developing quickly. March launch of International Polar Year, will hold related research activities over next 2 years. DFO looking at mapping of seabed, charting in the North as polar cap melts – shipping routes, safe access to ports. Also looking at resources in North, Center of Expertise on Marine Mammals, Science team on Mackenzie River Valley and Delta. Habitat has identified marine activity in North as a priority area. Government as a whole is developing a Northern Strategy, DFO will feed into this.

-Lack of capacity in DFO on East Coast for habitat related work. Science lacks ability to give advice based on their work. Where is science advice going to come from – will there be requirement to go outside DFO to peer reviewed literature? Often vast amounts of info on similar environments (US, Northeast Atlantic) that may be missed. Lack of data often used to authorize an investigation instead of considering alternatives to a proposed fishery.

DFO building partnerships: Centers of Expertise, partnerships with universities, establishing research networks with internal and external people. Always bring in outside researchers (university, industry) to peer review processes, publish advice on website, to ensure inclusive, transparent, current info used in decision making. Sending team to NOAA to ensure common approach to this work.

-What about Fisheries Management taking Science advice – has been a problem in past. How will Management take this advice and be seen as accountable – checks and balances to ensure that Management has to consider science-based info and consider alternatives? Science tries to remain distinct from Management – Science moving towards ecosystem science and ecosystem mgmt. Fisheries Management has been engaged in this process, open to moving in this direction, expect changes.

-ENGOS not in agreement with basic Risk Management Approach of government. May need to back up and discuss fundamental understanding of this approach – a priority for Workplan?

-Fish Habitat – ‘death by a thousand cuts’- Cumulative impact of little projects. Risk Management Approach doesn’t address this. Reduction of Fishery Officers in Central and Arctic is unacceptable, need more resources/officers. Prosecutions can have huge

impacts, do a lot of good. ENGOs still want to consider alternatives, not assume Risk Management Framework (RMF) as a given.

DFO: Need to have workshops with other people than are here, on how to apply RMF. Potential to better manage habitat under this framework.

Framework is not coming off the table. But having a more strategic Environmental Assessment process could improve ability to coordinate efforts. Recognize a lot of projects occur in isolation, not looking at cumulative effects. Government as a whole needs to look more strategically at efforts, can use RMF to do this.

EPMP is a continuous improvement plan, as progress forward, can add new elements. Need to focus on outcomes – not regulations, but compliance.

#### RCEN presentation – printout of slides available on request

(Currently updating presentation – will send out copies of new version)

- 2007 is 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary – will have AGM in Ottawa, invite DFO to be involved
- RCEN is a non-partisan organization, forum for ENGOs to network and collaborate. Not a consulting firm.
- Membership about 800 ENGOs across country- fluctuates as ENGOs are created and dissipate. Consists of regional networks of ENGOs in provinces and Yukon. ENGOs are members of regional networks, not directly of RCEN.
- Governance Structure: National Council – 11 regional reps, 10 caucus reps, 4 aboriginal reps, 4 francophone, 4 youth. Meet at least once annually at AGM
- Board of Directors: 8 reps elected from NC. Meet quarterly. Four Board Committees: Executive, Financial, Aboriginal Liaison, AGM.
- 10 National Caucuses: address specific issue, coordinate national efforts: Toxics, Mining, International, Atmosphere/Energy, Agriculture, EP&A, Forest, Health, Water/Fisheries/Oceans, Youth.
- Work with range of govt. departments: EC, NRCan, Ag Can, DFO, CIDA, Revenue Canada, DFAIT, Health Can, Voluntary Sector Initiative, etc.
- Services to ENGOs: coordination/organization, national database of members compiled from regional affiliates, outreach and information, research and education, capacity building.
- National and regional networks developed in parallel, supported by federal govt from beginning.
- Code of good practice on Policy dialogue: developed in 2001 to support civil servants in engaging stakeholders. Copies are available to all govt depts.
- RCEN unique model – no other country had similar structure, model has been adapted by UN and other countries, RCEN has worked with foreign delegations to develop similar processes.

#### Capacity Building services offered by RCEN:

- ENGO conference calls before and after meetings
- Website/Listserve – eg. for Fisheries Act Review
- Weekly E-bulletin accessible to public: posts calls for delegates, other activities
- Database for members
- Testing videoconferencing (work with DFO to set this up?)
- Engaging ENGOs: Delegate Selection Process – avoids govt cherry-picking ENGOs.

Govt will approach RCEN with request for number of ENGO delegates. RCEN puts out a call, sets up selection committee, selects delegates. Delegates communicate with other interested ENGOs before and after consultation, write reports, RCEN translates and posts on website.

Annual caucus meetings to build relationships, strategize, plan for the year, annual reports.

Three key points of RCEN:

- created by ENGOs, exist to help build capacity among ENGOs
- don't take position on issues; exist as forum to help ENGOs network.
- expertise is in process, not content.

ENGO members:

- Caucuses have had a lot of successes working with govt, especially work with CEAA.
- ENGOs face extreme capacity issues, rely heavily on volunteer time. RCEN coordination allows ENGOs to move forward on issues, cooperate nationally, improves effectiveness of ENGO work.
- British Columbia Environmental Network (BCEN) could not exist regionally without support from RCEN. Level of govt consultation with ENGOs depends on govt of the day. Regional connections/communications w. other regions, internationally relies heavily on RCEN. Delegates from other provinces, territories, countries have come through RCEN to BCEN to ask for help. E-bulletin keeps members informed of activities/work/issues across country, alerts them to information from other ENGOs/govt, input being solicited from govt, consultation processes etc.
- Listserve essential for members to share information, saves individuals a lot of time/effort. RCEN also brings members together on cross-border issues, facilitates face to face meetings with colleagues across the country, doing similar/related work.
- Regional networks have own structures, caucuses on relevant issues, give input to national level. Without RCEN, many members would not be able to be active at anything more than a local level. Grassroots organizations, volunteers rely on RCEN to enable participation on broader level issues. Great equalizer – allows smaller groups, volunteers to work with bigger national groups.

Questions:

-Do Caucuses take position on issues?

RCEN takes no position on issues. Debate over whether Caucuses can take positions. Official approach is that Caucuses enable member groups who want to take a position, to do so. Eg. Bill C45 – Water/Fisheries/Oceans Caucus does not take position, but coordinates activities of ENGOs who do. Individual ENGOs can take positions, sign on to position papers, but represent own groups.

-How to resolve differing positions?

Work on consensus, but support diverse viewpoints. Caucus members entitled to present different positions on an issue, or present/submit on specific issues that might not be presented in broad position. Only groups who agree will sign on to a position paper or support an effort. Eg. CEPA review – 90 ENGOs signed on to report.

DFO: Wants revised/translated versions of both DFO and RCEN presentations to be circulated to DFO regions across country, to strengthen understanding at regional level as well as national. Need to sort out how to get W/F/O caucus engaged, beyond participation of this Committee.

-DFO Aboriginal Liaison – working on how to collaborate with First Nations groups – interested in RCEN Aboriginal Liaison committee, their process and structures, would like more info.

-Mining Caucus – DFO plays big role in mining – interested in learning more about RCEN’s work. Will ask Caucus Coordinator to provide more info, mandate of caucus.

-A lot of RCEN members are volunteer – no paid staff.

Also includes major national groups with paid staff (‘Group of 8’)

RCEN involves these two streams, but provides more support to less enfranchised groups.

-Regional networks have same structure, non-position, non-advocacy.

#### Setting Priorities for 2007-08 Workplan

-Want to establish 3 priorities. Have several background documents (See binders)

-Coordinating Committee is here to establish priorities, plan activities, but will reach out to RCEN W/F/O Caucus to engage members in this work.

Process to identify priorities:

-Brainstorming from background documents – each person suggest top priority?

-Outcomes/Process tools – five “Cs”:

Communication: need to enhance at national and regional level, have ID’d some key areas/approaches already

Consultation: eg. Risk Mgmt framework, Habitat compliance model

Collaboration:

Coordination: how to coordinate partnerships, engage RCEN in some other DFO partnerships

Capacity: need to be cognizant of everyone’s capacity, be realistic, how much resources (funding/time) can be allocated to this work.

Ask everyone to write down their top priority, can identify from backgrounders.

Susanna’s report on ENGO-DFO working group came from distilling ENGO concerns from October workshop.

Should Fisheries Act Review be included in list of priorities, or is it already a given?

Agree that Habitat provisions of Fisheries Act will be a given priority, not on the table for this discussion.

Suggestions for priorities:

-Regional ENGO-DFO meetings

-Science basis for habitat compliance

-EPMP: Habitat compliance

- Science Priorities for Centre of Expertise on Habitat
- Communications/Education/Outreach Plan
- Enhanced enforcement of Fisheries Act
- Habitat Compliance modernization
- Compliance Education
- EPMP/Cumulative effects: Integrated Resource Planning
- Monitoring and Reporting
- Engagement of NGOs in habitat impacts of fishing
- Watershed management/Regional EAs
- Increased education/information

Aim of DFO modernization: Clarifying policy framework; clarifying roles/responsibilities btwn C&P Fishery Officers and Habitat staff; enhancing capacity w. 37 new FTEs for monitoring/compliance with regulations under the Act

Going to have regional differences in priorities, understanding of terms. Coordinating Committee can facilitate work on regional issues but want to ID national priorities here. Once priorities are established, can identify tools (use 5 Cs) to operationalize, and ID other actors who should be involved.

DFO: Need to focus goals within the scope of our mandate, choose realistic priorities in areas where we can practically implement change.

ENGOs: Just because something is slightly outside DFO's purview, shouldn't disregard it completely. Agree to choose priorities in areas relevant to people's mandate, but need to push the envelope a bit.

Everyone gets to weight priority areas using their own criteria - 5, 10, 25 cents between:

- Science: 80
- Habitat compliance/enforcement: 70
- Integrated resource planning/cumulative assessment/management/regional EAs/watershed management: 75
- Communication Education outreach :95
- Monitoring and reporting: 50

Discussion to clarify each of these areas before finalizing priorities:

Science:

- Having input from this group as to priorities for DFO Science groups' workplans, which are currently being developed. What are the questions?
- Scientific activity in Arctic – eg. why are salmon showing up?

Habitat Compliance/Enforcement:

- What is scientific basis?
- What is capacity?
- Compliance Versus Enforcement – alternatives to achieving goals?

-Strategic Enforcement – identifying which cases/industries are the most effective to enforce/prosecute in terms of sending a message, having an impact on other cases – best use of resources?

Integrated, resource management/ cumulative assessment/Regional EAs/Watershed mgmt:

- Would have to be a pilot project in one region
- Integrated resource planning happening already in some places
- Watershed management involves multiple jurisdictions – can be problematic
- Value added from integrated planning for areas involving marine and inland jurisdiction (Conservation NGO coalition releasing a paper recommending options next week, will address many of these issues)
- DFO acknowledges this as needed element, but difficult to achieve – return on investment has been low. DFO partnership with Conservation NGOs has prioritized this area, conservation groups argue that they are well-positioned to work in this field. This group may wish to back off this priority in recognition that it will be dealt with by conservation partnership. (List of Conservation groups in partnership has been circulated to this group).

Group does not agree to drop this priority entirely to Conservation groups. But will leave it on backburner for the moment – will get more information, monitor activities, get access to minutes, keep updated, identify opportunities to collaborate.

Where does Risk Management fit into these priorities? Under Science? Integrated resource planning?

Risk Management vs. Alternatives Mgmt: do we try to minimize the risk of an activity, vs. do we look for alternatives to that activity?

Want to ensure that an assessment of the Risk Management Framework can be included as an outcome, have had request from several ENGOs. This could fit under Science?

Communication/Education/Outreach:

- Coordinate efforts – ID deliverables, actors, (5 C's – this would occur in next steps of this process and wouldn't need to be separate priority?)
- Educating and informing w. respect to DFO Science and Habitat activities more broadly, between ENGOs and DFO
- Ensuring understanding of issues/level playing field – people coming to discussions with different/conflicting understanding of concepts/problems, eg. Risk Management (again, also an overarching goal of other activities)
- Don't want to preach to converted, argue over nuances among actors with similar objectives. Need to work on communication program to groups who don't have same interests/goals, more broadly? Not going to mount a national public media campaign.
- Communication/consultation needed with ENGOs so they can have input on policy, plans that will be shared with broader audience. ENGOs need tools, information to be able to communicate their positions, concerns.

Agree to drop this as a separate priority, incorporate as an outcome within selected priorities.

Monitoring and Reporting:

-This is an area where DFO can make real improvements, and where input from ENGOs can make a big difference. Eg. what mitigation measures are effective?

-Major priority in Western region.

-Could be integrated under another priority (Compliance/enforcement?), but can't take on everything with limited resources. Maybe some of desired outcomes could be listed under Compliance.

Agree to drop this as a separate topic – try to include relevant outcomes within other priorities.

Some priorities might involve regional activity as well as national.

**Lunch**

**First Priority: Role of Science in Habitat Management**

Description:

-ENGO input into DFO Research priorities

-ENGO questions regarding DFO activities/research agenda

-Conducting primary research vs. collecting/reviewing/analyzing literature (provision of advice?)

-How is scientific info being used – to fill gaps/improve knowledge; to improve decision making; or to change management approaches (eg. ecosystem management, Risk Management)

-Review of science supporting Risk Management Framework, Pathways, and alternatives

-Science based decisions vs. precautionary principle

-role of traditional knowledge

Outcomes/Deliverables:

-Healthy fisheries, fish habitat, and aquatic ecosystems

-List of priorities for research on habitat – especially for DFO Centers of Expertise

-Report from workshop on science basis of risk management approach and alternatives

-ENGO participation in DFO review of habitat impacts of fishing gear

-Better understanding of how science is used in DFO decision making (longer term)

Activities, Actors and Timelines:

1. Write out description of priority

\*Kim

2. Recommend that DFO engage RCEN in review of habitat impacts of fishing gear (to be undertaken by DFO, Fisheries and Aquaculture Management Branch)

\*AI to follow up and confirm that Coordinating Committee recommends DFO engage RCEN in this review process.

3. Could also do a primary brainstorming of research priorities for THIS fiscal year, via listserv, provide basic info on COEs, collect quick survey of input from ENGOS and prioritize (by end of March?), submit to DFO for information

\*Kim to forward translated info on COEs to Leela (2 weeks), who will post on Listserv with note to review material, submit recommendations for priorities (2 weeks), Coordinating Committee ENGOS will decide if need to prioritize and submit to DFO.

4. National Workshop on role of Science in Habitat (2 days, sometime in 2007-08):

-improve understanding of how science is used in DFO decision making

-identify priorities for research for COEs for next fiscal year

-explore science basis of DFO risk management approaches

Could distribute backgrounders before workshop, some info on COEs and their focus, so people come more prepared.

\*Susanna and Nick will be on organizing committee for this workshop; Leela to put out call for 2 other ENGOS (1 week to respond). Send draft call to CC ENGOS for review before posting it. Martha will be on Selection Committee. Once RCEN ENGOS selected, get them in touch with Nick. Committee will consider location, budget, timing, numbers, etc. and propose budget to DFO.

Group agrees that 2 priorities in addition to Fisheries Act Review is more realistic than 3. Focus on Science and Habitat Compliance/Enforcement. Will follow work of DFO and Conservation Groups on Integrated resource planning/Regional EAs/watershed management, and look for opportunities to participate. (Nick and Al will take lead in keeping group informed).

### **Second Priority: Habitat Compliance and Enforcement**

#### Description:

- ENGO input on Compliance policy (strategic and implementation) and stewardship
- Habitat Compliance Modernization: more strategic monitoring

#### Outcomes/Deliverables:

- Marine and freshwater fish habitat is protected
- Measures/indicators of success (biological, chemical, physical, social)
- Better understanding of compliance policy
- Better compliance/enforcement (99.999% compliance!)
- DFO report on compliance shared with ENGOS in a timely manner
- ENGO input/feedback to DFO on Compliance/enforcement policy
- Identification of regional priorities re. compliance

#### Activities, Actors and Timelines:

1. RCEN to approach National Round Table on Environment and Economy to work on funding/mechanisms indicators for fish habitat (marine and freshwater)

Look into existing measures – eg. report from Commissioner on Sustainable Development, National Round Table on Environment and Economy

\*Martha and Leela to draft letter for CC ENGOs to review and submit to Round Table.

2. Distribute draft habitat compliance policy for ENGO feedback.

\*Olivier and Leela to draft proposal to hire one ENGO to solicit and compile feedback (submit to DFO within 2 weeks).

Nick to send translated versions of draft policy to Leela by end of March. Leela will circulate with a note asking for ENGO feedback to be sent to selected delegate, who will compile and submit to DFO by mid-May.

3. Regional workshops on compliance: January – March 2008

\*DFO is developing policy, will be doing training. Regional managers would be in charge of organizing workshops, could engage ENGOs either through RCEN or regional affiliates.

DFO will consult regional managers at workshop next week and follow up with Coordinating Committee re. process at next conference call. Workshop in each province/territory?

Inclusion of Aboriginal groups: DFO committed to consult with Aboriginal groups on many activities. Proposing provincial workshops to update them on EPMP.

**Next Steps:**

Leela and Al to draft workplan for Coordinating Committee to review.

Next NFHCC teleconference: March 16<sup>th</sup>, noon ET.

Leela and Al to send out draft agenda and call-in details.

Next face to face NFHCC meeting: Plan for 2 more in 2007-08. Piggyback on National Workshop?

How is work of this committee communicated to Regional Directors at DFO?

Will be debriefed, minutes of this meeting will be circulated.

Closing Remarks: Feel workshop was very productive, accomplished a lot, more positive than some people expected.