

Executive Summary

FRASER SALMON ROADMAP INITIATIVE – CAMPBELL RIVER WORKSHOP

June 22-23, 2011 • Thunderbird Hall • Campbell River, BC

Participants: the workshop was attended by a diverse group of approximately 30 First Nations from the Fraser Watershed and Island/Approach areas and 6 DFO delegates

Fraser Salmon Roadmap Process objective for March 2011 through February 2012: to develop an Engagement Framework for Fisheries & Oceans Canada & First Nations to initiate the negotiation of arrangements for the collaborative management of Fraser River salmon

Focus and process of the Campbell River Workshop: Much of the workshop was structured as breakout groups which focused on gathering participant input on: components of an engagement; framework; agreement template; scope of topics and activities for collaborative management; collaborative management components; leadership engagement; Letter of Understanding between First Nations and DFO; and communications.

Workshop materials: A number of documents were presented in the form of a *Roadmap Workbook*. Presentations about the Roadmap initiative's objectives, phases, timeline, actions, milestones, and progress to date, as well as linkages to other co-management processes, were also delivered by members of the Fraser Salmon Roadmap Planning Group (FSRPG). All workshop documentation is available for download from the FRAFS website at www.frafs.ca

Outcomes: Workshop participants provided a wealth of valuable input and feedback to the FSRPG, which will help to shape the future of the Roadmap process.

A key outcome of the workshop was a recommendation, strongly supported by workshop participants, to develop a Letter of Understanding (LOU) between Fraser River and Island/Approach First Nations and DFO, along with a briefing note that clearly describes the Roadmap initiative. A draft LOU will be prepared over the summer and will be a major focus of the October 2011 Roadmap Workshop.

Workshop evaluation: participants' responses to the evaluation questionnaire revealed that both First Nations and DFO are growing more optimistic about achieving a collaborative management arrangement through the Roadmap process. (Full evaluation results are included at the end of this report.)

Action Items for the Fraser Salmon Roadmap Planning Group:

- Produce a summary of the Campbell River workshop including participant evaluations
- Seek more input from First Nation communities on the workshop documents and on the Roadmap process overall
- Draft the LOU and accompanying briefing note (simple and straightforward)
- Update the *Engagement Framework*, *Agreement Template*, and other documents based on feedback from participants
- Simplify language, use consistent terminology, produce a new consistent glossary, refine communications process, and tailor messages that are audience specific.

A full Report on Proceedings of the Campbell River Roadmap Workshop is follows. For more information, please contact FRAFS at info@frafs.ca or visit our website at www.frafs.ca.

Report on Proceedings

FRASER SALMON ROADMAP INITIATIVE – CAMPBELL RIVER WORKSHOP

June 22-23, 2011 • Thunderbird Hall • Campbell River, BC

Workshop Attendance

Approximately 30 First Nations delegates/staff attended the Campbell River Roadmap Workshop, along with 6 DFO staff. Approximately 20 First Nations communities and organizations were represented.

Facilitation Team: Marcel Shepert, Donald Golob (Delaney and Associates)		
	First Nations Delegates	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Fraser Salmon Roadmap Planning Group (FSRPG)	Deana Machin, First Nations Fisheries Council (FNFC) Ken Malloway, First Nations Fisheries Council (FNFC) Pat Matthew, Fraser River Aboriginal Fisheries Secretariat (FRAFS) Susan Anderson Behn, Island Marine Approach Working Group (IMAWG) (Regrets: Murray Ned, FRAFS; Tony Roberts Jr., IMAWG)	Barry Huber, DFO Corey Jackson, DFO
Workshop Participants	Errol Sam, Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Cheri Ayers, Cowichan Tribes Alberta Billy, Campbell River First Nation Daniel Billy, Cape Mudge First Nation Chris Cook, Namgis First Nation Jerry Alfred, Namgis First Nation/IMAWG Greg Wadham, Namgis First Nation/IMAWG Kristin Thomas, Halalt First Nation Dan Claxton, Tsawout First Nation Rupert Wilson, Kwakiutl First Nation Kelsey Campbell, A-Tlegay Fisheries Kim Duncan, A-Tlegay Fisheries Ray Silvey, IMAWG Tim Peters, Chawathil First Nation Flavian Harry, Tsawwassen First Nation Robert Hope, Yale First Nation Dominic Hope, Yale First Nation Richard Sparrow, Musqueam First Nation Ernie Crey, Sto:lo Tribal Council/FRAFS EC Tom Hewitt, Skeetchestn Band/Shuswap Nation TC Pat Matthew, Secwepemc Fisheries Commission Howie Wright, Okanagan Nation Alliance/FNFC Gord Sterritt, Northern Shuswap TC/FRAFS EC David Loewen, Takla Lake First Nation Matthew Kinch, First Nations Fisheries Council Aimee Arsenault, FRAFS	Adrian Wall, DFO Gerry Kelly, DFO Terri Bonnet, DFO Chad Rudiak, DFO

Workshop Summary

Day 1 – June 22, 2011

Welcome to the Weiwaikum Territory: Curtis Wilson, Campbell River Band Councillor

Opening Prayer: Alberta Billy, Campbell River Band Elder

Workshop Introduction and Information Sharing

The workshop began with an overview of the Fraser Salmon Roadmap process (objectives, phases, timeline, actions, milestones, progress to date) and the workshop agenda. Additional information about the Roadmap process can be found in the *Overview of the Fraser Salmon Roadmap Initiative* background document, which is available for download on the FRAFS website at www.frafs.ca. All documents presented at the workshop were provided in hard copy as part of the *Fraser Salmon Roadmap Workbook*, which is also available for download on the FRAFS website. These documents were prepared by the FSRPG and the Facilitation Team.

The Workbook includes the following documents:

- Fraser Salmon Roadmap Workshop Agenda – June 22-23, 2011
- Overview of the Fraser River Salmon Roadmap Initiative (background document)
- Guide to Main Concepts and Terminology
- Roadmap Workshops March 2011-February 2012 – Objectives, Timeline, Actions, Milestones
- Engagement Framework (last updated June 22, 2011)
- Agreement Development Process and Agreement template (elements outline)
- Scope of Activities for Participant Consideration
- Fraser Salmon Roadmap – Update on progress
- Fraser Salmon Roadmap Phases (2009-2013)

Issues Raised by the Participants

A number of issues were raised by participants in response to the information provided to this point in the Workshop.

Scope of management issues:

- It was stressed that it was very important for DFO to let First Nations know what they are willing to give up in terms of management authority to First Nations, and what management opportunities will be presented to First Nations.
- It was identified that there is concern among First Nations that as we move forward in the process, DFO will not be willing to be as expansive as First Nations expected in sharing management authority and responsibility.
- DFO responded that it will be important for local DFO staff to have a direct, ongoing link with DFO in Ottawa so they are involved in these earlier stages of the Roadmap process, and can confirm their support for the process. DFO identified that an internal strategy is being developed to assist with this.
- It was suggested that a Letter of Understanding (LOU) signed by DFO that sets out what management authority and management opportunities for First Nations would be up for discussion for inclusion in an agreement to manage Fraser Salmon would be a useful, important step in addressing concerns.

Communications:

- It was also stressed that First Nations want feedback from DFO on what they have heard from First Nations at each Workshop.
- It was identified that First Nations feel they are fully engaging in the Roadmap process, and this is not being reciprocated to the same degree by DFO.
- It was also identified that the language used to describe the type of relationship there will be between First Nations and DFO in relation to managing Fraser Salmon is important; for example, using “joint management”, “co-management”, or “collaborative management”.
- It was expressed that reaching out to communities that are not currently engaged in the Roadmap process will be an important part of the communication process.
- *Guide to Main Concepts and Terminology* – It was identified that the concepts and terminology were confusing and not easily understood by the workshop participants.

The Components of the Engagement Framework

The *Engagement Framework* document included in the Workbook was reviewed with specific reference to the partial list of Framework Components presented in the document. It was identified that its various components (e.g. contact list; Engaging First Nations leadership; Scope of fisheries management issues; relationship to other processes; Agreement Template) would be discussed to varying degrees at the Workshop. It was noted that significant work has yet to be completed on components such as bringing together information that exists on the DFO and First Nations vision statements, other negotiated agreements, treaties and court decisions related to fisheries management, guiding principles for engagement, and DFO and First Nations authority.

To assist the FSRPG, the participants were divided into breakout groups of approximately six and asked to discuss, answer, and report on two questions in relation to the components of the Engagement Framework:

1. **Is the list complete?**
2. **Is this a useful way to organize the components within the framework?**

Summary of input provided by the groups:

- It was suggested that the FSRPG develop a work plan that includes products, milestones, and more detail than was included in the *Fraser Salmon Roadmap Timeline* document.
- Linkages to treaty and treaty processes – need to build in aspects to the framework and agreement to reflect relationships that are already established.
- The potential for a Tier 3 component – need a commitment for our group to meet with other sectors to discuss different management approaches, or a more formalized Tier 3 arrangement in the form of a link to a multi-interest body.
- Information regarding other agreements and mechanisms, treaty relationships in other jurisdictions in Canada and the US, etc.
- Need to clearly distinguish between engaging First Nations communities and First Nations political leaders; these will require distinct engagement/communication processes.
- Communication perspective – guiding principles for engagement would be at the top.
- Need to identify resources to complete the work (requires commitment of resources from DFO).
- Timeline for engagement should be a component (short and long term goals).
- Evaluation framework – to be developed at the outset (short and long term).
- Need a mechanism to go back and adjust/refine the process as needed – the framework should be a “living document”.
- More information/analysis on other case studies and models to review before developing the agreement template; examine the pros and cons of other agreements.

- How will this agreement function in relation to decision making? Need to identify decision making structures and representation.
- Inclusion of a governance heading - some of the components listed would be headings within an agreement, and some would be headings within a governance structure.
- A clear accountability structure is required.

Fraser Salmon Roadmap Initiative and Linkages to other Co-Management Initiatives

In relation to the 'Relationship to other processes' component of the *Engagement Framework*, a presentation was given on the linkages between the Roadmap and other fisheries co-management initiatives currently underway in the province. The presentation discussed the potential scope and scales of co-management, the work of the First Nations Fisheries Council Co-management Working Group, and examples of joint management processes at different scales.

The *Fraser Salmon Roadmap Initiative and Linkages to other Co-Management Initiatives* presentation is also available for download on the FRAFS website.

Lunch

Lunch prayer: Chris Cook (Namgis First Nation, Native Brotherhood of BC).

Agreement Template

The Agreement Template component identified in the *Engagement Framework* and detailed in the *Agreement Template* document included in the Workbook was discussed and reviewed. It was explained that the steps in the Agreement Development Process were suggested as an approach in the J. Gardner report commissioned by the FSRPG, and that the elements of the Agreement Template were compiled from other existing, related agreements.

To assist the FSRPG, the participants were divided into groups of approximately six and asked to discuss, answer, and report on three questions in relation to the *Agreement Template*:

1. **Is the outline of the elements complete?**
2. **Are the three steps a useful way to organize an agreement template?**
3. **Are the sub-steps complete and ordered properly?**

Existing elements:

- Foundation agreement to initiate collaborative management negotiations
- Collaborative management agreement elements
- Implementation action plan

Summary of input provided by the groups:

- The terminology used to describe the various documents was found to be too confusing for participants, considering the large volume of material provided.
- Some First Nations participants felt that it would be useful to hear DFO's thoughts on Agreement Template elements first, as any work done in this area by First Nations could be derailed if DFO were to disagree.
- It was expressed that the Agreement Template was a good piece of work that will serve as a great start to building an agreement. The Workshop participants also agreed that *Agreement Template* elements could help to inform the development of an LOU.
- It was expressed that many of these elements should be included in the LOU (e.g. identify the parties to the agreement; items # 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.9; elements listed under # 2 – including but not limited to those elements).

- It was suggested that the LOU could serve as a foundational agreement that outlines the purpose, goals, and objectives (step 1); these components could then be lifted from the LOU to be included in the actual agreement (step 2).
- Difference between bottom up and top down – specifying “grassroots First Nations” reflects a desire among First Nations to control and manage their own fisheries.
- Need to note the type of review being done, i.e. the review of and references to other documents and agreements (e.g. 1993 Watershed Agreement, Yukon Agreement, etc.).
- Brenda Gaertner said this in her report that elements of a co-management agreement should be addressed one at a time in order to build slowly toward a lasting agreement.
- Should the Tier 1 component exist under this framework or separately?
- Need to include a clear representation structure, and a procedural component describing how the parties to the agreement will interact.
- Decision making process step needs to be more explicit, clearly described, and understood by all parties.
- It was expressed that clarifying the scope of the agreement would be an important step before the *Template Agreement* could be approved; however, other participants felt that the *Template Agreement* would form a good framework for a discussion about the scope.

Scope of Topics/Activities for Collaborative Management

The *Scope of Activities for Participant Consideration* document included in the Workbook was discussed and reviewed. It was explained that the items listed in the document comprised the FSRPG’s first attempt to develop a list of topics/activities to begin to provide detail to element 1.4 (Scope of topics for collaborative management) and to element 2.1 (Management activities listed in the Agreement Template) of the *Agreement Template*.

To assist the FSRPG, the participants were divided into groups of approximately six and asked to discuss, answer, and report on three questions in relation to the items listed in the *Scope of Activities for Participant Consideration*:

1. **Is the list of topics/activities complete?**
2. **Should all of these elements be included in an agreement?**
3. **Is it a useful way to think about and organize these topics/activities?**

Summary of input provided by the groups:

- Clarification about funding options
- Process for decision making (at various levels – local, watershed, etc.)
- Discussion about enforcement (local First Nations as the enforcement authority in their areas)
- Roles and responsibilities
- Capacity building and training
- Dispute resolution process (among First Nations and between First Nations and DFO)
- Science and research (joint technical committee, incorporation of ATK/TEK, fish health, DNA sampling, science planning, etc.)
- Data collection – expanded to include management and analysis, agreement for use of common data sets, sharing data, etc.
- Will the topics and activities only include First Nations fisheries, or also other fisheries that impact FSC (e.g. commercial, sport, international, etc.)?
- Communication – expanded to include communication with grassroots community members and political leadership
- Differentiate and separate the types of policy that can be addressed at different scales

- Stewardship – restoration and rebuilding of local stocks
- Water management
- Habitat – stewardship, restoration, etc.
- Under funding – recognize that into the future, third party funding will be an important part of implementing agreements, and recognizing that federal funding is decreasing.
- Collaborative management of test fisheries.
- Program development – review of existing programs (e.g. SEP), development of new programs and program renewal.
- First Nations fisheries protocol agreement added under fisheries planning
- Collective planning with other sectors
- Using test fish for FSC in times of shortage
- First Nations to manage their own fisheries
- Restorative justice – change this to “community justice”
- Under enforcement – include First Nations enforcement protocol
- Depending on the level of the agreement, whether between Canada and the watershed or individual First Nations, the scope will be different; policy and program development should be specific to Fraser salmon.
- Scope of activities that reflects joint management activities, not just fitting First Nations issues in with DFO’s current management system.
- Need to develop a third pillar of law – common, civil, and *aboriginal* law – to govern how management will proceed under the agreement.
- Describe engagement at different levels.
- In the US, fisheries management is based on 4 H’s – habitat/harvest/hatchery/hydro – which helps to define the scope.

Closing Remarks and Outline of Day 2

Everyone was thanked for their participation in the first day of the Workshop. The agenda and topics of discussion for Day 2 were briefly reviewed, and participants were asked to be ready to start at 9:00 a.m. on Day 2.

Day 2 – June 23, 2011

Opening Prayer: Alberta Billy, Campbell River Band Elder

Objectives of the Workshop and Review of the Agenda/Recap of Day 1

The objectives of the workshop and the agenda for Day 2 were reviewed with the participants. A brief recap of Day 1 and the progress made was provided.

Collaborative Management Components

The *Collaborative Management Components* document (agreement components, actions required, timeline, etc.) included in the Workbook was discussed and reviewed. Workshop participants offered the following input:

- Communications between workshops need to be improved; participants would like to stay up to date on the progress made by the FSRPG.
- A dispute resolution/appeal process will be required as part of a collaborative management agreement in case of conflict.
- While this agreement will be focused specifically on Fraser Salmon, it was noted that once

established, the agreement could serve as a template for other groups and other species/issues.

- Stewardship and habitat restoration is important to many groups.
- First Nations expressed that DFO must clearly state how far they are willing to go in terms of a collaborative management arrangement with First Nations.
- Concern was expressed about the timeline, and whether the process was being rushed due to the expiration of PICFI funding in 2012. DFO expressed that they will continue to advocate for the Roadmap process in order to seek continued funding.

Leadership Engagement

An update was provided on the First Nations Fisheries Council's engagement with political leaders through the BC First Nations Leadership Council, and linkages to other fisheries processes in BC. It was noted that while more and more First Nations groups are participating in the Roadmap process, the development of a Letter of Understanding would likely draw the interest and participation of political leadership.

To assist the FSRPG, the participants were divided into groups of approximately six and asked to discuss, answer, and report on three questions in relation to leadership engagement:

1. **How close are we to engaging political leadership in the Roadmap process?**
2. **What does the engagement look like?**
3. **What are the pieces?**
4. **What is the process?**

Summary of input provided by the groups:

- It was suggested that a briefing with the First Nations Summit would provide an opportunity to put this on the radar with the political leadership. Endorsement from the Summit would have a broad reach, and would raise the profile of the Roadmap process.
- The LOU will be a key piece of work that will help to engage leadership. A briefing note describing the Roadmap process would need to accompany the LOU. A timeline of December 2011 was suggested for finalizing the LOU.
- Communication document for Chiefs and Councils that identifies the benefits of the agreement, along with reassurance that those groups will not be left out if they choose to engage later in the process.
- DFO has work to do internally about identifying what's on the table.
- Need to be clear that the agreement will not detract from or supersede treaty agreements, but could actually enhance the ability of First Nations to have a stronger role in management (agreement will serve as a complement to treaties, not undermine them).
- Need to demonstrate value in order to attract groups to the Roadmap process. Putting allocation on the table was suggested; however, others felt that this process should not be about determining allocation.
- Committed funding is needed.
- What are the links to the larger groups, e.g. FNFC, UBCIC, BCAFN, Summit, etc.? How could this process be influenced by the Cohen Commission?
- Engagement with all First Nations that are accessing Fraser River stocks – e.g. regional meetings (will need to look at funding efficiencies), newsletter bulletins, etc.
- The preamble to the LOU/briefing note should recognize the authority of both DFO and First Nations.

Letter of Understanding

On Day 1 of the workshop, it was recommended that a Letter of Understanding between First Nations and DFO would be a valuable interim step toward establishing a watershed agreement. This was strongly supported by workshop participants. In breakout groups of approximately six, the workshop participants were asked to identify the elements that would be included in the LOU.

Summary of input provided by the groups:

- The elements listed in the *Foundation Agreement to Initiate Collaborative Management Negotiations* document (p. 10 in the Workbook) could be included in the LOU.
- Outline how parties come together on common objectives, and what the partnership will look like.
- Include an “out clause” for those who wish to disengage.
- Outline milestones and work to be done.
- Funding commitments for the process
- Scope of work
- Dispute resolution process
- Roles and responsibilities of each party
- Evaluation phase
- Outline the limitations of the LOU/agreement
- Definitions of terms (e.g. co-management)
- Clear statement of how far DFO is willing to go.
- Who will sign the agreement – Leadership Council delegates? Community based?
- How First Nations will structure themselves (Tier 1)
- Joint governance (First Nations and DFO standing together on management decisions)
- Opening statement about parties to the agreement (includes First Nations, DFO, First Nations organizations)
- Scope of the collaborative agreement
- Schedule/timeline for negotiation and implementation
- Preamble indicating that DFO and First Nations wish to enter into a collaborative management relationship
- Without prejudice to positions by parties involved in litigation
- Commitment to conservation and sustainability
- Increase or define First Nations’ share of Canadian TAC
- Address priority access for First Nations to Fraser Salmon
- Address pilot sales and economic opportunities
- Role of ATK/TEK
- Address termination or review clause (e.g. review every 5 years?)
- The LOU should be a 1 page document. Further information and explanation can be provided in a preamble/briefing document.
- Clarify relationships to other agreements
- Recognize that not all First Nations will have the capacity to participate in all aspects of the agreement, but that it will be open and transparent
- State the intention to move First Nations toward a decision making role about the management of Fraser River salmon
- State that measurable targets will be developed, and a process for tracking progress
- Need to determine who will be coordinating this process (best to build capacity rather than rolling this into current processes).

- Need to determine the appropriate tone to most effectively present this to leadership – formal or more open style? Need to seek input from political representatives.
- Identify interim steps – how will the management regime change leading up to the implementation of an agreement? (First Nations don't want to wait 2 years while the agreement is developed to see results).

Lunch

Lunch prayer: Alberta Billy (Campbell River First Nation Elder).

Communications

The final item for discussion in breakout groups was the communication process, including reporting back to communities, and the review of a draft contact list for First Nations organizations in BC with an interest in Fraser River salmon. In breakout groups of approximately six, Workshop participants were asked the following questions:

1. **What do you need to take back to your communities/organizations?**
2. **What are the key messages?**
3. **How can you help spread the word about the Roadmap process?**
4. **Who needs to be added to the contact list?**

Summary of input provided by the groups:

- Workshop participants need a document to bring back to their communities that describes the Roadmap process and progress made to date.
- Also need an overview statement about the LOU that clarifies the intention. Need to clarify that First Nations don't have to sign on to the LOU immediately, but that they can attend the Roadmap workshops and build their level of engagement slowly. Need to clarify that the LOU is the next step, which will help to attract new participants.
- Need to ensure distribution of materials related to the Roadmap process (other processes besides the FRAFS email list?). What mechanisms for communication will be most useful?
- 2 stages of communication – 1) Report out from the current Workshop over the summer; 2) in September, start preparing participants for what's going to happen at the October Workshop.
- Trouble with complexity of language in the documents was noted – need to clarify.
- First Nations and DFO need to have parallel processes between workshops, and come back and meaningfully discuss next steps.
- Need more engagement from groups in the mid and upper Fraser River.
- Communications should highlight not only the Fraser watershed, but also the participation of marine/approach First Nations.
- Add policy analysts from UBCIC, BCAFN and Summit to the Roadmap distribution – get staff involved in order to get leadership involved.
- Current participants are only advisors to the process; need leadership involvement from both First Nations and DFO.
- Seek advice from other groups on how to communicate?
- It was suggested that regional meetings could be held to get the message out (Lower/Mid/Upper River, etc.).
- DFO also has their own internal communications issues – need to ensure that the information reaches the appropriate people within DFO.

Workshop Evaluation

Workshop participants were asked to fill out an evaluation about the Campbell River Workshop, and the Roadmap process in general. The results of the evaluation are summarized in Appendix 2.

Summary and Closing Comments

The FSRPG identified the following next steps, which will guide their work between now and the October Workshop:

- Producing workshop summary report
- Summarize the results of the Roadmap Workshop evaluations
- Seek more input from communities about the documents presented and reviewed during this workshop, and about the Roadmap process overall
- Draft the LOU and accompanying briefing note (simple and straightforward)
- Updates to the *Engagement Framework*, *Agreement Template*, and specific topics and activities based on feedback from participants
- Simplify language, use consistent terminology, produce a new consistent glossary, refine communications process, and tailor messages that are audience specific.

Closing comments from Workshop participants:

- There is a lack of funding to get people to meetings
- Streamline documents and communications, cut down on jargon
- Trying to communicate about the Roadmap without specific information about what is and is not on the table presents a challenge for participants
- Concern about the tight timeline – doesn't help to build trust between First Nations and DFO
- The duty of consultation remains regardless of whether or not an agreement is in place.
- If no agreement can be reached, what is the alternative?
- Communications should not be dealt with last on the agenda, as it is a very important part of the process.
- It was suggested that the FSRPG should do a pre-check with participants prior to distributing revised documents to all groups.
- Need to develop a strategy for addressing rights holder issues – need to remember that First Nations rights are held at the community level.
- It was expressed that DFO is confident that we can reach an agreement on fisheries management that works for both parties. Moving forward with a structured framework and key objectives will help us to be more strategic about funding and work planning.

APPENDIX 1: Fraser Salmon Roadmap Workshop Agenda

Day 1: Wednesday, June 22, 2011 – 9:00am-4:00pm

8:30am	Meeting room open, coffee and snacks
9:00am	Welcome, opening prayer, introductions
9:30am	Objectives of the workshop and agenda review Update on progress – issues raised and how they are being addressed Fraser Salmon Roadmap Action Plan and Timeline
10:30am	Refreshment break
10:45am	What is an Engagement Framework?
11:15am	Roles and potential linkages between Fraser Salmon Roadmap and other co-management processes
12:00pm	Lunch
12:45pm	Facilitated session: Developing selected components of an Engagement Framework: What are essential ingredients for a management agreement?
2:00pm	Refreshment break
3:15pm	Continue with Engagement Framework components
3:45pm	Closing remarks and setting the stage for Day 2

Day 2: Thursday, June 23, 2011 – 9:00am-2:30pm

8:30am	Meeting room open, coffee and snacks
9:00am	Welcome to Day 2, new participants introductions, agenda for today
9:30am	Preparing for Leadership participation – a key component in the Engagement Framework
9:45pm	Facilitated session: Protocols required for reviewing, negotiating and ratifying a management agreement for Fraser salmon
10:30am	Refreshment break
10:45am	Continue protocol discussion
12:00pm	Lunch
12:45pm	Facilitated session: How do we communicate about the Engagement Framework? What are the key messages?
2:00pm	Closing remarks

APPENDIX 2: Summary of Results from the Fraser Salmon Roadmap Evaluations

Of the approximately 30 people who attended the workshop on Day 2, 27 completed a Fraser Salmon Roadmap evaluation questionnaire. The results are summarized below.

What are your thoughts about the Campbell River Workshop? (27 responses)

- Need dedicated funding for the process
- Time constraints: Too much to cover in 2 days; not enough time in breakout groups to provide sufficient input on complex questions; briefing individuals on the questions prior to the workshop would be helpful in the future
- Need clearer definitions and terminology; too much jargon; too many documents and materials presented; need to streamline content and language and ensure consistency; use diagrams to illustrate how the various pieces fit together
- Good facilitation, well organized and structured; the pre-workshop work of the FSRPG helped attendees to contribute and be productive in the breakout groups; more defined outcomes than previous workshops
- Good atmosphere, tone, and productive discussion at this workshop; good input from participants
- Workshop was product oriented, but the scope of the agreement needs to be clarified
- Workshop clarified some questions and concerns from community leadership
- Good opportunity to develop an agreement for co-management
- Good progress made (in particular, the proposed LOU is a significant step forward); building momentum
- Great workshop venue; tables should be arranged in groups if having breakout sessions

What are your thoughts about the Fraser Salmon Roadmap Process? (26 responses)

- More progress is needed; move forward in a timely fashion
- Concern about tight timelines
- Need to communicate to First Nations more regularly (between workshops); need to demonstrate progress
- Good intentions behind the process
- Need to expand to address all BC salmon stocks of concern
- Support and optimism was expressed by several participants
- Whole coast should be involved, as everything is connected
- Need to be clear on whether DFO is willing to make changes, and how far they are willing to go, where we want to end up
- Good progress to date; process is moving in a positive and constructive direction
- If the process fails, it will be several steps backwards
- Under resourced, under staffed, and too isolated from other processes
- Need clear goals/targets/timelines
- Make the process easier to understand with clearer language, streamlined materials, etc.
- In order to attract First Nations decision makers, DFO must participate as decision makers
- Much better progress and focus in the last few workshops, picking up momentum
- Planning group has a well articulated and iterative plan

How optimistic were you that the Roadmap Process would help First Nations and DFO move toward collaborative management of Fraser River Salmon when you first became involved? (19 responses)

- Eight (8) people said “not optimistic”: Concerned about previous track record of agreements; sceptical but there are always doubts in new processes; past Roadmap workshops felt limited in progress and frustrating; many years of history to be healed; not optimistic that could build a solid Tier 1 process.
- Five (5) people said “optimistic” or “somewhat optimistic”: Optimistic, but a watershed agreement is very broad in scale and scope; “cautiously optimistic”
- One (1) person said “was more when first became involved than now”: Questions are becoming clearer now.
- Five people said “not sure”: Creating change within DFO is difficult.

How optimistic are you now? (26 responses)

- Three (3) people said “not optimistic”: Less optimistic as we move forward, but we know what needs to be done; the process is getting pushed too fast
- Six (6) people said “somewhat optimistic”: The process needs continued funding; need clarity on what will be on the table from DFO; tight timelines; concerned that DFO and First Nations political leaders will not be supportive of true co-management
- Fourteen (14) people said “optimistic”: Can pave the way for First Nations and DFO to work together in the future; ready to endorse the process and move forward; more optimistic as the process progresses; the LOU will be a significant step forward
- Three (3) people said “not sure”: More open to the idea, 50/50, same as before

What message will you be taking back to your organization/community about this workshop and the Fraser Salmon Roadmap Process? (24 responses)

- Process will not affect treaty
- Support for the process and moving it forward, it is time to engage; make this process a priority;
- Step toward managing our own territories; work has been started to reach the goal of co-management;
- Too soon to say, but positive view
- The process is becoming more productive; good facilitation; good breakout sessions
- Sit and wait – not much to report yet on what an agreement might actually contain, still need clarity on what DFO will put on the table, what funding will be available after 2012
- Will report on progress to date (will use the briefing note from the FSRPG)
- Upper and Mid Fraser needs more representation and engagement in the process
- Get in or get left behind
- Unsure of what the outcome will be, but the process is moving forward; progress is underway

Do you see yourself or someone else from your community/organization participating in the October Workshop? (26 responses)

- Twenty-four (24) people said “yes, will participate”: some will try to engage more people from their communities/organizations (political representatives); some will not participate but will send someone else from their community; need to participate or will get “planned out of the plan”; perhaps need a legal review of a draft agreement prior to the next workshop;
- Two (2) people said “might participate”.
- Zero (0) people said that they will not participate in the October workshop.

What do you see as the most important thing that has to happen to prepare for the October workshop? (26 responses)

- Several responses indicated that the draft LOU and supporting documents (e.g. briefing note) is the most important next step
- Need to clarify what DFO will put on the table, how far they are willing to go
- Communication about FRSSI with all First Nations and other sectors
- More engagement from bands on the coast
- More discussions between First Nations (Tier 1) about how they see joint management
- Inform leadership about the process
- Communication process

What do you see as the most important thing that has to be addressed at the October workshop? (23 responses)

- Several responses indicated that the draft LOU and supporting documents (e.g. briefing note) is the most important next step (draft prior to the workshops; a draft to review at the workshop; who will sign; timelines; next steps; etc.)
- Provide jobs and fishing opportunities for First Nations fishers
- Finalize *Engagement Framework* document
- Management of First Nations resources and territories
- Trust between First Nations and DFO
- Clarifying what DFO will put on the table, confirming DFO's support for this process
- Engaging more First Nations/leadership, higher level DFO participants
- Content of an agreement
- Discuss how First Nations will organize themselves

Anything else you'd like to comment on? (10 responses)

- I can't see taking over worthless licenses
- There are a lot of court cases and constitutional law that defines First Nations principles; respect, everything is connected
- I believe that many here are mandated to participate – time to move forward, stalling and questioning this process only keeps us from moving forward
- Great job facilitating – important to keep communication open with other co-management processes (e.g. FNFC, treaty)
- Not to worry about stakeholders etc.; this is a government-to-government process, and if DFO is committed then it shouldn't get derailed. Also recognize where this process lies in the grand scheme.
- Would like to see this process with other species besides salmon
- Less material and more focus would help, but very good overall
- Well facilitated
- Change the evaluation form questions to answer on a 1-10 scale
- Review LOU draft