

FRASER SALMON AND WATERSHEDS PROGRAM

*Inspiring changes in human behaviour
for the benefit of salmonids and the watersheds they depend on*

Report of the Third Meeting of the Fraser Assembly

September 24 & 25, 2007
Quaaout Resort and Conference Centre
Chase, BC



Fraser Basin Council



What Is the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program?

In July 2005, the Living Rivers Trust Fund Advisory Group invited the Pacific Salmon Foundation (PSF) and the Fraser Basin Council (FBC) to lead development of a Business Plan to address salmon and watershed sustainability issues in the Fraser Basin. The two organizations engaged a wide range of key people in the Basin in a series of workshops where key priorities were identified and a strategic platform was developed. The resulting plan, the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program (FSWP), was approved with the following Vision:

To inspire changes in human behaviour for the benefit of salmonids and the watersheds they depend on

Three goals were identified:

1. Foster effective communications and governance approaches
2. Protect and restore habitat and water
3. Support responsive and effective fisheries management

Seven strategies were identified to achieve the goals:

1. Community Engagement
2. Governance and Integrated Planning
3. Engage First Nations
4. Integrate Water Use with Watershed and Fish Sustainability Planning
5. Protect and Restore Habitat
6. Sustainable Fisheries
7. Improved Fisheries Information

The FSWP will receive over four years (through 2009), approximately \$10M in Living Rivers funding from the Province of British Columbia and \$5M in cash and \$5M in in-kind from DFO through its Fraser Basin Initiative (through 2010).

The Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program In 2008

This past year, with the input of new staff and members of the Fraser Assembly, FSWP has seen some changes in terms of program management. These changes are reflected in the development of four new Program Areas, the implementation of Program Advisory Teams, and the development of a logic model, a tool to help with program evaluation and a guide to keep the program on course in the future.

In 2008 the FSWP is seeking to develop a work plan based on approximately \$4.0M in available funding directed to projects in four Program Areas: Education and Engagement, Integrated Planning and Governance, Habitat and Water Restoration and Stewardship, and Improved Information/ Approaches for Sustainable Integrated Fisheries Management. These Program Areas four broad Program Areas have been developed from the original Business Plan Objectives and Strategies, in order to better reflect the integration between themes that has emerged through the development of the Program. The Program Areas also incorporate the objectives of the Fraser Basin Initiative funding. Engaging First Nations is considered to be a critical component of all four Program Areas, and is therefore not listed separately.

A second key development within FSWP has been the introduction of Advisory Teams for each Program Area, a concept which was discussed at the Fraser Assembly meeting in September 2007. The purpose of each Advisory Team is to provide advice and strategic guidance to the Fraser Assembly and the FSWP Management Committee on key considerations and emerging priorities in each respective Program Area. The advice and guidance from Advisory Teams continues to inform the ongoing development of FSWP. Further details on FSWP Advisory Teams can be found in Appendix 4.

Finally, a results-based Logic Model and Management and Evaluation Framework to guide development and monitoring of the Program is under development. The model will be integrated with business models under development for the Living Rivers Advisory Group and the Pacific Salmon Endowment Fund Society.

What is the Fraser Assembly?

From the workshops that led to the creation of the FSWP, vision for continued participation of people who had been involved in its inception, as well as outreach to engage people in the continuing development of the program. To this end, the Fraser Assembly was established in 2006 as a collaborative, multi-interest forum on the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program. The purpose of the Assembly is to promote information sharing and coordinated delivery of the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program (FSWP) among interested parties to enhance watershed and salmonid sustainability in the Fraser Basin. The *Business Plan for Salmonids and Watersheds in the Fraser Basin* (the *Business Plan*) provides the strategic context for the Fraser Assembly's work. The Business Plan can be viewed on the Fraser Basin's Webpage: http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/programs/basin_wide.html .

The Fraser Assembly has met three times since its inception. The last meeting is the focus of this report. The next meeting of the Assembly is planned for June 2008. Further details on the Assembly can be found in Appendix 3.

For more information regarding the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program or the Fraser Assembly please contact:

Pacific Salmon Foundation
(604) 664-7664
Paul Kariya, Executive Director or
Tascha Stubbs, Program Administrator

Fraser Basin Council
(604) 488-5350
David Marshall, Executive Director or
Alison Macnaughton, Program Manager

Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	2
DRAFT 2008 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FEEDBACK	4
EDUCATION AND ENGAGEMENT	4
INTEGRATED PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE	5
HABITAT AND WATER RESTORATION AND STEWARDSHIP.....	7
IMPROVED INFORMATION/ APPROACHES FOR SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	9
PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.....	10
APPENDIX 1: FRASER ASSEMBLY AGENDA	13
APPENDIX 2: PARTICIPANT LIST.....	16
APPENDIX 3: FRASER ASSEMBLY BACKGROUNDER	18
APPENDIX 4: ADVISORY TEAMS TERMS OF REFERENCE	20
APPENDIX 5: WORKSHOP EVALUATION RESULTS.....	24
APPENDIX 6: 2008 FRASER SALMON AND WATERSHEDS PROGRAM GLOSSARY ...	28

Overview

This report summarizes results of the third gathering of the Fraser Assembly, held September 24-25, 2007 in Chase, BC and hosted by the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program. In addition to providing opportunities for networking, the objectives of the forum were fourfold, inviting participants to:

- Discuss highlights and developments within the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program, as well as develop priority activities for Program Areas for the upcoming year;
- Share details relating to project development and implementation and learn from each others experiences;
- Provide input and ideas towards informing program direction and the Draft 2008 Request for Proposals; and
- Join one of four Fraser Assembly Advisory Teams, that are associated with each of the FSWP Program Areas.

Over two days, the agenda included a mix of informative presentations, dynamic group discussions amongst Advisory Teams, and engaging plenary discussions. Day 1, September 24, focused on work to date, and the 2007/2008 Request for Proposals, and Day 2 addressed priority activities for specific Program Areas. Detailed agendas, as well as the list of participants, are provided in Appendices 1 and 2. All presentations shared at the Assembly meeting can be found on line at:

http://www.thinksalmon.com/event/item/fraser_assembly1/

This meeting of the Fraser Assembly introduced the concept of Program Areas, which have been developed to help provide a clearer structure for program management. Program Areas are associated with the original seven strategies of FSWP (see table below). Advisory Teams associated with each Program Area also met for the first time at this meeting of the Assembly.

PROGRAM AREA	STRATEGIES
Education and Engagement	Community Engagement Engage First Nations
Integrated Planning and Governance	Governance and Integrated Planning Integrate Water Use with Watershed and Fish Sustainability Planning Engage First Nations
Habitat & Water Restoration and Stewardship	Protect and Restore Habitat Engage First Nations
Improved Information/ Approaches for Sustainable Integrated Fisheries Management	Sustainable Fisheries Improved Fisheries Information Engage First Nations

Overall, the third meeting of the Fraser Assembly was met with an enthusiastic response, with a higher turnout of participants at the meeting, and a significant level of energy invested into discussions. Advisory Teams worked individually with facilitators from FSWP staff to generate considered responses to the Draft 2008 Request for Proposals (RFP), as well as to identify priority activities for each of the Program Areas. This input was subsequently integrated into the final RFP, which was issued publicly in October 2007. Specific input from the four Advisory Teams follows in this report. It is expected that these Advisory Teams will continue to play an important role in shaping and guiding the strategic development of FSWP.

The next Fraser Assembly is planned to take place in June 2008, in Prince George, in the Upper Fraser Region. The emphasis of this upcoming session will be on further strategic development of the program, with a focus on strengthening linkages between projects and across Program Areas, as well as a discussion around the newly developed Program Logic Model. Some time will also be spent on reports back from project partners and other important updates.

Draft 2008 Request For Proposals Feedback

The majority of time spent in breakout groups at the Fraser Assembly was dedicated towards collecting feedback on the Draft Request for Proposals (RFP), which registrants had received prior to attending. Breakout groups were coordinated by Program Area, and facilitated by FSWP staff members.

Overall, Advisory Team members responded positively to the opportunity to have input into the RFP which they would have to be responding to in order to receive funding. Features of the RFP that people liked included the new two stage call process, the availability of an increased FSWP staff to assist applicants more with proposal development, the revised timeline, the allowance of wages as a legitimate cost to secure committed staff on projects, the integration of First Nations into all Program Areas, and the option of submitting the application electronically.

As was expected, there were also many sections within the Draft RFP that were targeted with suggested changes. Common suggestions for improvement included: providing a glossary of terminology, making the rating criteria transparent, identifying key partners/contacts for proponents, and revising the timeline of the call. All other suggested changes are noted below, by Program Area. All feedback was received and considered by FSWP staff, and to the greatest extent possible, integrated into a Final Call for Proposals, which was issued publicly in October 2007. There is a general consensus amongst FSWP staff that while the two-stage proposal process was more onerous from a time management perspective, it resulted in more integrated, high quality proposals being submitted.

Education and Engagement

Facilitated by: Sheila Creighton (FBC) and Megan Moser (PSF)

Items that require clarification:

- 12-15 steps - can some be eliminated? Evaluation process requires too much human capital
- How do we know if a project is eligible for FBI / LR (answer: an internal decision)
- Are program areas emphasized equally?
- What does the partnership criteria mean-- Must it be DFO?
- How are minor / major capital categories – e.g., equipment / building—handled
- Other 3 program areas are goal statements, but education & engagement are not stated as a goal of the program

Features of the RFP that people liked:

- Concept proposal and short form; tone that FSWP will help and be a partner
- Revised timeline – March is better than June to support work in the field
- Money for education and engagement
- Pay wages to get committed staff

- First Nations integration into other areas
- Spirit of partnership between proponents and funders, opportunity to design program
- 50% funding match is not required to be eligible
- Recognition of need to get beyond the cycle of restoration, followed by degradation
- Format does not strictly constrain length of responses
- Electronic submission

Details of Suggested Changes:

- Make sure educators are on advisory / evaluator team (I.e. not just scientists)
- Also, expertise in social sciences, CBSM
- Familiarize applicants with tools of CBSM if used as a criteria (similar to need for definitions/ explanations)
- Looks like education and engagement are not eligible under FBI?
- Difficult to demonstrate benefit to salmon from education q2
- Change "public engagement" to "Community engagement". The discussion of public creates "us-them" division
- Add extenuating clause for extreme circumstances (comment from one person only)
- Provide Directions for multiple submissions, max number of submissions
- Multi year funding- review each year
- Electronic submission should generate an automatic receipt message (and note that in instructions)
- Provide a guide to RFP with definitions and terminology; terms mentioned: delivery method
- (from project selection criteria), CBSM
- Make rating criteria transparent (i.e., show weighting)
- Make sure educators on advisory / evaluator team, as well as expertise in social sciences, CBSM
- Familiarize applicants with tools of CBSM if used as a criteria
- In Appendix 3, looks like education and engagement are not eligible under FBI
- Difficult to demo benefit to salmon from education, Q.2 on concept proposal
- Add extenuating clause for extreme circumstances
- Directions for multiple submissions, max number of submissions

Integrated Planning and Governance

Facilitated by: Jessica Bratty (FBC) and Ernie Victor (FBC)

Details of Suggested Changes:

- Provide example in RFP for " concept proposals"
- In process a proposal from last year was approved than went through some scrutiny from interest group---the proposal never was funded.
- There needs to be clarity to other parties/stakeholders and sign-off from regulatory agencies.
- Recommendation to stage the process: concept proposal, feed back to next stage

- proponents with approval in principle, than detailed proposal.
- Letters of support from agencies (DFO) can be time consuming.
- Simplify the process (streamlined)
- Advisory to management/program team to technical team, than to final.
- In the Integrated planning and Governance envelope ---- why is there a technical review process.
- A need to have a flagging process for regulatory approval on-line.
- Include example concept proposal

- Improve clarity on how projects signed off from DFO;
Need to connect with agencies at concept proposal stage and improve clarity on extent of info required from agencies for sign off;
Need to identify who proponent should be in contact with - develop key contacts list "check-list" by list by region
- Need to identify FSWP staff lead for projects - especially governance ones;
Governance/Integrated Planning projects need FSWP staff facilitation and assistance;
FSWP management to assist in helping address community-identified barriers to improved governance
- Need to lengthen time for detailed proposals

- Need to use Web 2.0 technology to assist in review and submission process

- Advisory committees should have regional focus (like FsRBC)

- Need to do follow up and evaluation of projects after they're completed;
Program should assess long-term value for projects - conduct verification of delivery and performance after three years - meanwhile creating a database of projects and their value

- Need some high level criteria for concept proposal stage too
Suggested Integrated Planning and Governance criteria:
 - Does the project provide useful contribution to the evolutionary change providing and investment in a legacy for the future
 - Does the project support long-term changes in stewardship capacity and governance, such as capacity in consensus building, interest based negotiation, etc.
 - Does the project adhere to principles of operation such as inclusiveness, transferability, respectful, transparent, clear decision-making process, consensus building
 - Does the project reduce conflict
 - Does the project demonstrate knowledge of regulatory context and opportunities to identify and open linkages

Habitat and Water Restoration and Stewardship

Facilitated by: Andrew Stegemann (PSF) and Tascha Stubbs (PSF)

Details of Suggested Changes:

- Regarding "Degree of partnership" (Page 5 of Draft RFP) - there is a need to define "partnership" - *partnership* is a legal term that implies a funding arrangement; partnering would refer more to proponents partnering with each other
- The funding arrangement (40%, 40%, 20%) may cause hardship on stewardship groups. Nowhere in the RFP does it state the 40-40-20 stipulation- Only (on page 6) does it state "In all cases, there will be a 20% holdback..." If this is flexible- then change wording to, "In general, there will be...".
- (Related to above) Another option would be to have (or give the option of) proponents submitting a cash flow on the detailed proposal with a timeline. Funding details could be based on this.
- Effectiveness monitoring- create wording to address it (multi- year funding?) See page 3 of detailed template (question 3) ... It may be that there is no time for monitoring or evaluation within the one year time frame. The question could be re-worded to "What would you propose as a monitoring and evaluation framework". The wording should be changed also to "what are your tangible measures of success". FSWP may even want to provide or propose a monitoring framework.
- Appendix 3 related to the FBI rules... There should be a 1 pager for LR as well- or roll the FBI criteria into one document with LR criteria.
- (Related to above) A potential solution would be one generic call with no mention of LR or FBI at all.
- RFP should disclose how much available funding is in each pot (LR and FBI).
- Can non-societies obtain insurance? Could the cost of gaining insurance be part of an application?
- When there are multiple proponents applying (i.e. 4 groups), how is the proposal seen? Considered strong partnership under one strategy? Who should put their name on the proposal?
- Project design (see detailed proposal question 5 on page 3). Could "...by a Professional Engineer and/or Biologist" be changed to "...by an appropriate professional (e.g. Engineer and/or Biologist)
- The timelines of the call are too tight. With an October 1st release of the RFP (approximately), that gives ~ 6 weeks between call and concept paper. This is too tight
- The concept proposal should be more of a letter of intent. i.e. the concept proposal should be simplified. Perhaps even just a 2 page limit -- structure it well for reviewing purposes. The concept proposal would thus be a quick, community driven process.

- Under the above scenario, the FSWP may even want to consider reducing the amount of time to complete concept proposals and adding it to the time to complete detailed proposals
- What is the conceptual proposal's purpose? Is it a screening mechanism or a feedback tool?
- FSWP should encourage new proponents to use FSWP staff for help completing conceptual proposals
- A single proposal can intersect more than one strategy/Program Area. What do we do in this case?
- Evaluation Criteria- weighting.
- Given the timing of the RFP- this is really an 8 month project, not a full year. If this continues into the future, there is a four-month gap (which would especially affect multi-year projects). How will this be accommodated- how will the FSWP address this overlap? NOTE: This is also problematic as the March 15 smolt migration folks miss the boat
- Is the funding availability equal in all four areas?
- Proponents should not review proposals (conflict of interest). Highlights a basic concern around who is screening the conceptual proposals -- is there technical review involved- shouldn't there be (especially since it will help inform screening and feedback).
- Last year, some proposals got approved, but for (e.g.) 50% of what was asked for. Please be aware that some projects cannot be compartmentalized, and need funding to support it in its entirety.
- Be clear in the process where various "rejection stages" are.
- Shorten the review process to allow more time in the field

Improved Information/ Approaches for Sustainable Integrated Fisheries Management

Facilitated by: Alison Macnaughton (FBC) and Saul Milne (FBC)

Details of Suggested Changes:

- After item #2 in project relevance and significance section of the proposal template, add "demonstrate contribution to Wild Salmon Policy and other key policies or legislation" or "demonstrate how the project advances the objectives of the Wild Salmon Policy"
- After Item #4 in proposal template, add "is this a multi-year project?", consider funding renewal for one year project that does not get off the ground; FBI vs. Living Rivers – push the Department of Fisheries for rolling fund like L.R., (current contribution agreement restrains our ability on the funding), ID multi-year in the concept paper so we know what we are buying into, perhaps a line that reads "total cost by year" after the outcome section
- After item 2 in review and authorization (or somewhere else that makes sense) add "how will DFO and/or other key agencies be engaged in the project?" (This could also be fit into 'additional proposal information' item c) coordinates and integrates with other organizations and/or activities... i.e., in-kind needs to be clear, more than just has DFO has reviewed?
- Provide clarification of what we mean by "risk management approaches" - add to glossary or use easier to understand term
- "Evaluation criteria" section in RFP - this should be adjusted to incorporate new criteria and explanation of criteria for concept proposals vs. criteria for detailed proposals should be provided.
- Concept proposal should include the ranking criteria for proponents, perhaps a range for the ranking criteria
- ID opportunities to leverage

Priority Activities

Building on the priority activities that were listed for 2007, Advisory Teams also brainstormed new priority activities for 2008, for each Program Area. These new priority areas are listed in the table below, along with the 2007 priority activities for comparison. Engaging First Nations is considered to be a critical component of all Program Areas and is therefore not identified as a separate Program Area.

PROGRAM AREA	2007 Priority Activities	2008 Priority Activities
Education and Engagement	Maintain salmon as a highly valued public good, through collaborative projects which incorporate salmonids into existing events, programs and venues as well as encourage innovative new initiatives that address increased public involvement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote salmon as a highly valued public good through collaborative projects to connect communities to watersheds, inspire increased community involvement and encourage behavioural change. Projects could address a variety of constituents (K-12, university, adult, formal/informal groups, etc) through, but not limited to, the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Providing direct experience with nature. ○ Developing/implementing classroom programs. ○ Targeting outreach to strategic or specific sectors; e.g., festival goers, developers, industry, government. ○ Using marketing techniques to change behaviours (e.g., Community Based Social Marketing) ○ Gathering information or conducting research to support behaviour change. ○ Supporting salmon and watershed educational centres, organizations. ○ Integrating arts and cultural expressions. ○ Fostering watershed champions.
Integrated Planning and Governance	Initiatives that support collaboration and relationship building among organizations and interests, leading to effective multi-party watershed planning processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiatives that support collaboration and relationship building among organizations and interests, leading to effective multi-party watershed planning processes. Initiatives could include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of tools and supports to increase community capacity for engagement (e.g., information sharing techniques/tools; summaries of community values and interests, etc). ○ Initiatives dealing with integrated water governance. ○ Development of approaches to the

PROGRAM AREA	2007 Priority Activities	2008 Priority Activities
		<p>incorporation of conservation flows in watershed planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assisting First Nations to develop a process for interaction amongst themselves and/or engagement with other fisheries/resource sectors to discuss and resolve shared issues and concerns. ○ Assessments of policies and issues affecting water and water allocation. ○ Identification/implementation of incentives for participation in governance processes.
<p>Habitat & Water Restoration and Stewardship</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of tools (including best management practices, plans, models, guidelines, etc.) that protect habitat. • Initiatives which restore habitat for salmon, particularly within high priority watersheds • Development of approaches to the incorporation of conservation flows in watershed planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of tools that protect habitat (including best management practices, plans, models, guidelines, evaluation/monitoring tools, etc). • Initiatives which restore habitat for salmon, particularly within high priority watersheds. For example, water quality/quantity restoration and/or protection, riparian restoration. Note: Proponents should avoid compensation projects, i.e. compensation in one area mitigating damage in another area. • Initiatives which focus on access improvements for fish. Example, improving off channel access, modifications to in-stream installations (flap gates, pump houses, etc). Low maintenance projects with low follow up costs a priority. Proponents should also consider the context; i.e., whether improved access is indeed the limiting factor for species health within your specific project area. • Initiatives which foster coordination, collaboration, and exchange of among fisher organizations and fisheries sectors. • Initiatives which provide integrated information on habitat status to highlight high priority areas for restoration and protection.

PROGRAM AREA	2007 Priority Activities	2008 Priority Activities
<p>Improved Information/ Approaches for Sustainable Integrated Fisheries Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of strategies or technologies that reduce fisheries impacts on weak stocks and non-targeted species • Initiatives which foster coordination, collaboration, and information exchange among fisher organizations and fisheries sectors • New assessment approaches for in-season management of salmon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of strategies or technologies that reduce fisheries impacts on weak stocks and non-targeted species consistent with the Wild Salmon Policy. • Initiatives which foster coordination, collaboration, and information exchange among fisher organizations and fisheries sectors. • New and/or improved approaches for management of salmon. • Development of strategies to identify/cope with the impacts of climate change. <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prioritizing watersheds (biodiversity-based for action). ○ Integrating harvest with stock assessment platforms. ○ Support existing management/planning processes by recognizing and identifying their information needs (e.g., local stewardship centres). ○ New/improved assessment approaches. ○ Developing strategies to reduce impact on weak or non-targeted stocks. ○ Assessment of marine impacts as they relate to Fraser salmon. ○ Standardized monitoring, including juvenile assessment, stock assessment frameworks and fish distribution. ○ Joint sectoral monitoring.

Appendix 1: Fraser Assembly Agenda

**Third Meeting of the Fraser Assembly
Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program (FSWP)
September 24th and 25th, 2007
Quaaout Resort and Conference Centre, Chase, BC**

DETAILED AGENDA

September 24

The purpose of this gathering, in addition to providing opportunities for networking, is fourfold. Participants are invited to:

- Provide input and ideas towards informing program direction and the Draft 2008 Request for Proposals;
- Discuss highlights and developments within the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program, as well as develop priority activities for Program Areas for the upcoming year;
- Join one of four Fraser Assembly Advisory Teams, that are associated with each of the FSWP Program Areas.; and
- Share details relating to project development and implementation and learn from each others experiences

TIME	SESSION	FORMAT/QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER
9:30am	Registration (coffee and snacks available)	Circulation around Displays
10:00am	Introductory Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Welcoming Prayer – Little Shuswap Band</i> • <i>Welcome – David Marshall, Fraser Basin Council and Paul Kariya, Pacific Salmon Foundation</i> • <i>Review Meeting Objectives & Agenda</i> • <i>Group Introductions</i> • <i>Brief Program Overview – Mark Saunders, FSWP</i> 	Plenary
10:40am	Project Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mike Wallis – Salmon River Watershed Roundtable</i> • <i>Elizabeth Salomon-de-Friedberg – Nicola Water Use Management Plan</i> • <i>Michelle Walsh - Secwepemc Fisheries Commission - Groundwater Habitat Interactions for Interior Fraser Coho</i> • <i>15 minute Q&A session with Panel of presenters</i> 	Plenary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How are these projects addressing the program strategies?</i> • <i>What challenges have they encountered?</i> • <i>What lessons have been learned?</i>
11:40am	Georgia Basin Living Rivers Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Presenter: Al Lill</i> 	Plenary

12:00pm	LUNCH	
1:00pm	Think Salmon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chad Brealey – Pacific Salmon Foundation</i> 	Plenary
1:15pm	Overview of Fall '07 Call For Proposals & explanation of breakout groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Presentation by Mark Saunders, PSF</i> • <i>Questions</i> 	Plenary
1:45pm	Breakout groups have three main objectives: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Establish common understanding around Draft RFP;</i> 2. <i>Generate feedback on the process for allocating funding;</i> 3. <i>Identify specific priority activities for each Program Area</i> 	Facilitated discussion in Small Groups
3:45pm	BREAK	Coffee and snacks
4:00pm	Highlights of Small Group Discussions	Brief Presentations from Groups in Plenary
4:30pm	Reflections on the Day: Overview, Next Steps – Mark Saunders	Plenary
6:30pm	Dinner	

September 25 – Inaugural FSWP Advisory Teams Planning Session

The main objective for this half day session is to create and work with Advisory Teams that are associated with each of the Program Areas. Teams will communicate regularly and provide ongoing input and feedback to inform program development throughout the year.

TIME	SESSION	FORMAT/QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER
8:00am	Continental Breakfast	
9:00am	Welcome, Overview – Mark Saunders, FSWP	Plenary
9:30am	Advisory Team Breakout sessions. Four main objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review and provide feedback on Terms of Reference.</i> • <i>Review and refine priorities for Program Areas from previous day</i> • <i>Discuss ranking criteria for priority activities</i> 	Facilitated Discussion in small groups
11:30am	Report Back, Next steps, Wrap up and Adjourn	Plenary
12:00	Hotel checkout	

Appendix 2: Participant List

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Email Address 1
Scott	Aikenhead	S4S	scott@s4s.com
Clifford	Alec	Chief, Ts'kw'aylaxw First Nation	stacey@tskwaylaxw.com
Harold	Archie	Skowkale First Nation	manager@skowkale.com
Bob	Bocking	LGL Limited	bbocking@lgl.com
Bev	Bowler	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	bbowler@telus.net
Jessica	Bratty	FBC	jbratty@fraserbasin.bc.ca
Neil	Brooks	Kingfisher Interpretive Centre Society	kingfisherinterpretivecentre@gmail.com
Tom	Cadieux	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	cadieuxt@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Clive	Callaway	The Living Water Project	clivec@jetstream.net
Clay	Campbell	FRISP	crested@telus.net
Joan	Carne	Stream of Dreams Mural Society	info@streamofdreams.org
Joachim	Carolsfield	World Fisheries Trust	yogi@worldfish.org
Maurice	Coulter Boisvert	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	coulterboisvertm@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Sheila	Creighton	FBC	screighton@fraserbasin.bc.ca
Coral	deShield	Environment Canada	Coral.deshield@ec.gc.ca
Stephen	Dick	Lower Nicola Indian Band	sdick@lnib.net
Tina	Donald	Simpcw First Nation	tdonald@simpcw.com
Barb	Dutton	Kingfisher Interpretive Centre Society	kingfisherinterpretivecentre@gmail.com
Jamie	Felhauer	Salmon River Watershed Roundtable	jado@telus.net
Bob	Guerin	Musqueam Band	fisheriesmanager@musqueam.bc.ca
Lee	Hesketh	BC Cattlemen's Association	silverhillsranch@aol.com
Rick	Holmes	Univ. of Northern Bc Quesnel River Research Centre	unbcqrrc@laketown.net
Sara	Howard	Nature Conservancy of Canada	sara.howard@natureconservancy.ca
Allen	Huguette	Lumby Salmon Trails	huguette@greenparty.ca
Les	Jantz	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	jantzl@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Mark	Johnson	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	JohnsonM@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Jeff	Jung	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	jungj@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Paul	Kariya	Pacific Salmon Foundation	pkariya@psf.ca
Doug	Kelly	Stolo Tribal Council	dougkelly@stolotribalcouncil.ca
Scott	Koch	Village of Chase	dgarceau@villageofchase.com
Frank	Kwak	Upper Fraser Valley Sport Fish Advisory Committee	Frankkwak@shaw.ca
Al	Lill	BC Conservation Foundation	alanlill@shaw.ca
John	Louis	Musqueam Indian Band	fisheriesmanager@musqueam.bc.ca
Alison	Macnaughton	FBC	amacnaughton@fraserbasin.bc.ca
Nicole	Marples	Langley Environmental Partners Society	nmarples@tol.bc.ca

David	Marshall	FBC	dmarshall@fraserbasin.bc.ca
Brad	Mason	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	MasonB@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Saul	Milne	FBC	smilne@fraserbasin.bc.ca
Garth	Mirau	UFAWU-CAW Local 15	gmirau@shaw.ca
Dave	Moore	Moore Dave Fisheries Development	davemoore@telus.net
Zo Ann	Morten	Pacific Streamkeepers Federation	pskf@direct.ca
Megan	Moser	PSF	mmoser@psf.ca
Peter	Nicklin	upper Fraser Fisheries Conservation Alliance	indiseaent@shaw.ca
Janis	Olsen	Rivershed Society of BC	janisolsen@gmail.com
Bob	Otway	BC Federation of Drift Fishers	rbobbc@shaw.ca
Hal	Patterson	BC Federation of Drift Fishers	paterson.h@mortgagecentre.com
James	Paul	Esketemc First Nation	jpaul@esketemc.ca
Deborah	Phelan	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	pheland@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Jordon	Point	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	PointRJ@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
June	Quipp	Cheam Band	titleandrights@cheamband.com
Rick	Quipp	Cheam Band	rick@cheamband.com
Dianne	Ramage	Pacific Salmon Foundation	dramage@psf.ca
Brian	Riddell	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	riddellb@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Teresa	Ryan	First Nations Marine Society Native Brotherhood of BC	ryantl@shaw.ca
Tracy	Sampson	Nicola Tribal Association	tracy.sampson@nwsfa.org
Mark	Saunders	Pacific Salmon Foundation	msaunders@psf.ca
Marcel	Shepert	Fraser River Aboriginal Fish. Sec.	mars_shepert@shaw.ca
Dugald	Smith	Agriculture and Lands, ILMB	dugalds@shaw.ca
Elizabeth	Salomon de Friedberg	Nicola WUMP	esolomoni@mail.ocis.net
Mike	Staley	Fisheries Consultant	mstaley@mstaley.com
Andrew	Stegemann	PSF	astegemann@psf.ca
Gord	Sterritt	Northern Shuswap Tribal Council	g.sterritt@nstq.org
Tascha	Stubbs	PSF	tstubbs@psf.ca
Terry	Tebb	Pacific Salmon Foundation	ttebb@psf.ca
Neil	Todd	Nicola Tribal Association	neil.todd@nwsfa.org
Ernie	Victor	FBC	evictor@fraserbasin.bc.ca
Adrian	Wall	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	walla@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Mike	Wallis	Salmon River Watershed Roundtable	m308w@telus.net
Michelle	Walsh	Secwepemc Fisheries Commission	mwalsh@shuswapnation.org
Dave	Whiting	Fraser Basin Council	dave.whiting@telus.net
Greg	Wilson	Ministry of ENV	greg.wilson@gov.bc.ca
Ken	Wilson	Watershed Watch	wilsonkh@telus.net
Andrew	Wilson	Ministry of Env	andrew.wilson@gov.bc.ca
Veronica	Woodruff	BC Conservation Foundation	veronicarobin@yahoo.ca

Appendix 3: Fraser Assembly Backgrounder

The Fraser Assembly was established in 2006 as a multi-interest forum on the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program. The purpose of the Assembly is to promote information sharing and coordinated delivery of the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program (FSWP) among interested parties to enhance watershed and salmonid sustainability in the Fraser Basin. The *Business Plan for Salmonids and Watersheds in the Fraser Basin* (the *Business Plan*) provides the strategic context for the Fraser Assembly's work. The Business Plan can be viewed on the Fraser Basin's Webpage: http://www.fraserbasin.bc.ca/programs/basin_wide.html.

The Fraser Assembly has met three times since its inception. The last meeting was held in Vancouver, in February 2007. The next meeting of the Assembly is planned for September 24 and 25, 2007, in Chase, B.C.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Fraser Assembly is a collaborative meeting ground with four main roles:

1. Provide annual guidance and input to the implementation of the *Business Plan for Salmonids and Watersheds in the Fraser Basin*;
2. Promote leveraging of technical, human and financial resources for implementing the *Business Plan*;
3. Facilitate communication and information sharing on relevant initiatives;
4. Encourage, where appropriate, coordinated or integrated delivery of relevant initiatives;

The Pacific Salmon Foundation (PSF) and Fraser Basin Council (FBC) are responsible, with input from relevant strategy partners, for guiding the Fraser Assembly's deliberations. The Fraser Basin Council is responsible for convening and facilitating the Fraser Assembly.

Specific responsibilities of the Fraser Assembly include, but are not limited to:

- Provide advice on annual *Business Plan* implementation workplans developed by the PSF, FBC and relevant strategy partners;
- Share information on new sources of funding and identify leverage opportunities;
- Keep participants abreast of new initiatives;
- Assist in identifying priority projects and participants associated with the implementation of specific *Business Plan* strategies;
- Monitor, evaluate and recommend periodic adjustments to the *Business Plan* as requested or as appropriate.

Composition and Participation

The Fraser Assembly is comprised of organizations in the Fraser Basin that have a relevant and substantial interest in the implementation of the *Business Plan for Salmonids and Watersheds in the Fraser Basin*, and may have specified responsibilities in one or more of the priority strategies of the Fraser Basin Living Rivers Program. Participants include representatives from all orders of government, non-profit organizations, stewardship groups, and commercial fisheries. We welcome new members gladly.

For more information please contact:

Sheila Creighton

Program Coordinator, Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program

Fraser Basin Council

Email: screighton@fraserbasin.bc.ca

Phone: 604-488-5366 ext. 117

Appendix 4: Advisory Teams Terms of Reference

Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program

Draft Advisory Teams Terms of Reference

Background

In September 2007, four Advisory Teams were established in accordance with four new Program Areas identified for the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program (FSWP). Advisory Teams will address the following Program Areas:

1. Education and Engagement;
2. Integrated Planning and Governance;
3. Water and Habitat Restoration and Stewardship; and
4. Improved Information for Sustainable Fisheries.

These Program Areas are a complement of the original seven FSWP strategies and additional objectives identified by program funders. Engaging First Nations is a critical component of all FSWP projects and is therefore integrated into each Program Area.

Intent

The purpose of each Advisory Team is to provide advice and strategic guidance to the Fraser Assembly and the FSWP Management Committee on key considerations and emerging priorities in each respective Program Area. This advice and guidance will inform the ongoing development of FSWP.

Roles and Responsibilities

All Advisory Teams members participate on an equal basis. Advice and guidance put forth to the FSWP Management Committee by the Advisory Teams will be achieved through consensus of all members. FSWP staff will provide facilitation and administrative support to the Teams. Advisory Team Members will liaise and communicate with their respective organizations regarding the scope and content of the work undertaken.

The FSWP Advisory Teams are a collaborative forum with four main roles:

1. To identify priority activities for each respective Program Area;
2. To provide guidance on the project review process in each respective Program Area (e.g. regarding project review criteria and the makeup of Technical Review Committees);
3. To assist in the assessment of Conceptual Proposals; and
4. To provide input to help inform the development and implementation of an overall FSWP Program Accountability Framework.

Specific responsibilities of the Advisory Teams include, but are not limited to:

- Convening at least twice per year, in conjunction with meetings of the Fraser Assembly and by other means as necessary.

- Maintaining ongoing correspondence and discussion around key issues either via email or through web-based collaboration tools.

Composition and Participation

Membership on Advisory Teams is open to any participant in the Fraser Assembly. As such, the Teams are an extension of the active and collaborative relationships among Fisheries and Oceans Canada, provincial government agencies, First Nations, local governments, community stewardship groups and a wide variety of NGO and private sector interests that the Fraser Assembly encourages. To the greatest extent possible, membership within each team will include, but not be limited to, at least one representative from each of the four orders of Canadian government, the private sector, and civil society. A preliminary participant list is included in Annex 1.

Advisory Team Meetings

Meetings will be held on an as-needed basis but will, at a minimum, occur two times per year, likely in conjunction with meetings of the Fraser Assembly.

Communications

- FSWP staff will provide both facilitation and administrative support for each Advisory Team.
- Meeting notes will be compiled and distributed to the broader membership of the Fraser Assembly, and the FSWP Management Committee by the facilitator and secretary for each Team.
- Advisory Team members will be responsible for communicating with their respective organizations regarding the scope and content of work undertaken.
- Ongoing dialogue amongst Team members will take place through either email and/or web-based collaboration tools

Funding

Associated costs with the Advisory Teams will be built into the operating budget of the Fraser Assembly. Travel subsidies will be made available, by application, to those Team members who do not have institutional support.

Term and Review

The duration of these Terms of Reference is from September 25, 2007 – Sept 25, 2010. These TOR will be reviewed on an annual basis through a suitable mechanism supported by the Fraser Assembly.

Annex 1: Participant List

Education and Engagement

Facilitator/Secretary: Sheila Creighton/Megan Moser

Richard	Holmes	University of Northern BC Quesnel River Research Centre
Bev	Bowler	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Joan	Carne	Stream of Dreams Mural Society
Tina	Donald	Simpcw First Nation
Nicole	Marples	Langley Environmental Partners Society
Janis	Olsen	Rivershed Society of BC
Ken	Wilson	Watershed Watch
Veronica	Woodruff	BC Conservation Foundation
Adrian	Wall	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Clive	Callaway	The Living Water Project
Deborah	Phelan	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Bob	Guerin	Musqueam Band
Mark	Johnson	Fisheries & Oceans Canada

Integrated Planning and Governance

Facilitator/Secretary: Jessica Bratty, Andrew Stegemann

Tom	Cadieux	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Allen	Huguette	Lumby Salmon Trails
Jeff	Jung	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Doug	Kelly	Stolo Tribal Council
Jordon	Point	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Brian	Riddell	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Murray	Ross	Secwepemc Fisheries Commission
Elizabeth	Salomon-de-Friedberg	Nicola WUMP
		Native Brotherhood of Bc/FN Marine Society
Teresa	Ryan	
David	Barrett	Commercial Salmon Advisory Board
Clifford	Alec	Chief, Ts'kw'aylaxw First Nation
Garth	Mirau	UFAWU-CAW Local 15
Ernie	Victor	Fraser Basin Council
John	Louis	Musqueam Indian Band

Water and Habitat Restoration and Stewardship

Facilitator/Secretary: Bill Granger/Tascha Stubbs

Bob	Otway	BC Federation of Drift Fishers
Mike	Wallis	Salmon River Watershed Roundtable
Joachim	Carolsfield	World Fisheries Trust
Tracey	Carson	Bowron Lake Enhancement Society
Maurice	Coulter Boisvert	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Stephen	Dick	Lower Nicola Indian Band
Jamie	Felhauer	Salmon River Watershed Roundtable
Lee	Hesketh	BC Cattlemen's Association
Sara	Howard	Nature Conservancy of Canada
Tracy	Sampson	Nicola Tribal Association
Greg	Wilson	Ministry of ENV
Neil	Todd	Nicola Tribal Association
John	Werring	David Suzuki Foundation
Clay	Campbell	Farmland Riparian Interface Stewardship Program
Scott	Koch	Village of Chase

Improved Information for Sustainable Fisheries

Facilitator/Secretary: Alison Macnaughton/Saul Milne

Bob	Bocking	LGL Limited
Bob	Grant	Community Fisheries Development centre
Les	Jantz	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Brad	Mason	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Dave	Moore	Moore Dave Fisheries Development
Peter	Nicklin	upper Fraser Fisheries Conservation Alliance
Fred	Robbins	Esketemc First Nation
Jim	Shinkewski	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Mike	Staley	Fisheries Consultant
Gord	Sterritt	Northern Shuswap Tribal Council
Michelle	Walsh	Secwepemc Fisheries Commission
Frank	Kwak	Upper Fraser Valley Sport Fish Advisory Committee

Appendix 5: Workshop Evaluation Results

Fraser Assembly – February 26, 2007

EVALUATION SUMMARY

1. How would you rate the February 26th Fraser Assembly overall?

Circle one:

1 (poor)	
2	
3	2
4	10
5 (excellent)	1
Not rated	1

2. What specifically did you like about the Assembly meeting?

- Interaction on programmatic activities, feedback and direction
- Open, frank discussion
- There are some areas that have progressed quite rapidly
- Plenary discussion periods
- A variety of representation from organizations and discussion was great
- Good discussion! Good vision! Good program!
- Well structured
- The program updates, in particular the presentation from Al Lill
- Staff seem to be listening
- Learning more about how the governance structure was set up, networking
- Getting the various organizations together

3. What specifically did you not like about the Assembly meeting?

- Too much 1-way presentations
- Location is not very accessible.
- There did not seem to be any address to pressure to legislate new well reporting and logging
- Discussion of management and evaluation framework
- Would like an update geographically of ENGO/stewardship groups and ID gaps, overlaps and help build partnerships between groups. This could avoid competing for funding resources.
- I agree with Murray – more transparency is needed to explain how projects come to be approved.
- Nothing

- There was insufficient time for small group meetings and no reporting out from the group leads
- How do we keep in contact between Fraser Assemblies
- Break out session too short, limited information on projects
- Little opportunity to talk about year two projects

4. What would you suggest as improvements to the approach taken for the Assembly meeting?

- Bring in project presentations 1x/year. 50% time on above (interaction on programmatic activities, feedback and direction) and 50% of time on program strategy presentations (Annual Assembly and banquet).
- Hard to follow where ideas get incorporated. Not possible to understand if past work has been properly evaluated and built upon.
- Reporting of activities throughout the year as a preparation for next meeting date
- Develop a checklist of questions to guide and encourage (not limit) plenary discussions
- 2-day sessions to get feedback from breakout sessions to entire group, i.e. interested in providing input to two break out groups.
- I like the idea of proponents presenting/displaying posters.
- More short project presentations; less overview.
- None
- Formalize the small group sand have separate breakout rooms (one room is too noisy. Also more clearly articulate what the objectives of the small group discussion are.
- more discussion on program delivery policies
- increased participation from NGO and stewardship communities, not enough information to relevant FN and organizations
- more time to work together to discuss projects not just share information

5. How would you rate the discussion and relevancy of your small group session?

Small Group: Aboriginal / Governance

1 (poor)	
2	
3	1
4	2
5 (excellent)	

- More time
- More time for discussion, there are big picture issues, flip chart notes were weak

Small Group: Communications

1 (poor)	
2	
3	1

4	2
5 (excellent)	

- More definition of the goals of the session. Great discussion and brainstorming, yet I don't feel that we were able to prioritize communications messages.
- It was just brainstorming session on ideas; needed to more fundamental issues for example who, how and what to communicate
- Did not have time to bring thoughts together toward a goal

Small Group: Habitat / Water

1 (poor)	
2	
3	1
4	3
5 (excellent)	1

- A clear description of what the session was to achieve in a short time as some were off topic. More time could have improved success measures to be quantifiable/qualifiable but would be best in a 2-day format.
- Nothing
- It was not clear how the information will be used.

Small Group: Fisheries

1 (poor)	
2	
3	
4	1
5 (excellent)	

More time

Not indicated:

Too short and not clearly connected

6. What, if anything, would have made the small group session better?

– more time and clear feedback links to program directions

7. In order to assist in planning future sessions of the Fraser Assembly, please let us know what should be the *most important* goals of the Fraser Assembly sessions (please rank from 1-6)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Receive updates on and discuss the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program	8	1	2	1			
Suggest future directions for the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program	2	10					
Informal networking			2	3	2	4	

Share updates with other organizations		1	1	2	5	2	
Discuss specific projects	1		3	2	2	3	
Discuss cross-cutting issues	1	1	3	4	1	2	
Other: links to other funding source business plans							1

8. Are there any additional comments you want FBC and PSF to consider as we continue our work?
- Please review work already done under Fraser Green Plan before embarking on more studies
 - A virtual forum or on-line follow-up would be great to see how the Assembly and related docs (i.e. framework) was affected/impacted. I would like to be updated on ongoing of the document status.
 - Why is NO info available online? The optics are important.
 - Happy to see further development on communication challenge and look forward to seeing improvement

Appendix 6: 2008 Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program Glossary

Community Based Social Marketing (CBSM) – Initiatives that apply marketing techniques to foster behaviour change that benefits society. (See www.cbsm.com and/or www.uwsp.edu/cnr/uwexplakes/conventions/2007/CBSM-presentation.pdf).

Delivery method – The means by which education or outreach materials or program will be made accessible to their intended audience.

Fraser Assembly – A collaborative meeting ground to promote information sharing and coordinated delivery of programs among interested parties in a fashion that, consistent with the Business Plan, supports watershed and salmonid sustainability in the Fraser Basin. The Fraser Assembly will also provide guidance to the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program.

Fraser Assembly Advisory Teams – Four Advisory Teams formed from membership of the Fraser Assembly to provide advice to the FSWP on the four Program Areas.

Fraser Basin Initiative - Governed by a contribution agreement with PSF, this is a DFO commitment to funding and in-kind contributions to the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program.

Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program Management Committee – Consists of all FSWP staff, and includes the PSF and FBC Executive Directors, who meet regularly to plan and manage the program.

Living Rivers Trust Fund – An endowment fund created by the Government of BC which is managed by the Vancouver Foundation. The access to these resources is through the management and approval of the Living Rivers Trust Fund Advisory Group. This fund provides financial support to both the FSWP and the Georgia Basin Initiative.

Living Rivers Trust Fund Advisory Group – Provides overall review and approval of strategic direction, annual program work plans and funding levels for the Living Rivers Trust Fund.

Pacific Salmon Foundation and Fraser Basin Council – Two organizations that have signed an MOU to collectively manage the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program.

Pacific Salmon Foundation: Board of Directors – Provides overall management, project approval and financial accountability to the Fraser Salmon and Watersheds Program. They also have final project and funding approval authority for both Living Rivers Trust Fund and Fraser Basin Initiative funding envelopes.

Pacific Salmon Foundation Board of Director's Project Review Committee – A committee of the PSF Board of Directors who provide analysis of all projects and technical information. This committee makes funding recommendations to the PSF Board of Directors for final approval.

Risk Management Approaches – Risk Management identifies potential risks to successful completion of projects. Risk Management Approaches are then determined and executed to mitigate this risk.

Technical Review Committee – A committee of informed individuals/experts who will evaluate and rank the technical feasibility and probable success of each project. *This committee does not participate in final decision making.*

Wild Salmon Policy – The full Wild Salmon Policy can be found at http://www-comm.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/publications/wsp/wsp_e.pdf