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Overview

• Definitions and Methodology (Hoberg)
• Local Benefits (Markey)
• Draft Policy and Institutional Design Option (O’Carroll)
• Comparing and Contrasting - Joint Solutions Project Proposal and Clayoquot Sound (Hoberg)
• Recommendations (Hoberg)
Mandate

• “Provide… recommendations to parties… as to the various institutional mechanisms and options required to make EBM a reality in the CIT region” (RFP p. 2)

• “The CIT approach to EBM involves:... Exploration of new policy instruments and management arrangements” (EBM Handbook p. iv)

Definitions

• Institutional design - who establishes, implements, monitors, and enforces the rules
  – e.g. does a government agency or co-jurisdictional board approve watershed plans?

• Policy design - establishment of operational rules
  – the objectives to be pursued, e.g. protecting known red and blue listed and regionally-rare ecosystems
  – instruments by which they are going to pursued, e.g., management target
  – specific settings of those instruments, e.g. protect or reserve >70% of known occurring blue-listed ecosystem
Design Methodology

• Evaluative Criteria:
  – Effectiveness
  – Efficiency
  – Equity
  – Aboriginal Rights and Title
  – Administrative Feasibility
  – Adaptability
  – Acceptability

Design Methodology

• Institutional design considerations:
  – What authority does the institution have?
  – Who participates?
  – What are the decision-rules?
  – How does it relate to other institutions?
Local Benefits - Outline

- Clarifying the mandate of CIT Process
- CIT area as economic region
- Appropriate literature: lessons for action
- Institutional relationships: orders of local control
- Recommendations

Institutional Framework: Orders of Local Control

- Direct Ownership
- Co-jurisdiction
- Co-management
- Resource Access
- Special Arrangements

Local Benefits

Capacity Demands
Recommendations

- Establishing supporting institutional structure(s)
- Conducting outreach and education
- Facilitating community and regional development
- Recognizing explicit link between access to resources, corporate linkages and local benefits

Draft Institutional Design

When viewed from an institutional perspective, effective ecosystem-based management is really a question of proper institutional design (Imperial 1999).
Regional Steering Committee

- Authority:
  - Monitoring and assess EBM institutional implementation
  - Resolve institutional implementation disputes
  - Set priorities for adaptive co-management; and
  - Oversee implementation, on-going practice and evolution of EBM.

Science Body

- Authority:
  - Assess, design, monitor and evaluate adaptive co-management (ACM);
  - Adjust EBM planning and practices standards based on ACM; and,
  - Build technical capacity for territorial monitoring.
Dispute Resolution

• Authority:
  – Resolve EBM planning and practice disputes, including:
    • public complaints
    • appeals of enforcement action
    • appeals arising from the approvals process, and
    • conflicts between licencees.

Territorial Steering Committee

• Authority:
  – Negotiate IMA
  – Negotiate Gov’t-to-Gov’t Land-Use Plan
  – Monitor and assess IMA implementation
  – Resolve disputes regarding EBM institutional implementation.
Territorial Co-Jurisdictional Body

• Authority:
  – Tactical and operational plan approval
  – Granting and replacement of licences; and,
  – Monitoring.

Recommendations

• EBM content and plans need to be made legally binding

• An assessment of capacity requirements for implementing EBM in the region should be conducted as soon as feasible.
## Comparing and Contrasting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Joint Solutions Project</th>
<th>Clayoquot Sound</th>
<th>JAG Design Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>EBM Council</td>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Reg Steering Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBM Standards</td>
<td>Gov’t / FN</td>
<td>CSSP + Cabinet</td>
<td>Steering Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Gov’t / FN</td>
<td>Cabinet</td>
<td>Terr Steering Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Plans</td>
<td>Gov’t / FN</td>
<td>Tech Plan Comm?</td>
<td>Co-Juris Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Plans</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
<td>Co-Juris Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Co-Juris Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Gov’t with Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt EBM</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Science Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>JSP / Gov’t</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Funding Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve Disputes</td>
<td>Gov’t / FN</td>
<td>Cabinet / CRRC</td>
<td>DR Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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