



I would first like to thank the Chair and the members of the National Advisory Panel on Marine Protected Area (MPA) Standards for the invitation to present this afternoon.

My name is Ian MacPherson and I am the Executive Director of the Prince Edward Island Fishermen's Association. I am pleased to be joined this afternoon by Melanie Giffin who is a Lobster Biologist and Industry Planner for the PEIFA.

For those of you that are not familiar with the PEIFA we have six local fishing organizations that are represented on our Board of Directors and form the backbone of our organization.

We advocate on behalf of over 1260 harvesters. Our primary species are lobster, herring, mackerel and Bluefin tuna.

The PEIFA is an organization that is very active in all areas of the fishery as our contribution to provincial Gross-Domestic Product (GDP) is one of the highest in Canada for a fishing sector.

Therefore, the discussion around Marine Protected Areas is a file of great interest to the organization and our members.

We have actively participated in a number of forums over the past two years and we want to emphasize that our comments and concerns come from a position of wanting to make the fishery better for harvesters now and many years into the future.

We feel we have a responsibility to give open and honest input regarding the MPA process to date, and forward some of our concerns while addressing most of the questions the panel has posed.

In our presentation we would like to discuss communication in the current MPA consultation process, MPA parameters and MPA research, monitoring and review.

The PEIFA would like it noted that there exists a wealth of traditional and community knowledge in our indigenous and non-indigenous fishing communities. This knowledge should be an integral part of any decision making process. Both our communities share a common goal of wanting our fisheries to flourish for many more generations. We want to underscore that science does have its rightful place in resource management issues but that the observations and input of all those on the water also need to be respected and taken into account in the decision making process.

Communication: The PEIFA has been very interested in MPAs and actively sought early information sessions and ongoing communication. A commitment by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans

Canada (DFO) to issue updates every 6 months was made. In the past and to date the PEIFA has felt this was an insufficient frequency of communication. Meetings were held in January and November of 2016, and February 2018. As you can see this did not meet the biannual information sharing commitment.

Face to face meetings have mainly been report outs on the DFO activities and although appreciated these meetings have not provided sufficient opportunities for industry input.

Consultations with the Atlantic Provinces, First Nations and other Fishing Associations have been conducted separately. By conducting dialogue in silos any sort of regional outlook as to where MPAs should or could be located has not taken place. Therefore, neighbouring fishing organizations do not have any idea on what other organizations are recommending. As meetings have not been conducted in a grouped fashion, we have situations where information can be disseminated by some organizations long before their own meeting occurs.

Important meetings also need to be sensitive to primarily fishing seasons so that valuable harvester input can be received. As of today and based on our current fishing seasons, July and October are the only months we can obtain harvester input and participation over the next six months. Recently we were to meet prior to our April 30th spring lobster season opening. The meeting was cancelled by DFO and now that opportunity has been lost for a number of months.

MPA Parameters:

Regarding MPA parameters we pose the following questions.

As I mentioned earlier Bluefin tuna is an important species to our fishery. As an internationally managed species what assurances do we have that other areas are protecting the species as well?

Is there a co-ordinated strategy on how the international community are connecting on their MPA efforts?

MPAs and Research, Monitoring and Review

Under MPA research, monitoring and review we have the following concerns.

- What if an MPA is not effective?
- What are the measurement tools that will be used to assess MPA effectiveness?
- What is the contingency plan if measures are not effective?
- Can the MPA designation be removed or changed?
- Who will be doing the area monitoring?
- Where will the funding for proper scientific research coming from?

We can appreciate that the concept of wide spread MPAs is relatively new to Canada and that decisions on these questions cannot be made in a vacuum or solely by one country. However these are important questions to the fishing industry that require detailed answers, the development of practical guidelines and solutions.

The IUCN guidelines note that "Recognizing that land based systems can threaten or destroy MPAs" The value of the MPA can be completely jeopardized if pollution from land-based sources cannot be controlled."

The PEIFA, The Gulf of Nova Scotia Fleet Planning Board and the Maritime Fishermen's Union are currently involved in a very public campaign to stop the new construction of a 10 kilometer long, 1 meter diameter pipe that will discharge in the range of 65 to 90 million litres per day of pulp mill effluent into the Northumberland Strait. The area of discharge is currently designated as a marine refuge. We are actively seeking a Federal environmental review on this whole project and we see this as a prime example of how a land based pollution source will not be properly controlled and can have significant negative impacts to our surrounding fishery.

We are also perplexed that we may have "no take" zones for fishing in the same area that oil and gas exploration and extraction are allowed under some of the current parameters.

As organization and citizens we must find a balance between industry applications, the aspirations and values of Canadians and the fishing community.

In summation and with respect to the questions posed by the committee, we offer the following comments from a fishing organization perspective.

- 1) There must be more open, transparent and co-ordinated dialogue so that industry can actively participate in creating standards. Many of the questions posed in this document need to be answered first so that groups understand the MPA framework, how it works and where it is headed. Current communication is not frequent or detailed enough for appropriate decisions to be made by stakeholders.
- 2) As stated, there is an untapped resource in the Indigenous and Community knowledge that must be sought and more importantly respected in the decision making process. We must remember that these are groups and people have significant investments in their fleets and make their preferred livelihood from the ocean. Community survival is at stake and these stakeholders more than anyone needs our marine species to be sustained and flourish but to be able to continue their livelihood.
- 3) In terms of a thorough review of the IUCN guidelines and recommendations to the panel, I would like it noted the fishing industry received an invitation to present to the panel on April 17th. We were not aware of the panels' formation or the panel's specific mandate until this date. As a fishing organization it is very difficult for us to offer specific recommendations without consulting our committee members on this suggested framework. We have not been able to do this for the reasons mentioned above. The tight timetable to review and present, the lack of meetings in other vital fishing areas in Atlantic Canada has resulted in limited fishing industry participation in this process. Earlier this week I was asked by my colleagues in surrounding areas

to bring these concerns forward to the panel. An additional collective concern is that there is no direct industry representation on the panel. We feel this is an important component in achieving the desired results in the consultation process.

It is our hope that the committee will assist the fishing community in fixing the current communication model so that we can come up with standards that make practical sense and are the best for Canada. Sufficient time must be allocated to allow this process development to be effective.

The PEIFA will endeavour to make some specific written recommendations in the near future under the challenges we have detailed.

Again, I would like to thank the National Advisory Panel on MPA Standards for the opportunity to present and provide what we hope is viewed as valuable feedback to this process.

We would be glad to answer any questions the committee members may have.