

Round 2 – NAWMP Stakeholder Input Workshops  
Table Leader Notes

**When completed save file as <city\_last name\_date> in the workshop location folder on the USB drive and transfer to DJ Case via email or USB drive BEFORE YOU LEAVE the workshop.**

Workshop Location: Edmonton  
Workshop Date: February 8-9, 2011  
Table Leader Name: Mike Anderson

**Exercise 1 – Fundamental objectives**

Step 1 – Capture succinct notes and phrases that clarify what the fundamental objectives mean to your group

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	Did not get to this one.
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	<p>Reflects on #1 to explain what "sustaining wf populations mean".</p> <p>Relates to lots of other conservation goals too.</p> <p>Maintain other ecosystem functions too. Hydrologically, etc.</p> <p>Maintaining ecosystem functions part of this too. Big picture landscape issues affect wetland functions too. Not necessarily pristine, but functional. Wetland conservation means more than conserving the basin in many systems. A scale issue in many places. (eg. BC forests).</p> <p>Jim asked about terms -- is 10 years or so enough? Longer obviously better. Practical constraints may limit this.</p> <p>Scale varies with the issue; don't rule out tools.</p> <p>Our goals are WF, but not for general public, need a broader value proposition that appeals to more.</p> <p>TP may be around water (incl. wetlands). in SK, movement of water is the main issue.</p> <p>Watersheds or sub-watershed may be natural integrating unit. Not best for ducks, maybe, but best for important stakeholders. Need to recognize that this will likely take a lot of work.... lots of modeling probably.</p> <p>Recognize waterfowl, by and large, are doing relatively well.</p> <p>Success likely to reside in working toward biodiversity goals with LS conservation.</p> <p>Likely need to think more about public education; local scales (e.g. RMs, watersheds). Big staff-intensive</p>

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
	<p>challenge. Can't resource to lead, take advantage where we can? Be opportunistic.</p> <p>Phrased rather like a means objectives. Do we broaden the statement to reflect broader values??? Maybe not with respect to the Plan. It's a means for a lot of people.</p>
<p>3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting</p>	<p>About resources from the Plan perspective. It's a means objective. For Canada, it's a huge driver for Nawca funding. It's about support for state agencies, etc.</p> <p>Need to perpetuate link to land, to resources, to ecological roots. In Canada, it's important not to loose that. Not just waterfowl hunting. It IS fundamental; it's connection with the land and understanding and commitment. It's not just money it's social sustainability for conservation.</p> <p>VIP = A connection to the land makes a good case for synthesizing human objectives into one (3&amp;4).</p> <p>ethically acquired free-range organic healthy meat may help connect.</p> <p>EC legislations = permissible activities vs. promotional activities. Providing sufficient quality opportunities is absolutely consistent with Canadian federal policy; promoting one group over another not.</p> <p>VIP = Recognizing the importance of habitat should be a fundamental objective; we arent working on building support for this. ....</p> <p>need to help people connect to landscapes that produce waterfowl for whatever reason. Three and four really should be combined again.</p> <p>VIP = Connecting people to the land is the broader goal than hunting or birding, or It's a bigger tent; we need a bigger tent. (Relates, frankly to Leopold's land ethic). Need to do this deliberately and do it together.</p> <p>This is for polictical and financial support, and thus has means elements, but it's also about sustaining conservation writ large.</p>
<p>4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and</p>	<p>See #3 above; this was an integrated discussion of both objectives.....</p>

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	

Step 2 – List the most important measurable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measurable objectives
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	Did not get to this one.
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	<p>Changes in cover over time (including wetlands). Net change may be a good proxy for ecosystem function. Radarsat for water may be useful. Space-based platforms. Look at broad changes, not just waterfowl change. Need to understand relationship between LS change and wetlands and waterfowl demographics.</p> <p>Net LS change seems important (e.g., perennial cover and wetlands) but so too is understanding relationship between LS change and waterfowl demography.</p> <p>Do we need to assist other stakeholders/interest groups to do that too????? How much do we need to invest in this???</p> <p>From a duck point of view, this is mainly about garnering support.</p> <p>Is diversity of wetlands an important one???? Probably. Just consolidated deep basins won't do it. Need the diversity; a representative mix of the "natural suite" of wetlands. Maintain what we have now, probably optimistic. Restoring more shallow types probably unrealistic.</p>
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	Did not get to this.
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	

### Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms.

Valuing fundamental objectives table notes:

Varies with whether wearing agency hat or personal values. People did various things.

Interconnectedness of objectives evident.

Most re-did initial fundamental scores to accommodate means linkages that they created later.

Much variation in fundamental vs. means total (range 33-65 in boxes)

Most started out with heavy LS weighting; one focused on populations.

### **Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes**

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

Institutions and Processes table notes:

Current institutions seem inadequate or we wouldn't be having this discussion. Varying preparedness to discuss this. JV focused mostly.

#### 1) Objective setting:

Need to be science driven. SMART objectives. Working group to review. Federal agencies must have key roles. Start ground-up? Begin at JV scales??? Flyway JV connection seen crucial. Multi-tier process? NSST should play a strong role. Experts that cut-across important. Need to link HMWG and NSST experts. Maybe population objectives (#, distribution) can be better set at a larger scale; then habitat objectives at more of a regional scale???? Need to get HMWG and NSST out of silos and working together on this. Maybe be leverage here to get existing cross-border JVs working more closely together on planning. Should U.S. and Canada regulation setting processes be more strongly integrated???? Should this be at the FWY level. Processes may remain different, but policy decisions could be more consistent. How expand ideas about HD objectives???? Broader stakeholder engagement may be needed. Some diversification of agency roles will be needed for flexibility and effectiveness. If our goal to connect people with land may differ a lot from place to place. More engagement of states and provinces; other government departments?? Other NGO communities. JV or provincial level focus. NAWMP partners focus attention; may not take the reins, however. NGO partner options may vary from places to place and may argue for a more bottom-up regional approach to HD objective setting. Urban vs. rural differences to address too

#### 2) Adaptive management:

Must be some new combination of groups, or at least some over-arching coordination. Needs to move away from current silos. PC responsibility??? Re-invent the PC. PC as coordinators. Working groups to inform this. Who does measuring and monitoring?? Agency responsibilities. Pooled funding sources for monitoring and assessment??? Surcharge on habitat funds?... on licenses.....on other interest groups somehow?? Green Budget coalition in Canada may be a group that could help with funding the conservation agenda.

NAWMP would need to be reinvented. Connections to JVs need to be strengthened; so too with the Flyways. and can  
HD working group needed; if emerges under NFC, then at least the linkage of the three technical groups can connect to FWY, and JVs (through the PC?).

What can foster change in our most resistant groups????? e.g., FWY technical committee people.

Revision of Plan include a commitment to DOING things?? Nudge objectives with addition of assigning responsibilities.

**General comments** – enter any comments or reactions you want to record  
Any general comments:

Round 2 – NAWMP Stakeholder Input Workshops  
Table Leader Notes

**When completed save file as <city\_last name\_date> in the workshop location folder on the USB drive and transfer to DJ Case via email or USB drive BEFORE YOU LEAVE the workshop.**

Workshop Location: Edmonton  
Workshop Date: February 8-9, 2011  
Table Leader Name: Bob Clark

**Exercise 1 – Fundamental objectives**

Step 1 – Capture succinct notes and phrases that clarify what the fundamental objectives mean to your group

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	population is able to sustain itself over the long-term (not always year after year in the same place); whether or not the population is harvested; proper management (avoid overabundance); abundance in proportion to available habitat- recognize natural variation in habitat like wetlands; populations should track habitats in ways that you would expect (no decoupling); properly recognize or value ALL waterfowl, including nonharvested species? Healthy water bird populations - and perhaps beyond waterfowl (waterfowl is an umbrella group - indicator of habitat quality for ALL wetland-associated birds and other wildlife); maintain (natural) diverse complement of waterfowl species in synch with habitat conditions (i.e. not just mallards) - species composition; maintain productive capacity of the "landscape" (demographic rates); objective can be attained at larger scales, not always at local or regional scales (birds move depending on local conditions).
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	create long-term "landscape" conditions capable of supporting demographic rates (leading to positive population growth rates) when natural environmental conditions allow, throughout the annual cycle ("set the table") - recognises that natural conditions aren't favourable every year/season in every place and need for broad-scale thinking; recognize the many benefits for ecosystem services (socioeconomic impact) and other biota - plants and animals; "long-term"; terminology is important and needs to be clear - define "conserve" to reflect or imply that it allows for working landscapes, management and so on (i.e., it is not full "protection"); define - landscapes has broad meaning (includes seascapes); compensate landowners in

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
	some way (e.g., financial or tax incentives) to save or restore critical habitats like wetlands and natural upland cover.
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	We are losing people who hunt waterfowl - not always clear why; why do we want to perpetuate - is it for increased awareness of conservation, increasing financial inputs, more management control over populations, build political support for conservation; maintain or increase opportunity and access for purpose of consumptive use; could increase programs for mentoring (tradition, use); increase social acceptance (via education?) of hunting - e.g., people are more nervous about guns than fishing rods.
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	This one is too long- reword?; Not a fundamental objective = means objective; Increase and perpetuate public support for conservation including waterfowl; create more access/opportunities and interpretive capacity (what can "you" do to help and make a difference), especially in urban areas; overall awareness of the big (scale) picture issues; "festival themes" (snow goose fest at Beaverhill) - there is a thirst for this.

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	Population sizes (over long-term) of all waterfowl species (applicable broad scale). Trends in age (sex) ratios; survival rates (banding information).
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	Habitat area and link to demographic rates (target areas); net landscape changes (key wetland and upland habitats). Support for landowner incentive programs.
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	permit sales; mentoring opportunities; harvest and hunter numbers, hunter recruitment, hunter satisfaction via survey, days in field, support/acceptance of hunting by non-hunting community in the media
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	public attitudes toward (waterfowl) hunting; viewing; investments in conservation programs; support for policy of tax revenue from sales of specific products (e.g., "viewing"s supplies) to conservation programs (e.g., habitat programs). Increased overall value of waterfowl and key natural landscape via activity in conservation programs.

**Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives**

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms.

- ranked conserving landscapes the heaviest to capture values for other species (i.e., biodiversity values); this is the starting point for other objectives; more arrow from this objective speaks to its importance; other societal benefits including to landowners and that could translate into more support for programs/policies.
- waterfowl hunting low because this population is more likely to take part/contribute, so you need to encourage and invest more in the non-hunting component (i.e., impact potential is greatest)
- weighted nonhunting arrow lower than hunting because higher numbers relative to hunters means that they have similar net impact.
- populations can be healthy if you manage waterfowl via hunting (e.g., overabundance; need an arrow?)
- useful exercise in thinking about how to weight these objectives and the linkages; good to see that the linkages are being explored in greater detail in a quantifiable manner.
- tended to assign some of the letter boxes similarly with 2 exceptions: landscape to populations and populations to hunters took the most relative weights from the fundamental objectives.

### **Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes**

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

A. Ideas for (coherent) social process for setting multiple objectives (populations, landscapes, hunters/people):

- Move new ideas to the policy arena, e.g., (tax) incentives to landowners to help achieve objectives. Needs to be expanded/strengthened.
- Partnerships seem critical (must have the right composition); emphasize this for collaborative planning and achieving goals (e.g., populations and habitat). NAWMP structure seems to be a good model: it's a matter of ensuring that it works.
- JVs work - and the structure can be used to form "arms" to address specific issues in programs and policies (e.g., in BC). Bring regional perspective and can rank importance or gravity of situations.
- JV partner members may be limited in terms of their influence with their home departments/agencies; consistent, frequent communication, hold workshops to increase knowledge in executive levels (targetted people) across key departments.
- Mechanism or change to allow freeing up of resources to apply to policy and stewardship programs (not just direct program).
- Generally, from provincial perspective, processes for hunting regs = no major problems or issues.
- In Canada, regs are fairly straightforward and no major problems amongst jurisdictions; but, the system is relatively simple.
- Better communication or linkages between JVs and Flyways (state, provincial) to address hunter and other concerns.
- At continental scale, federal (or NAWCC, PC?) oversight and high level concept then given to JVs (Flyways) to implement. (should be able to roll up and scale down).
- In some jurisdictions the JV structure or management board isn't always well-organised to address multiple objectives (tighten in some cases).

B. Monitoring progress towards achieving goals and adapt accordingly:

- Species-specific harvest information is available for use by provinces and so on.
- Habitat tracking could be improved (JV and national scale) - some conservation investments not being tracked; difficult to use information; underreporting may be a problem.

C. Institutional change (what kind(s)?):

- improve NTS.
- national templates for setting and tracking goals; JV accountability.

NAWMP has no "authority" - develop buy-in by partners; can only appeal via charm and free lunches. Get buy-in and partners can unleash themselves.

**General comments** – enter any comments or reactions you want to record

Round 2 – NAWMP Stakeholder Input Workshops  
Table Leader Notes

**When completed, save file as <city last name date> and email or transfer on USB drive to DJ Case BEFORE YOU LEAVE the workshop.**

Workshop Location: Edmonton  
Workshop Date: 8 February  
Table Leader Name: Milton

**Exercise 1 – Fundamental objectives**

Step 1 – Capture succinct notes and phrases that clarify what the fundamental objectives mean to your group

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	good; does not imply growth or sustainability of current levels; tied to proportion of population in order to maintain support; maintain of viable groups to be effective in lobbying support;
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	what is meant by waterfowl landscapes - vague, agricultural, breeding areas....; is there overlap with other activities that occur in other activities; very waterfowl centric; are the terms inclusive enough; is this a means or a fundamental objective; are we looking at this as a goal for waterfowl or the policy support; difference between "perpetuate" and "sustain", both action but perpetuate is more intense; what is the scope of "opportunities"; why do we wish public support - influence decision makers and allocation of funds; waterfowl landscape is a vague term - rather landscapes that support waterfowl; dichotomy of view - waterfowl or broader to wetland dependent" key words: sustain, enjoy; stakeholders are very diverse; broaden waterfowl to waterbird as more inclusive to public; separating waterfowl hunting from other opportunities
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	terminology - what is meant by "maintain" and "healthy", carrying capacity?; more than minimum viable population; levels determined upon societal objectives; rarity vs very abundant; societal valuation in setting goals; Achieve and maintain with an socially acceptable target - action oriented; "Achieve and maintain waterfowl populations at goal levels"
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy	what is meant by "conserve", means different things to different people; replace with "ensure"; reword - Ensure landscapes are capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at goal levels"

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	

Step 2 – List the most important measurable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measurable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	current sampling; number of waterfowl hunters as proportion of population is maintained or increasing; how large does the proportion need to be in order to maintain public support as a socially accepted activity with increasing antihunting sentiment; recruitment and retention can be measured;
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	Value of Nature to Canadians,; how to separate proximate and ultimate cause in observed effect in the metric; Identify and measure participants - photographers, bird watchers; measuring enjoyment difficult and value laden
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	populations at a determined level; waterfowl populations levels are at a level to meet user expectations - socially acceptable;
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	

### Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms.

residual values - "just because" not all allocated to boxes "A" -"G";

similarity in relative allocation among boxes.

suggest should be a return arrow from waterfowl hunting to healthy populations; lower value for Waterfowl Hunting and Viewing and Enjoyment raises question whether they should be separate objectives.

### Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

Who is ultimately accountable, strong top down component to drive process forward?

Most of main partners are sitting at the table of JVs, lack of representation of nonconsumptive users unless represented by government;

There is a need to link harvest management process with habitat JVs;  
How do we deal with trade-off between wildlife objectives and other societal desires?  
Need to have societal and economic filters at local level.  
What is appropriate level of integration? Macro and micro  
Direction setting vs implementation setting;  
Authority vested in federal governments, Plan Committee can establish objectives but federal has ability to allocate resources to realize objectives.  
Require a human dimension technical group;  
Many processes current in-place, examples of technical committees at federal-provincial level and JVs; information flows upward with buy-in demonstrated; use of federal-provincial meetings of ministers to agree upon objectives.

**General comments** – enter any comments or reactions you want to record

Round 2 – NAWMP Stakeholder Input Workshops  
Table Leader Notes

**When completed save file as <city\_last name\_date> in the workshop location folder on the USB drive and transfer to DJ Case via email or USB drive BEFORE YOU LEAVE the workshop.**

Workshop Location: Edmonton  
Workshop Date: February 8-9, 2011  
Table Leader Name: Roberts

**Exercise 1 – Fundamental objectives**

Step 1 – Capture succinct notes and phrases that clarify what the fundamental objectives mean to your group

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	Consider the number of birds, species specific, distribution. Species are distributed over landscape that aren't detrimental to human populations (e.g., Canada geese in backyard vs. golf course). Also traditional wintering areas. Scale is important. Migration concerns (hunter dissatisfaction). Limited ability to change this.  Can "distribution" be added/considered in wording of fundamental objective. both numbers and distribution should be considered.
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	most definitely !! conserve is inclusive, considers both sustain and perpetual Do we have natural landscapes? Naturally maintained landscapes to maintain healthy population (# 1) in order to get away from human conflict. Change practices (e.g., on cooling ponds or other open water that freezes) to ensure that waterfowl behave in seasonal migration patterns
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	maintain tradition of waterfowl hunting and things that go along with that, opportunity to go hunting easily accessible lands (maintain access, can't be solely for clubs on private lands if so then we have failed) maintaining the numbers of people who hunt (proportion of population as well as number of people) securing public acceptance of hunting- not a bad thing for waterfowl population characterize as a family value- who we are as Canadians- fundamental part of who we are (e.g., same activity same

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
	<p>time of year; one of our main activities) everyone in family is involved in process maintain as family value- build as family value</p> <p>How to get there is multi-faceted. Try different things and they have to appeal to different family members. Experimenting with different things. Youth-oriented hunting weekends.</p> <p>Needs to be marketed as a family activity. Has to be fundamental to what happens in family.</p> <p>Perpetuate means there is a decline. Need to find an equilibrium</p>
<p>4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes</p>	<p>Access, boardwalks Fundamental for achieving # 3 (perpetuate waterfowl hunting) Different from # 3- providing the opportunities. More a part of landscapes (more boardwalks). Start really young with families. Can be done with anyone, When you think of NAWMP, is this one of the end. Is the means to get to end. Families want to see ducklings for someone drafting a policy, this is a means to ge the waterfowl populations Need to have both 3 and 4 in plan in order to achieve plan Hunting is more than pulling trigger, but entire holistic approach and thus need # 4 Talking to landowners, this becomes important. Lots of landowners don't hunt but enjoy raising waterfowl. Level of scale- may be too narrow by not involving rest of public. Increase value of waterfowl and landscapes in Canada, the way to do this to have larger propotion of population doing this. Narrowing oportunites is appreciation. Does enjoying watefowl landscapes even belong in here. In past, NAWMP has focussed on populations, now a switch to just view the landscapes or birds. Don't care if can't identify species, they are there for numbers</p>

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
-----------------------	------------------------

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	Human conflict? Measure decrease in complaints. Measure migration numbers (e.g., overwintering) Surveys (long term average, last 20 years). How do you set the objectives? Once again species-specific.
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	measure water table levels (do we have levels that can maintain populations every year, or every 3 years) Is wetland still there? looking at net. Ensure not losing more than you are conserving.
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	Number of family members involved in the tradition of hunting (e.g., training dogs) that don't directly hunt Measure hunter satisfaction or number of hunters (not same thing). Depends on hunting experience, but need critical mass to sustain. Recruitment rate (new hunters involved) Turnover rate (number of years out of 5 that you hunt) Number of permits sold Number of guns, ammunition sold for waterfowl hunting (less clear, difficult to separate out)
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	number of parks, number of boardwalks measuring public's knowledge of where to go and view waterfowl and waterfowl landscape Proportion of population that partakes in these activities Where the birds are is not always an attractive landscapes. Which do you value more? Speedboats or ducks? In landuse planning need to consider this (e.g., soccer field vs draining wetland).

### Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms.

secondary landscapes that are housing populations at various times.

What was valued highly before this exercise is now 0 after the exercise showing interconnectedness of all the objectives

Need populations to ensure viewing at enjoyment.

Do the original values remain important

Where do dollars go? If you had a \$1.00 and had to determine where best to use, this would result in different proportions. Would put more into messaging that a duck is really important.

Left points in original boxes to ensure meeting objectives.

Values are still there if left at 0, but "disguised" now.

Unless hunters grows then you won't have landscapes

Capitalize back into box the money being spent by viewers.

Could have double arrow going from hunting to populations (e.g., snow goose) and also from viewing and enjoyment to healthy populations  
Waterfowl hunting and viewing are all about values.

### **Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes**

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

Given folks who were consulted in round 2 there was not a lot of public input

Management oriented and not public policy oriented- could be a problem

Does science need policy or simply inform it

There is not overarching coordinating body (e.g., regs, populations, habitat) all are fairly separate.

Group opinions across round 2 are varying (biased). need an international body that would oversee and try to come to consensus on position. Need a neutral body.

Talking about groups who view waterfowl- who are these people. Are they part of a club.

That group should be part of the decision making. Ultimately responsibility lies with government. The responsibility to get opinion comes from government, but who is the group we need to determine.

The round 2 participants will provide checks and balances in system, but won't capture public opinion.

Need to ask broader community for their opinion.

how does NAWCC Canada fit in?

Measure progress need one body for integrated goals.

Are groups that we all interact with that have stakeholder groups that aren't here.

Consult with individual stakeholders. but can't speak for them. Public process is using science to inform.

Important to consult with groups so their stakeholders buy in.

Part of public process, bigger and stronger grassroots buy in.

NAWMP will affect resources going into land management practices.

Tradeoffs examined to increase harvest capacity, produce more birds or accept lower population objective. How are those decisions facilitated. Implementation of revised document will be difficult if other institutions not involved (e.g., need a coordinating body)

IS JV process still valid? YES, for habitat. need new mechanism (or JVs could do) to examine hunter and population goals.

Need to manage for multiple objectives. So, JVs could monitor. Would really help if more buy in from grassroots than regulatory

What level of monitoring. Habitat Matters or Assessment. Some basic data you could monitor every year and there are some that could be done by 5 or 10 years. Set a process out in advance (adaptive element to plan) to ensure monitoring is effective. Would need some annually to ensure capital involved. Viewing enjoyment is not necessary to monitor every year. If it is to engage folks in public policy, need mechanisms to ensure numbers are captured.

Fundamental objective should be importance of NAWMP besides just waterfowl. Want people to support conservation. Connecting people back to nature. Make link. Broader than public. Few conservation agencies may not be aware of NAWMP either.

NAWMP represents broader conservation than waterfowl and wetlands. Struggle with setting the bar (still the plan is waterfowl). Is there a maturity date for a plan that is too specific? Some of hunter objectives are self serving.

#### Decisions

New coordinating mechanism will they be responsible for all decisions. Will they be all encompassing

Distribution of funds- NAWCC Canada in past

Using a scheme that is layered. Technical body that reviews and provides, but doesn't get to vote. Get expert opinion.

Technical body- different reviewers (Because of expertise involved) e.g., Fund obj # 4 vs. # 1. similar to grant reviewer process

Separate review process (technical expertise) from decision making process.

Coordinating body. Continentally. Would be similar to NAWCC or Plan Committee, but include hunter and viewing groups too. Need a group that is small enough to be working.

Reasonable number to adjudicate money and other resources. 6-10 folks.

Can rely on existing bodies, but need to merge

Board. Visionary and representing divergent ideas. National groups and representation. Don't get mixed up with operations, but use smaller groups to take on these responsibilities.

Resources. Members contribute. Depends on membership. May need a broader source of funding.

Broader representation in new structure at various levels, but may not be required at each level (e.g., advisory board, theme specific, and scientific and technical).

**General comments** – enter any comments or reactions you want to record