

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: Ottawa
Workshop Date: 14FEB11
Table Leader Name: BLISS

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.	- keep as is
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<p>closest links to #4 should #4 be on list for 1 and 2 to exist3 and 4 are necessary pre-cursors who's paying....3 important and 4 ----access to the resource is important to satisfy both 3 and 4 -- sustain opportunities....is a minimum statement, compared to 3 --- roll 4 into the other three --- habitat, pops, societal ==> merge 3 and 4 --- there is a hierarchy3 not at expense of 1 and 2 -- keep 4: Perpetuate opportunities..... -- number indicate our futures means linking with the unspoken majoritysustain, perpetuate, maximize, opportunities etc.3/4: maximizing use and enjoyment of waterfowl and their habitat (landscapes) -- keep 3 and 4 separate</p> <p>....NEW STATEMENT: Perpetuate non-consumptive use and appreciation of waterfowl and their landscapes (yes a fundamental objective)</p>
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the	- keep as is: maintain healthy waterfowls populations in North America

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	new wording: Conserve AND ENHANCE landscapes capable to sustaining

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<p>see modified statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use existing surveys on value spent on activities - outdoors card (like habitat stamp) to buy and can track # of cards; conservation license plates - something like Pittman/Robertson act in the US.....on all recreational products or a subset - basically we can't think of any direct methods to measure....so use indexes - sales of binocs, clientel at hotels, # nature tours, - target audience increasing in size (aging population) and diposal income any metrics there e.g. ecogifts and land donation.....do some statistical correlation on various aspects to see if something there - nature survey to canadians -
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.	
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.

- habitat is intrinsically important saw a variation of approaches....protect intrinsic value and have low linkages; have a balance between intrinsic and linkage values; to have little or no intrinsic value and linkages have the value == amongst five people we see this variation....so it is a challenge
- challenge was describing today's situation
- discussion was that the future is not necessarily with the hunting community but we have to pay a lot of attention to with all the other societal values, e.g fish, carbon sequestration,
- how to get the majority of community to be proactive and not reactive to wetlands/waterfowl conservation?....only contribute when there is a threat....interested in rarity whereas waterfowl community interested in abundance?
- lessons to be learned from how hunting community has been proactive, has invested money and worked to achieve their goals.

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes challenges

- continue to lose habitat
- losing hunters

Key challenges

- interest in waterfowl conservation is waning
- allocation of resources in waterfowl mgmt inefficient
- what is inefficient? where the money goes and how it gets put on the ground
- too labour intensive to get access to funds that go on the ground?
- if we did not think about existing situationscreate a joint venture or processes that are not heavy and high transaction costs as per current NAWCA process -- JVs, CWDC, NAWCA canada, NAWCA, Plan committee, province steering comm etc. etc. ==> too complex
- if we designed the Nawmp system today it would be much leaner etc.
- organizations suffer from turnaround and need to continually spend time to bring new people up to speed.
- we should strive for more simplicity of process
- waterfowl mgmt works and is not a sore thumb so it does not get attention
- but are we doing the right things?
- need to do integrated resource management; NAWMP is part of it for the waterfowl plan, but on the ground needs to include all wetland management for all species - getting funding for broader conservation - these moneys are general fund and from all taxpayers, not just users/viewers
- discussed drawing funding from viewers
- hunting community pays for consumptive side of it;
- Things fall apart in implementation - interest in JV

- Eastern Habitat JV is ineffective at implementation - maybe too big, too many issues? But black duck covers entire EHJV habitat, so stays one large entity and ineffective
- Do we need to reorganize how to do business within JV's? Maybe smaller areas within
- If priorities flow in from all bird groups, can make overlap - conservation planning at JV level - need silos of information to feed to JV level - BUT there are issues at JV level
- Who is ultimately accountable
- would make the JV smaller because they are different - maybe need a director bigger level picture
- Think of JVs as smaller more jurisdictional working on local issues with local partners
- All players need to see themselves at the table and has to have a benefit
- Need a
- the funding requirement has been part of this - if want NAWCA have to be part of JV, but NCC found wasn't worth their effort and dropped out.
- tighter jurisdictional piece would solve some of the problems, particularly in terms of relevance and bringing more partners to the table.
- If too broad,
- flyway is about population management-
- need a structure base, and grow from there. We are doing good things, but they are the right things?
- Fed/prov
- currently operating like an ineffective charity - too much money in administrative - need smaller administrative units to act at local levels for land conservation - e.g. quick purchase ability.
- create a compelling business plan -

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: Ottawa
Workshop Date: February 14-15, 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
<p>1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America</p>	<p>Our Group began with THIS objective:</p> <p>What does healthy mean???? Levels? VIP Context of use; how many do you want?? Context is mainly human use... how many want to hunt. North America big; whats the distribution context. Climate change will move birds around and perhaps change CC. VIP CC MAY Require more frequent changes in objectives. Carrying capacity a key issue. So over-abundance an issue too. VIP Healthy may be too loaded or vague a term to be useful. Needs to have components elaborated -Viable population self-perpetuate - In balance with habitat (+ or minus) - Adequate to satisfy human aspirations (#, distributions, etc.) May want to consider different public/private land goals</p>
<p>2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations</p>	<p>Wetland and uplands, all times of the year. VIP Linked to population goals via K; relating that to individual LS characteristics challenging.</p> <p>VIP No net loss within a region would require a commitment to tracking net change in landscape conditions. Better than we do now. Don't have a great handle on habitat trends to enable this.</p> <p>Requires context of #1 to set for both total ducks and certain species (e.g., scaup vs. mergansers) to do this. Should waterfowl needs drive this wholly??</p>

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
	<p>vs. other plans?</p> <p>Need to understand how LS change affects populations to do this well; but that will vary among species. Likely competing objectives too.</p>
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	<p>Try to combine them???. Just two of many forms of human use. Not too classes of people. Hunters contribute \$\$, information (bands), political activism, control of over-abundant species, .</p> <p>Different views about this. Another is that hunters have been an dominant factor in waterfowl management and will be for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Promoting vs. enabling?? Should agencies really be promoting hunting vs. other uses??</p> <p>VIP Start with a single general human-use objective. Sub-bullets may be viewing, hunting, EGS, connecting to nature, etc. Begin with hunting for emphasis.</p> <p>Other bird plans -- what do they do? No link to HD objectives.</p>
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	<p>Too narrow, more than just viewing</p>

Step 2 – List the most important measurable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measurable objectives
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	<p>Measurable attributes:</p> <p>Hopefully waterfowl populations so far beyond minimum viable pop size.</p> <p>Link to CC; makes sense K/2, etc. Do we have a K goal too??</p> <p>How decide if you want more, same, less???</p> <p>VIP One possibility is No Net Loss (ala DFO in Canada). Are we satisfied with today???. But doesn't work for everything?? OK for guilds, but not specialists???. Would species in decline be a trigger -- could we define that??</p> <p>Decline for how long?</p>

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
	<p>Hunting desire may be used to drive departures from "no change" e.g. Black Ducks.</p> <p>Aside-- need more contemporary survey of hunter characteristics and desires in Canada.</p> <p>Human satisfactions seem hard to track; constantly shifting; so setting policy on that basis is challenging.</p>
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	Must include breeding staging wintering habitats
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	
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.

Group reflections:

Present vs. future weights a difference for some people. Hunting high now for some, may not be so going forward.

VIP Weights on fundamentals varied from 48 to 60 in our group.
Web of interconnections evident.

Perspective (agency vs. personal) a major factor in how people approached this.

VIP If could look ahead 10 years???

1) more weight on habitat and populations
Because if successful there, others follow.

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

Table 1 -- Anderson

Some kind of overarching structure seems necessary -- probably not a classical hierarchical governance role, but some kind of coordination role or more directive role, but not usurping existing decision authorities.???? A re-invented PC was suggested.

Need, for instance, better integration among species and habitat JVs. Coordination among JVs should be improved. Overarching group (continental scale) would insure that this should be better. Has PC not done its job adequately???

NAWCC has no single authority. If it were to take this role for Canada, lack of authority/accountability is a weakness.

No government will likely relinquish its authority.

Key Functions:

authority to manage populations and harvest
planning and delivering habitat
funding habitat programs.
Setting and managing social objectives.

Science support for all of these is vital too.

Thinking is that basic authorities (govt) for harvest and habitat management are unlikely to change. Challenge is to create common/coherent goal setting and coordinated management.

How do we affect policy for working landscapes (agriculture and forestry)? Need to bring in other stakeholders. How fit in to that? How build influence? Need to be one of players.

See triangle drawing of owners or ultimate authorities. pop/harvest at apex; habitat lower left; social lower right. Habitat authorities are private, crown & industry. Under social put hunting and non-consumptive categories; authorities remain uncertain at this stage. Under pop/harvest federal government with advice. Science supports underpins this too. Does structure needed differ by scale -- yes, we think.

Need, in places, to re-connect habitat and population goals. Has there been a "hair line fracture" in the left side of the triangle? JV management boards may not be doing that. Lots of doing; but is it all connected? Not a lot of evaluation going on; may need to do more. May be a real limiting factor for the whole system.

Funding constraints may affect what we do too, not just conceptual disconnects. Funding for both certain kinds of habitat work and science.

A steering body above the JVs is needed in a more active role. Policy guidance. A taste of that came with the continental NAWMP Assessment. Should be repeated periodically. VIP Something has to connect the parts, even without delegated authority. This was a strong emergent conclusion of the group.

VIP Coordinating body needs to involve people at each "corner" and everyone needs to see mutual benefit in working together.

.Recorder note -- we ran short of time. Our group said, "we're just getting rolling" when told we had 5 minutes to wrap up. We had a very good discussion; but more time to wrap it up would have been helpful.

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: Ottawa
Workshop Date: February 14-15, 2011
Table Leader Name: Kathryn Dickson/Dave C

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	
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	to be successful, NAWMP needs to contribute to landscape ecosystem sustainability in larger scale
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	<p>Fundamental? For some people, for others it is a means to another objective. Assuming it is adopted as being fundamental, at what level so we want hunting perpetuated?</p> <p>Such that any one who wants to hunt waterfowl can, relatively unrestricted (in terms of access and public acceptance), waterfowl hunting remains a public resource (not elite, or privately owned), with a critical mass of hunters which is at minimum the number we have now.</p> <p>The word "perpetuate" implies history, tradition.</p>
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	Discussion about whether this is really a means objective to ensure political capital to sustain the others. No! Should be a fundamental objective for its own sake. But should not use different vocabulary here than in (3) above. Reconnecting people with nature....use waterfowl to do this.

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

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

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	<p>Such that any one still can who wants to can,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - absence of regulatory barriers - presence of regulatory support - there are places to hunt <p>relatively unrestricted (in terms of access and public acceptance)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - species abundant enough to support reasonable expectation of achieving success - there are places to hunt - positive media coverage - public supports hunting - municipalities reduce zones of no-firearm discharge <p>waterfowl hunting remains a public resource (not elite, or privately owned),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - public lands open for hunting <p>with a critical mass of hunters which is at minimum the number we have now</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - # of permits - # active waterfowl hunters <p>.</p>
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if to `sustain opportunities`, then how many bird-watcher days, number of festivals, public access provided with messaging, proportion of NAWMP activities that take viewing objectives into consideration and provide messaging - if to reconnect people to nature and conservation through waterfowl, then the attributes are different - how many people contributed to nature conservation organizations, landowners with conservation easements, lobby government for conservation programs

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

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

Observations:

- for each of us, the organizational mandate definitely affected our results, there is no universal answer, so the challenge will be to build the plan in a way that everyone can see themselves and their roles
- that said, held in common at this table, that healthy populations and conserving landscapes began with the highest weights, lower for the uses
- no matter how big the initial intrinsic values are, the complexity of linkages reduces the intrinsic value
- G (support from viewers for landscape conservation) very low, but this is a problem because we (NAWMP) has not brought this into the strategy yet, almost all of their value is in what we can get back
- missing step is what values `should be` in the future, as opposed to what they are currently
-

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

Dave Case--sitting in for Kathy Dickson

Mark Gloutney

Reviewed the current institutions--flyways, HMWG, NSST, Joint Ventures.

Habitat is not a function of Flyways. Limited engagement of Canadians in Flyway system because of their focus on U.S. regulations.

There is a fledging HDWG. NSST is more active than that.

Role of USGS? It's varied. Changed now. Northern Prairie does little waterfowl research now.

LCCs--something for the future. Very broad taxonmically, narrow in terms of program and that is research. Some are already saying we should be looking at other large-scale stressors.

Lots of administrative weight around managing the waterfowl management enterprise. Took 5 minutes to just list out components.

If the goal is coherence between harvest and habitat, how much overlap is there now between those two areas. So, can we just change the agenda. I interact with harvest people very little. I can do my job on habitat side without interacting with harvest side at all. Heard it said that if you want to do something new, you have to create a new institution.

Clearly, because of authorities, there will be a federal role on both sides of the border.

Reco

Every joint venture should have representative going to the flyway meeting . . . have members of flyways formally participating on joint venture board. Right now these are in silos.

The other part where there is interaction . . . at the NSST. But, this is really information-sharing, not decision-making. Not much direct interaction with plan committee.

Another issue, have the Harvest Management Working Group, but don't have an analogous institution on the Habitat side, except for NAWMP Plan and in U.S., there is the Assoc. of Joint Venture Coordinators.

If you look in Canada under NAWMP--there has been some national decisions. For example, allocation of NAWMP funds.

Haven't talked about the role of AFWA. We also haven't talked about the recruitment objectives. We are in a new game completely. What institution would cover these R&R objectives? In Canada, you need engagement on this national as well as provincially. Going to be reaching out to NGOs a lot.

AFWA--is mostly states. Engagement of Canada is pretty sad.

Looming issue--growing disconnect between Canada and U.S. In Canada, institutions are weakening. So important to remind folks in EC, that we are in the "export business"--we are exporting ducks to U.S. hunters . . . \$ flow north from that. Maybe need to consider species joint ventures.

Continental assessment--pintail and scaup action groups were treated as joint ventures. Don't feel a need to change that structure to become formal joint ventures.

One of biggest challenges . . . trying to advance international issues with VERY different structures on both sides of the border. For example, U.S. doing a lot with wetland inventory, but there is not counterpart to that in Canada.

What is the genius of what NAWMP achieved? Harvest system has worked. Habitat system (institutional framework) has worked. Is this a question of effectiveness or is this a conflict? What is the imperative?

If we forecast forward . . . efficiency is going to be more important.

Flyways

Is there anything we can suggest with their responsibilities? In eastern Canada, provinces don't participate.

Reco . . . If Flyway meetings were more focused on JV issues, we could bring those two groups together. That would draw Canadian/JV participation. Could use flyway structure to try to coordinate/harmonize breeding, migrating and wintering efforts. The Atlantic Coast JV and Atlantic Flyway already operates that way. Not much coordination between PHJV and PPJV--it's a function of the border.

In Canada, have regional technical teams, but decisions are made by the Federal government.

Enhanced role for Flyway/Joint Venture structures--integrate those two things together.

If the objective is more integration of decision-making.

One of thing coming out of Arctic Goose JV--the NAWMP Committee has to put pressure on provincial folks to participate in the JV. Can't just let them walk away from the table.

East is a pretty good model.

Do we need a Black Duck Joint Venture? Or do appropriate people go to the other meetings.

How to handle hunter recruitment/retention elements.

We are talking here mostly about "little people/the worker bees". We need to be thinking about folks at the senior level

NABCI council--hasn't met in a year in Canada.

How do we carry forward to insure engagement at national level.

Plan Committee--is overarching federal body that bridges between U.S. and Canada.

Have to set up something for real senior people to interact between the 2 countries.

Need a committee of Director of USFWS and CWS Directorate General--that's the level we need to be operating. Give the impetus to people at lower level to move files from edge of desk more to the middle of the desk.

Wall Charts:

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: Ottawa
Workshop Date: Feb 14-15
Table Leader Name: Elizabeth Roberts/Dave C

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.	<p>Coming from change of society. If no more kids that want to hunt</p> <p>Make link between hunters and NAWMP. Would not be here if not for hunters. Need to make sure there is opportunity and inclusion of hunters.</p> <p>Need a user group (core group). Plan serves. This group has maintained the plan over the decades. Clear link and need to embrace it. Continue to make sure the two are merged and grow together</p> <p>Who are targets? General public. Role of government to understand hunting (funding for conservation). Hard to maintain interest, but need to express.</p> <p>Role of waterfowl hunters in conservation for facilitating conservation. In terms of perpetuate, this means sustaining, more or less. Will only be able to sustain if enough people think it does good things. Environmentalist say, socially, economically, and biologically sustainable to be sustainable.</p> <p>Management resources directed for biologically. Socially with youth hunts, different segments of society.</p> <p>Need to think about perpetuate in social, biological, and economic context.</p> <p>Direct money to hotels, market, but also money they put into conservation.</p> <p>National fishing hunting trapping heritage day just approved. 3rd Saturday in Sept. Received unanimous endorsement. Politicians get it, provides an opportunity, so now needs to act on it.</p> <p>Different target audiences (bureaucrats). Not necessarily with agencies already involved, but with other parts of government as they don't get it. Other cultures don't get it.</p> <p>There is a gap there with the other agencies. What always</p>

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
	<p>wins out is when you speak of mandate of the benefits to conservaton and the like and then the light goes on. Recognizing there is a gap.</p>
<p>2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.</p>	<p>View waterfowl and sustain those opportunities. It is typically where people live. If you consider the conflicts, it is usually where the people live. Objective should be to enjoy in the natural landscape. This is a silly one. Can create opportunities, but need the participation. Is this a way to achieve the other fundamental objectives. How does it fit with other ones? Change wording. provide resources and political support to achieve landscapes and populations. There is a need for them. There are 2 parts (A/ what you see when you drive down road, are there wetlands there, still the waterfowl that used to be there; is the ecosystem still there and B/ discrete areas (big marshes, wetland complexes, spectacular viewing opportunities that bring the people). Both are important. Other point in sustaining opportunities is conflict between interests. Why do you have duck lines in here? Too close to path. veiwers don't like to see dead ducks Old ways of appreciating waterfowl need to be integrated better to avoid conflict Overall goal is to support habitat population and landscape. Opportunities is irrelevant. Not economic, but it is social. I don't hunt myself, but I recognize that this group is important. High density centres.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>relates to species at risk act. If not healthy, falls into other category Biodiverstiy quesiton. Species abundance. in a given environemnt ther should be a given number of species. Through monitoring system if you can monitor species biodiversity you will know if you have healtly population. Over (goose) and under (pintail) abundance. Health = biodiversity Healtly means sustainable populations to meet needs of peputate waterfowl hunting and opportunities for others. Keeping some populaiton numbers in check. Need to be a balance in order to secure funding for habitat (Can be contradictory to benefit) Abundance and distrubtion.</p>
<p>4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at</p>	<p>Maintain or restore broad areas that can support different waterfowl populations, perpuate populations in those areas Kind of interesting. Traditionial sense, conserving</p>

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	<p>landscape, more or less how do you create a sustainability across a landscape to restore, maintain populations. How do you do this? Answer to one is not necessarily answer to Landscapes look like they do as economic pressures have defined them that way. turns objective around a bit and come up with innovate waysto promote that kind of landscape. Magnitude and scale that makes sense at economic scale.</p> <p>"Conserve" considers both BMPs and sustainability Has to relate to waterfowl since the waterfowl manamngnet plan.</p> <p>Create a sustainability to landscape for waterfowl, you are beyond waterfowl.</p> <p>How do you reach those people that need to be involved in sustainailibyt. How do we leveage dollars to incorporate those others.</p>

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	<p>National hunting, fishing, and trapping heritage day and invovlment in that.</p> <p>Overall numbers of permit sales.</p> <p>Analysis of permit sales. Demographics. Age class of hunter, urban vs. rural</p> <p>Measure success by effort (number of birds harvested)</p>
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<p>Number of areas open.</p> <p>License sales- measures opportunity</p> <p>Conservation support from hunters needs to be expressed and then marketed this.</p> <p>Birdwatching license- some mechanism to capture those folks.</p> <p>Birdwatching doesn't create the cognitive issues since nothing is taken away from the landscape.</p> <p>Volunteer agreement on website. Clubs, associations. In QC they reprot their bird observations and they do contribute.</p> <p>Bird atlas. The bird watchers are the ones who provide input. Not direct resources, but they are contributing in kind.</p> <p>Number of birdwatchers who submit information.</p> <p>Waterfowl festivals. Generate revenue</p>

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
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.	Specific species populations indicate where problems are as they are in harmony with their habitat. Says a lot about their landscape decline. Count them. Good surveys that are designed to meet what is required.
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	Better job putting things in context. Counting acres, wetlands conserved. Less job looking a types of wetlands conserved to sustain populations (uplands). Give more context to task at home. (lack of landscape data). Determine what habitat base is and how much you need to protect, conserve (amount through regulation too) Can it be done with duck dollars. Need to use duck dollars to leverage a lot more dollars. Final metric is sustainable waterfowl population. Current landscape composition and look at losses or gains. Some species are very specialized in their habitat requirment. Look at specific landscape attributes. Populaitons are reflective of their habitat so need to count the populations (e.g., pintail decline, scaup) Maintaining level of population is best indicator of habitat.

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

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

Where we are generally now, most of weight in healthy landscapes. In terms of level of effort, rests with Conserve Landscape. Conserve populations.

Is this how it should be? What should be changed? Thinks it is the right one. I would put more emphasis on the viewing and enjoyment so they start carrying more of the load than they have been. Others agreed.

Regarding viewing . . . we put down something here. It really comes down to a marketing process. Second is a behavioral thing--fundamental difference between a viewer and a hunter. Non-hunter takes nothing. In this exercise, there may be extraneous information that we are not factoring in correctly.

Goal is the move "g" up to "f".

Jim--Could goal 4 be changed to make it more fundamental? It is really a marketing question. We have to ask those viewers that question--"how important is this to you and what are you willing to do about it?" Needs to be a parallel process.

We need to reconnect people with the plan? Does using the NAWMP to reconnect people with nature resonate? No, obj 1 and 2 are fundamental, 3 and 4 are means.

Simply put, if you could get everything from hunters, we wouldn't be worried about non-consumptive? No, there is still the question of a social license. Angling example . . . we made the connection with the first fish we caught. Realized we needed clean water, etc. Do you have to shoot something to become engaged? Right now it looks like yes, have to have some kind of interaction.

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

Renewal of interest in current plan. Only a few represents present at consultations, reflective of interest in waterfowl provincially. Interest is waning. Dollars, enforcement interest. Some provinces have indicated little interest in waterfowl. Engage provinces. Is the current structure, nawcc, jvs?

Common problems could insert "wildlife" or "wildlife and fish" into the problem. How is changing the institutions going to make any difference to the problem. All the folks involved currently are causing the problem. Is not necessarily the problem (lack of resources). Why are we being pushed this way.

Why do we need to change the structure? Can we add?

Current format is for habitat. How do engage population side.

Have DUC, Delta of waterfowl hunting community, lack in viewing community. Can't just have them, what will they bring to table. Specific issue, not at table because of structure. Maybe we don't need to have integration at every level? Does there need to be habitat people at regulation meetings. Let population people set objectives and then implement. Should hunters be at table to set regulations.

Can we set some objectives through integration and then let specific groups work to achieve them

First objectives were not prescriptive in way of telling individuals what to do and how. Who needs to be at table?

NABCI is a good start for some of those other viewers- needs resources to keep momentum going. Never really got involved with hunters. Need to convince them to be involved.

Do not transfer involvement/ interests between bird groups. NABCI has been a non-started. Concept side for 10 years or so and not going anywhere.

Have recognized who the key viewers are.

Are waterfowl hunters represented in plan? Don't think most waterfowl hunters see linkage between activity and NAWMP. Hunters are support for habitat and population goals. Do hunters need to be at table to make those decisions. Don't have to be at table if their support of process in role is indicated through agencies at table.

Look in retrospect to determine where we need to go in future. Very important to keep hunters and waterfowl hunters in forefront.

Look to other bird groups and report what we have done over 25 years. What is level of engagement in each? what have we learned from NABCI

Private sector agencies don't need to be monitored in process. They need to acknowledge their role. Define interests from other groups.

Don't know enough about other interests and how they would contribute.

Marketing challenge..

One thing is to recognize what we have to do and what is our role in solving other problems (e.g., when fish and wildlife budgets decreasing in each province).

Certainly has impact on plan in long run. Interest from NGOs in past, now just a few NGOs and feds. Why aren't you at table? What would it take to get

Can't assume what problem is before you can fix. Need to determine

New partners: AAFC, NRCAN.

NAWCC puts national focus on wetlands, federal policy, prov. engaged.

Not necessarily money is required to do activities. Can be lobbying from members, info sharing, etc.

NATIONAL meeting, symposium on wetland. # 1 conclusion- national leadership

Structure is functional (change partnership list slightly). Don't know if correct, can't conclude at this time. Haven't gotten there in terms of defining what we are all about.

Does new PC have authority to manage harvest. Yes.

Does new PC have authority for habitat. Yes

Lot's of this depends on what you want to achieve.

Need to bring harvest and populations together. Some joint goals.

Who are right people to be at the table. Maybe the Jvs are too narrow with their partnerships.

If not specific resources on table, their interests wane. Participation tends to drop off if time.

Defining what will be activity for PC in terms of hunting waterfowl. How will institutions handle this- youth hunts, hunter recruitment. If fundamental objective of NAWMP would need to be funded by NAWMP, feds, provinces, etc. Maybe this is a way to reengage provinces.

Will take outside interests like this to indicate

Are current institutions positioned to deliver- depends on what happens.

Some agencies may not support hunting. If target audience is hunters and viewers, we are missing the boat. Need to address missing support.

If we need to change policies on landscape is more than hunters and viewers.

Anglers are big constituents of wetland conservation. Huge industry and interest. Very little engagement.

National hunting, fishing, trapping heritage day provides opportunity to make link to waterfowl and wetland. there are other ways to identify.

Expand membership of existing structure.

If can't bring anything to table, why come. If they don't you won't stay

Consult with these groups.

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: Ottawa
Workshop Date: February 14-15, 2011
Table Leader Name: Dean Smith

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of term fundamental objective was confusing, and viewed as a "goal" - biological and resonates well, use healthy versus sustain, and "healthy population" is viewed as all elements of the life cycle of birds - use of "healthy" may not be the best - you can be healthy but at some point you'll die - maintain - at what level, current, historical; will we not try to increase some species populations, while some populations are abundant and do we want to maintain? - maintain doesn't always imply flexibility, it can vary as ecological condition changes, it can mean a constant value, or other meanings - combined "maintain healthy" means more in balance with carrying capacity, implies cyclical nature of population
2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - implies need to modify/manage habit to balance carrying capacity - natural landscape not impacted by humans are working and are the common denominator; working landscapes are where we have the most ability to take action - physical extent (spatial) vs quality aspects; for example the southern JVs deal with shortage (quantity) vs the northern JVs take actions to improve quality - conserve landscapes, makes more sense than "maintain healthy" - really, the conserve landscapes is in the context of the "population" level, so clearly they are linked - does conserve include restore, conserve, manage, protect, etc (it does not simply mean "maintain current"); therefore, it implies we need active management not just a policy

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
	<p>response (not all habitat is equally important, thus need priorities on what to conserve and method to be used)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should "habitat" be incorporated or is "landscape" more reflective of the more complicated and integrated nature of the population needs - agreed landscape is better and most appropriate
3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should be #4 in the ranking, recognizing - 3 and 4 could be combined, but Jim R explained that likely need numerical goals likely to be set and having hunting go to 0, while viewing numbers increase - this wouldn't be acceptable - group agreed with this - bulleted list doesn't have implication of ranking, but numbering list might - perpetuation of hunters should be unique objective from the viewers because they have very different "user group" - recognize that hunters are the reason behind why we have the NAWMP - Jim R clarified that perpetuate was a more active term versus sustain was a passive approach
4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jim made point from Edmonton workshop that waterfowl could be "use waterfowl to reconnect people/public with nature"; this made people think - how you manage this group and their activities is very different than the hunting community - could be accomplished with wetlands in urban areas, but does this really help achieve populations

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - annual populations, at all levels of the life cycle, that are in line with carrying capacity - measure or determine what the "balance" is between species and within species according to the carrying capacity of its habitat - what about distribution; how does this factor into it; healthy population also implies distribution of that population (might be more important to biologist rather than hunter/viewer) - historic distribution and/or measure of current distribution vs the historic - distribution is also a measure of disease risk management - measure contaminant profile of bird and indicator of "healthy popl'n" but this implies a different interpretation of

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
	<p>"healthy" than what we generally use in the fundamental obj</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - healthy genetics; hybridization, are these important - hunter success is measure of population health (also applies to #3)
<p>2. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - percentage of some greater measure, it's a comprehensive measure of the broad characteristics of quantity and quality - quantity determined through inventories remotely sensed with consistent methodologies over time - quality assessment is more difficult and involves many other individual measures (+/-) such as invasives, wetland density, cover type..... to reflect the complexity of the landscape - careful that too many measures, too expensive, and will be discontinued because of cost - must try to find the "5" key measures that will be supported in the long term and be done consistently - tools used today, may not be the best, but if they are consistently supported and carried out they may be the best - need to measure what is lost - learn from work on health of watersheds
<p>3. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - number of hunters, licenses, total harvest, hunter satisfaction (but there is a lot of context for measuring this)
<p>4. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes</p>	

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

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

- weight on the top half of the chart, the bottom half is benefits derived that can't be achieved alone
- equal weighting between popl'n and landscapes for a couple people, but sense that more should really be put toward landscapes and three others weighted landscapes much higher
- a regulatory framework is required to really be an underpinning of this model
- where does incidental take fit into this model as it certainly impacts populations?
- putting more weight on landscapes, you also contribute to other species beyond waterfowl, as compared to focusing effort/attention on waterfowl populations
- hunters are clear users and pay taxes and license fees, but viewers pay taxes too just not licenses
- the general framework in Canada is that viewers, hunters, and others all pay through public funds
- landscapes contribute most to healthy populations, landscapes still have high residual for all of the group

- appears similar distribution of landscape original value to A, B, C
- most comfortable with the initial assignment of values and glad these numbers are captured because people are more comfortable with these numbers than the final numbers in the corners of the diagram
- some concerns that there are a number of outside factors that have major impacts

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

- current plan committee concept is good in that it links habitat managers with population managers, but perhaps need to make it work
- if all 4 fundamental objectives are included, need consideration for the imbalance between them - perhaps a matrix to analyze the weighting and then work out how structure should be developed
- can quantify popl'n and management, but hunters and bird watchers are harder to assess
- habitat is the easiest element to measure and assign management responsibilities to gov't of other institutions
- discussed whether there is value in separating private and public lands
- need to ensure that management is targeted at both public and private lands, because it is recognized that public land alone can't get us to goals
- questioned whether provincial hunting groups play a role in regulatory processes; they do to some extent but province is highly variable and difficult for any one group to reflect all local issues
- Nova Scotia recently sent out survey on their regulations and wish they would have asked questions about interest in hunters playing a role in the regulatory processes
- many groups have difficulty engaging at the continental scale, they are generally able to engage a local scale
- some concern that the institutional structure concerns are only within the existing structure not by the outside groups like Federation of Anglers and Hunters in Ont. But, this group is really disconnected for the habitat side of the discussion
- so perhaps it is better awareness with broader network of groups that is required more than new structure
- JVs focus more on habitat and very little with population, while others clearly consider population goals to identify habitat needs etc.
- hunters certainly are not well connected to the JV community
- the JVs (habitat vs species) seem to be disconnected
- What feedback gets back to hunters is limited because in reality the harvest management or regulatory groups don't want to change regulations
- other disconnect is that the senior government levels are really unaware of NAWMP; need much more effort to engage the numerous audiences - tell them where it came from and what it does and that it's the "grand-daddy" of conservation plans
- danger is that we get lost in creation of new processes if we don't market ourselves and the success we have achieved
- there are many situations where people with responsibility for managing the resources really don't understand the outdoors

- SUMMARY:

- need to address the polarization and improve communications
- we have many people involved in management that aren't really active in outdoor activities like hunting and wildlife viewing
- the current infrastructure is generally not broken but could possibly use some minor improvements/tweaking
- hunters/viewers don't really know about NAWMP and its structure, nor do they necessarily worry about it; structure is more an internal issue
- senior bureaucrats are not aware of NAWMP, nor are many hunter organizations, and we need to tell the story of success and benefits

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