

Pribilof Islands Ecosystem Stakeholder Process Organizing Committee
April 16, 2003, 9 am teleconference
Agenda and meeting summary

Agenda:

1. Discuss and reach consensus on a three-phase approach to stakeholder process planning
2. Discuss and reach consensus on regular time for organizing committee meetings.
3. Finalize plans for fisheries interests meeting in Seattle (pre-stakeholder meeting)
4. Formulate plan for identifying and contacting stakeholders and identifying stakeholder representatives:
 - a. timeline
 - b. format
 - c. who will do contacting?

Meeting Summary:

Present: Aquilina, Evie, Randy, Greg, Joe, Meg King (Resources Solutions/UAA)

- 1 Discuss and reach consensus on a three-phase approach to stakeholder process planning:
 - Evie proposed conceptually breaking the planning for the stakeholder process into three phases to facilitate fundraising and contracting with Resources Solutions/UAA. The three phases:
 - o Phase I: Convening stakeholders and building trust in the process. Approx. 8 weeks (April 16 – June 15). Tasks: outreach to stakeholders, including meeting with fisheries interests in Seattle (see below). Cash budget (does not include in-kind contributions): \$3,016.
 - o Phase II: Stakeholder process design: Approximately June – September 2003. Tasks: Work with stakeholders to identify stakeholder representatives to participate in the process. Convene first one or two stakeholder meetings and work with group to design structure and ground rules of process. Cash budget: Approximately \$20,000.
 - o Phase III: Process implementation: Details to be determined by larger stakeholder group.
 - Discussion:
 - o Evie explained WWF will pay for the cash expenses of Phase I, and suggested WWF, TNC and the Tribes consider drafting a MOU under which all the parties agree to contribute funds for Phase II. Committee members agreed this is a good idea, especially to show seriousness of intent and good faith when requesting matching funding from industry stakeholders. Evie suggested a combined total of at least \$10,000 in cash contributions. Greg explained the Tribes do not have discretionary funds, but could probably make

an in-kind contribution. Joe suggested we approach the CDQ groups for Phase II funding as well.

- o Evie pointed out the Phase I & II funding will not be passed through SWAMC because working with SWAMC will be a topic of discussion for the full stakeholder group during Phase II. Committee members discussed passing the funding through WWF or TNC if needed, and covering this in the MOU. Meg said Resource Solutions could be flexible and work through a series of small contracts with different entities. All agreed to take a wait-and-see approach and table this discussion for the time-being.
 - o The group discussed action steps needed during Phase I to ensure the committee has built stakeholder trust sufficiently to proceed into Phase II by June. Greg stressed on Islands face to face communication is best, followed by telephone, fax, letter then email.
 - Conclusions: Committee members all agreed this is a good conceptual planning framework. Greg, Debbie, Randy and Evie will all work with their respective organizations to identify resources, and will provide that information to Evie who will draft the MOU and Phase I and II budgets. All committee members agreed to consider and correspond via e-mail about additional specific tasks for Phase I.
- 2 Discuss and reach consensus on regular time for organizing committee meetings:
- Discussion: Evie presented the argument that a regular meeting time would facilitate wider stakeholder involvement in/access to organizing committee meetings and would make her task of organizing and noticing about meetings easier. All agreed that a regular time would probably result in less full committee member participation but the pros (outlined above) might outweigh the cons. Debbie suggested holding regular meetings or occasional special meetings in the evening to enable people who could not get away from work during the day to participate.
 - Conclusions: The committee committed to trying a regular meeting time of **every Wednesday at 9 am** for at least one month, and to revisit the decision at that time.
- 3 Finalize plans for fisheries interests meeting in Seattle (pre-stakeholder meeting):
- Discussion: Evie received word from Margaret that May 28 or 29 were preferable dates. Joe thought those dates would work well relative to the next NPFMC meeting in Kodiak in June, and will allow enough advance notice to people to ensure best possible attendance. Evie spoke with Dave Cormany at NOAA Fisheries; they are planning a first public meeting around the fur seal plan update in late May or early June; they now might consider holding it in Seattle (vs. St. Paul or St. George) to make it coincide with our fisheries interests meeting. Meg suggested drafting a one-page document with problem statement and argument for participating in the process. Randy will not be able to attend May 28 or 29, but will seek to have Paul Dye represent TNC. Joe anticipates 15-25 people attending, depending if primarily attended by trade associations vs. individual companies.

- Conclusions: We will plan to hold the meeting on May 28 or 29, depending on NOAA fisheries schedule. Evie will contact Dave Cormany about dates. Joe will draft a list of invitees. Evie will draft an agenda and email to committee for approval at next meeting. Evie will draft one-page document with problem statement and argument for participating in the process
- 4 Formulate plan for identifying and contacting stakeholders and identifying stakeholder representatives:
- Discussion (brief): Evie stressed the difference between stakeholder interests vs stakeholder representatives who will actively participate in stakeholder process and the need to have a plan we can communicate to stakeholder interests. Meg will work on a draft approach, but stressed she thinks we should be asking stakeholder interests how they think it should happen.
 - Conclusions: Further discussion was tabled until next meeting.