

Ducks Unlimited Canada

WORKSHOP REPORT

Canadian Wetlands Leadership Workshop

Ottawa, April 30 – May 1, 2014



This report was prepared by:



INTERSOL

Groupe Intersol Group: Warren Wilson Inc.
205 Catherine, Suite 300
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1C3
Ph : 613.230.6424 Ext 141
Fax : 613.567.1504

Table of Contents

Section 1: Getting Started / Setting the Stage	1
1.1 Workshop Context	1
1.2 Preparing for the Workshop	1
1.3 Purpose of this Report	1
1.4 Opening Remarks	1
Section 2: Wetland Conservation in 2014	3
2.1 Building Canada’s Wetlands Industry (Pat Kehoe).....	3
2.2 Plenary Discussion	3
2.3 SWOT Analysis	3
Section 3: Focus on Vision and Direction	6
3.1 Perspectives from Industry, ENGO and Government Representatives	6
3.2 Potential Vision Elements (Discussion)	8
Section 4: Focus on Vision and Direction (cont’d...)	10
4.1 Review of Outcome Statements from Day 1	10
Section 5: Desired Outcomes, Actions and Leadership	11
5.1 Recommendations for Priority Actions and Leadership	11
Wetlands as Good Business	11
5.2 Plenary Discussion: Moving the Discussion Forward	12
5.3 Potential Leadership Models (Mike Sullivan).....	13
5.4 Plenary Discussion on Leadership Models	13
Section 6: The Path Forward.....	15
6.1 Next Steps	15
6.2 Closing Comments	15
Appendix 1: Flip Chart Note Capture – Vision Elements	16
Appendix 2: Table Discussion Results – Day 2 Feedback.....	21
Appendix 3: List of Participants	23

Section 1: Getting Started / Setting the Stage

1.1 Workshop Context

A workshop aimed at reinvigorating a national dialogue on wetland conservation in Canada was held in Ottawa on April 30/May 1, 2014 with the following stated objectives:

- To Identify the long-term, coordinated actions needed to conserve Canada's wetlands
- To determine the best approach forward for engaging stakeholders; creating a leadership structure and; ensuring participation from industry, non-government organizations, government and academia to advance conservation actions

1.2 Preparing for the Workshop

A Steering Committee of 12 representatives of major interests in wetland conservation in Canada worked to plan the event. The Steering Committee also prepared background documents that are referenced in this report and that should be reviewed by the reader including:

- Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats (SWOT) analysis – Wetlands Conservation in Canada
- Sample Strategic Frameworks
- Fact Sheet – Progress since 2003 Conference on Canadian Wetlands Stewardship

1.3 Purpose of this Report

The workshop included a series of framing presentations as well as facilitated small group (table) and plenary discussion. Approximately 45 people attended the session. A complete list of participants and a full agenda for the session are available separately.

What follows here is a report from the meeting. The report includes a synthesis of key discussion points, decisions and actions. The report is intended as a record of the meeting to be used by the parties in pursuing the process objective outlined above. All Power Point presentations are also available separately.

1.4 Opening Remarks

Jim Brennan of Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC) and Greg Northey of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture opened the workshop by welcoming participants and thanking them for their participation and engagement.

Jim and Greg reviewed the workshop objective. They also spoke to anticipated outcomes including:

- Collective vision for wetlands by 2025
- Priority outcomes and actions
- Leadership structure
- Process to assign actions, responsibilities, timelines
- Commitment to future stages of the work

Participant Expectations

As part of round table introductions, participants expressed the following expectations for the workshop:

- Ecological goods and services (EG&S) / ecosystem values / national capital need to be part of the agenda moving forward
- Ecosystems services a key to social licence to operate
- To understand other people's perspectives – especially other provinces, industries; providing perspective from own jurisdictions / organizations

- Optimistic / hopeful we identify useful actions and innovation
- Want to share ideas - market-based instruments; SAR trading and Water quality trading
- Need industry to internalize wetland conservation; conservation as part of our culture
- Delivering a wide range goods and services not just wildlife; feeding into other objectives related to waterfowl populations and land conservation
- Need more balance: in terms of recognition of values; more avoidance over offsets/restoration
- Alarmed at 80 acres loss of wetlands per day in Canada; hoping for a way to change that
- Looking for renewed and increased enthusiasm for implementing strategies
- Collective action is the way to get things done.

Section 2: Wetland Conservation in 2014

2.1 Building Canada's Wetlands Industry (Pat Kehoe)

Pat who was also the Co-chair of the Steering Committee for the workshop, made an opening Power Point presentation that described the current environment for wetland conservation in Canada. This presentation is available separately.

2.2 Plenary Discussion

Following Pat's presentation the following points were raised in a brief plenary discussion:

- There are U.S. use laws – that are much stronger than Canadian policy: Is there a need for new laws in Canada?
- Laws are one of the many things we can use to conserve wetlands – part of the toolkit
- Currently, there are regulations re: activities and development around wetlands in six provinces
- Inconsistency of good practices undermines good regulation in Canada; we need consensus about what good practices look like so there is not so much individual discretion
- Silence from environmental agencies has made job of implementation tougher at municipal council level (e.g. landowners association – need partnership right through implementation)
- We have come a long way on EG&S, but there's a lot more work to be done in terms of how we will be able to use values, for example:
 - ① A provincial Treasury Board responded that EG&S is “paper value;” doesn't make the argument stronger
 - ① Landowners respond “If there's this much value in wetlands, you have to pay for them or else we have other uses for them that will pay”
- In another province, cattle industry is good for wetlands: graze cattle in wetlands or else they get drained
- It has been five years since the last forum on EG&S: How do we bring all these pieces together?

2.3 SWOT Analysis

As outlined above, a draft SWOT was prepared and tabled by the Steering Committee. Participants used the draft SWOT as a starting point for discussion around the following question:

Have we got strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats (SWOT) about right? Anything to add or highlight?

In general participants felt that the SWOT table was a “reasonable take” on the current planning environment for wetland conservation in Canada. The discussion largely validated what was there. However a number of additional points were highlighted / added as follows:

STRENGTHS

- The market for offsets is driven and created by regulation - Government will have to be involved at some point / still a role for government
- Social and economic interests and awareness in wetlands has increased since 2003
- Availability of information on the internet makes people more aware and has tendency to motivate action towards wetland protection
- Good reservoir of experience in Canada, through NAWMP and Ramsar International Convention, NAWCC (Canada) - A lot of experience; some transfer of experience
- Mentoring lacking
- Wetland conservation is a way to demonstrate social licence to be able to operate in communities - A pre-occupation for some participants/industries
- Regulation is a helpful tool in the toolbox, particularly as a proactive tool

- Expand first “strength” regarding provinces gradually adopting strong policies to “jurisdictions” (because municipal as well as provincial) as well as to “sectors”

WEAKNESSES

- Lack of enforcement and monitoring of public policy (including laws and regulations) - Who is going to support interveners? Usually enforcement at local, municipal, county level – these jurisdictions don’t have the funding
- Lack of compliance promotion – e.g. public education, guidance documents, government resourcing
- Need for consistent policy and regulation from federal to provincial to municipal:
- Perhaps “consistent” not right word, rather “alignment of integration” – developers can play this to significant disadvantage
- However, important to recognize difference among jurisdictions – ecological, resident preferences, etc.
- Need a baseline, or else could become competitive disadvantage
- How to get the message out to producers regarding the importance of wetlands / value of loss, how do we have that discussion? Not so much trouble with regulated industries, but agriculture industry more challenging.
- Economic valuation of EG&S - Questions concerning rigour and reliability; OR perhaps lack of capacity – 3 of 8 people who do this kind of work in the country are in the room! Case studies are data-intensive and don’t have capacity to do it. Some really good techniques, but lack of person-power; need pilot studies and case studies on individual values; need standards in terms of basis of EG&S evaluation; distinguish public and private benefits
- Low political consequences for inaction are an impediment to success
- Statistics Canada work on valuing EG&S – national accounts – been put on the back-burner
- Lack of science is excuse for political inaction – but we need to use what we have
- Translating knowledge into messages that everyone is going to understand: Need to find “the sweet spot” – accurate but effective messages
- Inadequate focus on peatlands particularly given significant extent in Canada: of 140 m ha of wetlands; 119 m ha are peatlands
- Incentive programs not being evaluated adequately so can be made more effective
- Evaluations are mostly project-based; therefore we lose appropriate context or landscape/regional approach
- Policy on private lands is lacking (especially for ephemeral wetlands on landscape)
- Need for a shared vision for wetlands conservation

OPPORTUNITIES

- Need to improve valuations
- Re “Continue to compensate landowners for personal...” change to effective and appropriate funding models”
- Need to study what’s an incentive? What’s a subsidy? From ethical perspective, not clear when incentives are appropriate and when they will have negative consequences
- Re-cast or elevate discussion from “wetland conservation” to management of the resource
- Better understanding of environmental psychology of our citizens
- Need to strengthen consciousness raising: what will motivate action?
- Cross compliance
- Why not tie environmental stewardship to access to agricultural payments?
- A collective, diverse voice is powerful
- Joint recommendations and information have more weight when they are taken back to participants’ jurisdictions and organizations

- No loss of individual identities, everyone continue to do own lobbying
- Reinstatement of NRTEE or NRTEE-type organization
- Leverage support from corporations to release those costs or risks to corporate profits
- Feed into or support wetland conservation goals and commitments e.g. Convention on Biological Diversity (Aichi targets), waterfowl population goals
- Promote wetlands as a solution to other issues or challenges faced by government, e.g. flooding, drought

THREATS

- Highlight fact that climate change is going to change the way we are going to do wetland conservation in this country plus the benefits of wetland conservation to climate change adaptation
- Invasive species – permeates wetland conservation across country - Contributes to way lower biodiversity
- Muzzling of civil service
- Overstated rhetoric has reduced credibility
- Important regarding how to approach conversation, e.g. linking to real issues of the day
- What's happening on uplands
- Impacts on wetland ecosystem services from adjacent activities or development, or from higher up the watershed
- Nature of agriculture is changing: towards Industrialization
- Globalization and changes in ownership make it more difficult to access and influence "landowners"
- Larger farms tend to be more adoptive of good practices
- Increasing disconnect between youth and nature
- Fewer waterfowl hunters, understanding of ecosystem services
- Difficulty for crop folks to be brought into the conversation
- Always "bad guys;" attitude towards crop producers is counter-productive
- Notion among broader population that "producers should be doing this anyway, why should we pay?"

Section 3: Focus on Vision and Direction

3.1 Perspectives from Industry, ENGO and Government Representatives

With the SWOT discussion in view participants focused on elements of a vision – for successful wetland conservation in Canada. The focus statement was:

What does success in 2025 look like? In what areas do we need to achieve results? What results do we need to achieve?

To initiate the discussion, a panel of presenters shared their perspectives. Once again, PowerPoint presentations are available separately. The following key messages were noted:

Bob McLean (Environment Canada)

- If costs are not personal, it is difficult to motivate people. If impact has implications for costs elsewhere –e.g. if consequences are financial, they will be of political interest
- Industry is highly motivated – e.g. the Canadian Business and Biodiversity Council is encouraging companies to build conservation right into their business plan; responding to social licence/social responsibility
- We must take the value proposition and make it more personal.
- EG&S is the right concept, but we need to take it to next level – more personal, to motivate decision makers and people to care.
- Need to equate natural capital and EG&S to other sectors in an adaptive management context. There are wetland trends, but also social, economic, and other environmental trends at landscape scales.
- Connect beneficiaries to the providers: Who is receiving the \$5,000/ha of EG&S? Beneficiaries are highly distributed. How do we get them to support the providers?
- Connect the dots on the regional scale. Need a business case for conservation including wetlands at that scale, with partners, conservation outcomes, and investments to argue for and to maintain. The biggest trend is jurisdictions are stepping back from project-level approaches to landscape-based approaches e.g. Alberta regional land use planning provides a good frame of reference for environmental, social, economic objectives.
- Leadership and governance are really important to maintain momentum. Takes the motivation of individuals to make a big difference

Paul Short (Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association)

- Large percentage of world's wetlands are peatlands. In Canada 90% of wetlands are peatlands; 81% Virgin Peatlands; 15% Agriculture; rest of land uses <1%
- We need a national wetlands/peatlands strategy – like a forest strategy. This would allow for conservation, development and social responsibilities
- Should be “resource management” perspective: shift from conservation to resource management – comparable to forest, wildlife, fisheries
 - 87 policies / regulations impact peatlands: none focused on peat harvesting as resource management
 - No regulations as an industrial activity: e.g. “Peatland Stewardship Act”
- Wetlands/peatlands need to be on the agenda of CCRM Ministers responsible for resource management
 - EC or NRCan – who's in charge?
- We need inventory / reconnaissance level, including depth of bogs
- National coordination of research to coordinate funding to oil and gas, mining sector, peat harvesting
- Change the conversation: from conservation of wetlands to resource management of wetlands/peatlands

Discussion:

- ✓ Conservation has always meant wise use

- ✓ Concerns that wetland “management” is too development oriented: don’t want to go down that path
- ✓ Conservation has components that merge around the concept of natural capital
- ✓ Whole suite of supporting instruments for conservation

Ian Barnett (Nature Conservancy of Canada)

- Net gain... in 2003 the vision included a net gain of wetlands; if we don’t hold to that, we will lose
- Seen an increase in that sentiment... well received among industry as well
- Perspective: What can we bring to the table? ENGO resources have increased significantly in the last 25 years; on-the-ground programs give NGOs credibility and a seat at the table. Also need to bring science to the table – good business approach
- Partnerships: Essential ingredient to wetland conservation success. Important to take time to learn “What makes the partners tick; everyone has goals and mission – what is common ground?”
- Policy: Engaging with civil servants, politicians, ENGOs have been invited to provide counsel and advice
- Pocketbooks: What will help drive this forward? A diverse suite of financial resources from small personal donations to large corporations and governments, etc.
- Passion: Contain a sense of urgency and commitment; allows us to elevate important messages. Health, education, religion are top philanthropic draws – try to link wetlands to those

Randy Milton (Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources)

- Nova Scotia is 25% crown land (only half not in protected areas, so 12% dedicated to all public values and uses; 75% of province is private land)
- Started talking about wetlands in 1960s – no policy until 2010. We’ve come a long way; still a long way to go
- Factors for success
 - Connect wetlands to human well-being: ensure people understand “what’s in it for me?” Provisioning, regulating, cultural, sustaining services. What assists communities in managing economic aspirations? Sometimes wetlands in the way of those economic opportunities, so which do we avoid? Minimize? Offset losses?
 - Vision for 2025: Policies and processes that contribute to human well being at the local level by recognizing the contribution that sustainably managing wetlands make, in the context of the existing and future economic/social aspirations of communities, while maintaining functional wetlands delivering a host of ecosystem services.
 - Need to look at functionality of wetlands within the landscape
- What do we need?
 - Work with legislators – education needed on ecosystem services
 - Incorporate wetlands in broad decision-making processes – focus on the landscape where impact is
 - Policies, regulations, enforcement; increase understanding of stewardship and minimize time in court
 - Money
 - Landscape planning
 - Tools for functional assessment
 - Improving inventory – plus, what are the trends? Are we gaining or losing? What is the quality?
 - Clarity and education – among all agencies and consultants – what are the full set of values and what are the impacts?
 - Whole purpose should be sustainable landscapes

Greg Northey (Canadian Federation of Agriculture)

- Agriculture is unique because the base is private lands and working landscape (not pristine); requires very different treatments or ways of managing

- Currently, agriculture has a market driven approach to how environment is handled. If it's important to people who are buying your product – e.g. MacDonalds, Unilever – then it's important to producers. Literally about market now, less government.
- Agriculture is concerned with feeding Canadians. Conservation must be couched in a business / production context. What is of real value of wetland to agriculture community? e.g. flooding, if you have a wetland you can reduce insurance premiums – this is an important aspect.
- Different approach to agriculture than other industries. Very different requirement: monetary value and how it's communicated to agricultural community.
- Need research: how can wetland conservation practices be compatible with business goals?
- Need to monetize value to farmer and to society; these values also drive production practices (e.g. incentives for EG&S)
- Recognize current stewardship practices: existing practices should also be recognized in whatever programs and policies we put in place.

Discussion:

- ✓ Can a market-based incentive program for agriculture get us to the place we want to be? Or is there a place for regulation as well? (E.g. mitigation sequence in NS)
- ✓ Incentives are an ideal way forward. Individual producers are regulated in many ways. Regulation is not an ideal way. If you want action on landscape, market-based incentives and market driven requirements are the way to go. Industry is being regulated by the supply chain.
- ✓ MacDonalds just announced that they are moving towards “sustainable sources.” they want third-party certification. Walmart is going to reduce prices on organic foods. MacDonalds will start sourcing sustainable beef by 2016. Industry working to add environmental verification to “Verified Beef”.
- ✓ If no one's going to pay more, and it's going to cost producers more, who will pay? Very concerned about wetland loss in this circumstance. Just one of many issues: GMOs, organics, hormones.
- ✓ CFA position on cross-compliance? Income supports? What drives agriculture is markets and prices.
- ✓ Have we done enough about monetizing ecological goods and services? And translating ecological goods and services into human well being?
- ✓ Different commodities have different impacts on the environment: cropping has a lot of inputs; grazing is compatible with wetland conservation
- ✓ Big question: how to get urban people to start paying money to protect the environment

3.2 Potential Vision Elements (Discussion)

Following the panel presentation and discussion, participants brainstormed ideas around the focus statement and then “themed” the ideas into what represent elements of a vision for wetland conservation in Canada. Appendix 1 of this report contains all of the brainstormed ideas organized by theme. The Themes were further worked in small groups and the following outcome statements were developed and supported.

Wetland Conservation in Canada

1) WETLANDS AS GOOD BUSINESS	<p>Wetlands are good for business and human well-being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Mitigation: We will have comprehensive wetland policies in every province and territory that includes a mitigation hierarchy and sequence to (avoid, minimize, mitigate, offset) to manage wetland damage or destruction. ◆ Incentive: Market-driven incentives encourage wetland “conservation” or “industry” or stop wetland loss
2) SHARED VISION IN CANADA – CANADIANS CARE	Broad support for integrating wetland conservation in land use decision-making by governments, industry, other stakeholders and individuals at levels that improve wetland function
3) WETLAND/PEATLAND INVENTORY	In 2025, Canada will have a comprehensive inventory of existing and lost wetlands. This inventory will allow for analysis of status and trends (quantity and quality).
4) COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ In 2025, Canada is internationally recognized as a leader in wetland conservation (protection/stewardship) and management (wise-use) and works with its international partners on common wetland. ◆ In 2025, industry, governments, First Nations and NGOs in Canada collaborate and cooperate to achieve common wetland goals. This collaboration is linked to a management framework that accounts for various planning scales.
5) EFFECTIVE REGULATION	<p>A regulatory system that maintains wetland function that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Appropriate/equitable/fair ◆ Efficient ◆ Effective ◆ Accepted ◆ Has high compliance ◆ Flexible ◆ Clear
6) EFFECTIVE PLANNING/ MANAGEMENT AT A LANDSCAPE SCALE	Wetlands managed in landscape context at an appropriate scale.
7) RESOURCES, CAPACITY AND RESEARCH	<p>All sectors and general society have capacity to positively contribute to effective successful wetland conservation. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Funded comprehensive science (wetlands in the landscape) ◆ Sufficient government staff and resources ◆ Wetland education for all

Measurable Biophysical and Empirical Results: An integrated and informed management system enables a net gain in the area and function of healthy wetland ecosystems across all regions of the country.

Section 4: Focus on Vision and Direction (cont'd...)

4.1 Review of Outcome Statements from Day 1

On the second day of the workshop, participants reviewed the vision elements and outcome statements developed on the first day in small group and then plenary discussion. The results of the table discussion are contained in Appendix 2 of this report. The key messages from the plenary discussion are noted below:

Are we starting to consent around vision elements?

There was general support for the statements – in general participants felt that the vision is heading in the right direction. The following additional points were noted:

- ✓ If we're going to get buy-in, we're going to need to develop goals that everyone can live with
- ✓ If we want everyone "in the tent" we can't go with net gain
 - Can't be achieved in all regions of the country: there will be places that can't afford not to have gains/ other parts of the country where we don't need gains
 - Need to look at it from national perspective: set the stage to enable regions to set their own
 - Need a more realistic approach
 - Some think that "no net loss" is setting the bar low – realistic in terms of industry use; others think "no net loss" is not business oriented
- ✓ No one in the room is opposed to "reversing the trend"
- ✓ Use language of "sustain" to ensure everyone is in room with us when we try to work out details.
- ✓ Focus should be on retaining enough wetlands to perform certain functions: mitigate flooding, drought, waterfowl habitat, etc.
- ✓ The question of "net gain:" No doubt we will continue to lose wetlands, and wetland restoration, enhancement, compensation will not replace functions of natural wetlands
- ✓ The onus on this group is to set the bar higher; establish a precedent – reasonably achievable and meaningful. Need to put something forward to enable leadership of organizations to shoot at. Status quo isn't good enough.

Specifically, what is the industry reaction to this?

- ✓ Good: Workshop outcome statements elevate wetlands to a "resource asset." With this comes responsibility to manage with other values in mind: some areas protected, others to be used.
- ✓ Our industry is supportive of certification and setting aside habitat of high conservation value: this workshop has elevated wetland issues to level of, for example, fish habitat and critical habitat.
- ✓ Industry wants to be part of this proactive conversation.
- ✓ Within many parts of the country, wetlands are not on the radar for industry.
- ✓ Need a balance: must recognize that industry must pay attention to a lot of policies – tough and complicated. Need to recognize wetlands as part of the landscape, integrate into the bigger picture.
- ✓ Need to understand impact of policies on people and their livelihoods – What does "net gain" mean to an individual on their farm? – determined mostly by details on how to achieve these outcome statements.
- ✓ Modern agriculture and conservation are not incompatible.

Section 5: Desired Outcomes, Actions and Leadership

5.1 Recommendations for Priority Actions and Leadership

For each of the vision elements and outcome statements, participants began an initial conversation on the kinds of action that would be required to move forward in the direction that is implied. The following was noted:

Wetlands as Good Business

- National coordinating body: to share information: must be ongoing to ensure continuing dialogue and follow-up – Leadership by green budget?; industry/NGO national coalition; government is ex-officio
- Perform a policy scan: share what is working elsewhere
- Support economics / research – Leadership by academics with input from ENGOS
- Show pilot projects and research on how/why they work – Leadership by national coordinating body; need one or more CEOs to step up and take this on

Shared Vision (combined with Community Cares statement)

- Agree with vision statements of Day 1
- Creation of a wetland stewardship committee / council – no clarification of how to be structured
- Non-partisan; non political; involving all stakeholders
- Must be led by outspoken, committed, individuals; ensure challenging work of multi-stakeholder group continues
- Needs to also have technical subcommittees to develop and share information to enable policies to be developed in
- Organize national workshops
- Pull in wetland scientists societies and others into council
- Ensure specific budgetary resources to maintain group as cohesive unit
- Develop synergies with other similar groups
- Canada cares should be highlighted, separate statement? Highlight importance of wetland education to public at large; need to recognize that wetlands are a new area to some professionals

Wetland/Peatland Inventory

- Seek/acquire funding to continue to elevate the CWI to completion – leadership by DUC
- Make completed inventory available to public – leadership by EC
- Use existing inventory datasets; adapt to present inventory – leadership by DUC
- Leadership – NRCAN; EC?

Collaboration and partnerships:

- Develop an appropriate collaborative structure; recognizing existing groups who have leadership roles (e.g. NAWCC and Joint Ventures) but may not be broad-scoped enough
- Establish communication network
- Maintain engagement in the NAWMP internationally and re-affirm commitments – leadership by EC
- Develop mentorship between incoming and outgoing cohorts of professionals at DUC and EC – leadership by DUC and EC
- Focus beyond waterfowl production and seek opportunities to address broader wetland goals (e.g. biodiversity, water quality, carbon, flood control, etc.) – leadership by DUC/EC etc.

- Engage relevant federal and where appropriate, provincial officials (CCFM, CCME – standing committee structures)
- Align and engage with other conservation frameworks / initiatives
- Develop an appropriate and inclusive leadership structure such as the NAWCC council, JVs
- Establish a communication network to put all collaborators in contact e.g. Community of Practice
- Have a national conference that charts progress every three years (depending on leadership model)
- Need a nationally coordinating body in continual existence – leadership by Green budget? Government as ex-officio
- Nationally coordinated body – to get existing data out there – so much already done
- Incentives: don't like government grants: not good business

Resource capacity and research:

- Secure and re-invigorate investment to finance wetland conservation elements as core business to governments – leadership by government
- Scope and evaluate potential funding sources: funding from provincial policy, etc – leadership best done through a coordinating body
- Integrate wetland conservation into normal practice of a variety of agencies and institutions; groups taking ownership of wetland conservation – leadership by coordinating body to oversee this change in philosophy
- Set up a knowledge sharing network e.g. State Wetland Managers Network
- Connecting higher education with research node that is interdisciplinary, supported by industry and government agencies – leadership by coordinating agency or university with support from all groups
- Industry agrees to share technology and information to advance wetland conservation – address proprietary gaps

Effective Regulation and Effective Planning

- Technical sharing principle – emerging for many of these themes
- Co-chaired by industry and ENGOs, government ex-officio

5.2 Plenary Discussion: Moving the Discussion Forward

Again in general participants expressed that the conversation was of value and that there was a desire expressed to continue to move the agenda forward. Some additional discussion points were raised:

Who's missing from this discussion? Who's got an interest?

- Insurance industry
- First Nations and other Aboriginals, Métis
- Youth
- Grower groups (grain, canola, pulse, roundtable for sustainable crops)
- Engineering professionals – involved in managing water – drains, culverts, etc.
- Real estate developers
- FCM
- Agrologists
- Pipelines and transmission
- Delta Waterfowl and other NGOs and CNGOs not here
- Railways, highways
- Financial sector

- Nature foundations
- Professional planners
- Joint Venture coordinators
- All provinces and territories represented
- Association of Storm Water Managers

5.3 Potential Leadership Models (Mike Sullivan)

Three potential leadership models were presented:

1. Former Wetland Secretariat (NAWCC (Canada))

- NAWMP partner funded
- Arms length from Environment Canada
- Independent coordinator and staffed at various levels
- Successful leadership model
- Reports, workshops and forums

2. NAWCC (Canada)

- NAWCC group – good at delivering NAWMP
- Hard to get leadership on other things, like inventory
- Membership limits scope; EC led
- Hard for group to champion some of things on list because heavily government; not so much industry
- Policy subcommittee struck – expanded to provide leadership on other wetland activities?

3. Independent council

- Could reflect make-up of current steering committee
- Broadened as needed
- Broader wetland network

5.4 Plenary Discussion on Leadership Models

Discussion focussed on the role of a leadership group; principles that might underlie the work of the group; structure; funding and; the value proposition. The following was noted:

What are the action items or roles for national wetlands leadership?

- To develop the vision
- To implement the vision: identifying what needs to be done; ensuring that it is done
- Developing consensus with other stakeholders
- Leverage resources to do the work
- Communicate results
- Ensure commitment

If these are the things that we need to get done, what are the principles that we need to lay down?

- Government involved but not government-led:
 - Government is partner at table: government can contribute; participate but not vote
 - If government is involved, difficult for government to push; government can be resource
 - Ex-officio status has a value
 - Collaborative work – common ground

- Shared responsibility so government is one of players: Industry, NGOs, Aboriginal, Government
- No “bullies” or “vetos” – agreement but not necessarily consensus
- Need terms of reference
- Builds on work; not duplicative
- Communicate results
- Members willing to work collaboratively:
 - Align with / satisfy other obligations (e.g. Ramsar committee) – legitimacy
 - Members articulate in sharing perspectives but willing to be influenced
- Time/scope required needs to be clear

Will the leadership structure need to be something new?

- It can't be part of NAWCC
- NAWMP not of interest to everyone
- Government role in NAWCC not consistent with requirements as described above
- Logistical problems: resource problems at EC regarding NAWCC functions
- Structure not conducive to playing coordinating role – needs to be outside of NAWMP framework
- Possibility that membership could collapse down to few people / then another part could look after broader conservation interests being discussed here
- Can it be a committee/commission of NAWCC? Probably better as a new entity since then it belongs to all, not to another organization
- Leadership is probably something new
- It is industry/NGO initiated, with government participation

Is there an appetite to fund this idea?

- Some NGOs interested
- Industry/NGO willingness to be involved if business case for value-added: how improve our ability to engage in conversation and have outcomes that we can live with?
- Form follows function

How could this help in your organization? What is the “value proposition”?

- More work needs to be done: building the business case and articulating what is the value proposition?
- We need a national multi-stakeholder group to do the following:
 - Share issues; understand other perspectives; proactive approach to issues
 - Build consensus where possible with NGOs/industry
 - Provide a mechanism for coordinating input to international obligations – forum with non-industry people
 - Enable knowledge transfer: learning failures and successes
 - Work together to advance knowledge – establish science agenda
 - Provide national overviews of technical knowledge and guidance (e.g. NAWCC “Sustaining Wetlands series”)
 - Provide planning tools – and social and political acceptance of tools
 - Coordinate research on economic valuation
 - Focus on common cause and public policy advancement
 - Establish a network of experts or “community of practice” – share learning, best practices and experience, using latest technology e.g. webinars
 - Leverage resources
 - Access to a core of people doing similar things – realize efficiencies

Section 6: The Path Forward

6.1 Next Steps

The following action items were confirmed:


	ACTION	DATE	RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES
1	Circulate Report from Workshop ○ Includes Participant Contact List	Oct 2014	Steering Committee
2	Prepare draft terms of reference for the “leadership group” based on the discussion ○ Include the value proposition ○ Separate document / annex to send out to industry members	Nov, 2014	Steering Committee
3	Finalize report with feedback from the group	Dec, 2014	Steering Committee
4	Express interest in SC participation - contact Jim / Pat, and assist to further develop leadership structure, TOR, budget, etc.	Oct, 2014	All
5	Obtain commitment to a TOR / Charter – To solidify real participation	Winter 2014	
6	Work planning to follow	Spring 2014	

6.2 Closing Comments

In a final roundtable discussion participants expressed that the workshop had been of value and achieved the desired outcomes. The following additional points were noted:

- Interest in continuing: e.g. “Agriculture partners will want to be part of this”
- Hopeful: Looking forward to the future
 - To the future of wetlands, and particularly to reversing trends in wetland loss (80 acres/day)
 - To enhancing social license to operate
 - To further engagement of industry on this issue
 - To seeing wetlands as resource assets – management not conservation or protection
- Consensus: There is a lot of emerging consensus around key issues / common ground among diverse stakeholders
 - Trajectory of discussions similar to those on the Boreal Forest
 - Need to “get it on paper”
- Now the work begins: Need commitment soon plus hard work; need to get something done, not just talk about it
- Important: To establish national role and opportunity, with high level of interest and buy-in
- Appreciative: Of high level of engagement from industry and others; of improved mechanism for implementation of the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation
- Concerned: That this group will deal with broad national issues that benefit us all: we need to figure out how to do that
- Learned a lot: Well worth the time to understand diverse viewpoints

Appendix 1: Flip Chart Note Capture – Vision Elements

**Canadian Wetlands Leadership Workshop**

April 30 & May 1, 2014

EMPIRICAL BIOPHYSICAL RESULTS

Net Gains

- Area
- Wetland Services / Function
- Species Supporting

We will have:

- Net wetland habitat gains on the developed southern landscape (i.e. settled parts of Canada)

2014 levels of wetland services are intact / sustained

Invasive species in wetlands are controlled

No net-loss across the board

Net-gain where it counts

(Empirical success on the ground!)

No further loss of wetlands

Net gain of wetland functions bright future for wetland dependant wildlife populations

Typha Angustifolia – no longer spreads west

Botumus does not spread west

Every rancher has a healthy riparian area (and knows what a riparian area is)

RESOURCES AND CAPACITY AND RESEARCH

PTI –Increased investments in social & economic research and capacity (human capital)

- I.e. Rhonda MacDougall in Manitoba hires economists to help Mgr manage water resources
- There is adequate staff and financial (capacity) to resource wetland conservation programs (this includes ecologists and policy assessment folks)

Bring in all aspects of wetlands hydrology, water quality habitat – deconstructed wetland science silos

Education & extension increased for private land owners

Wetland impact on GHG known and measured

Have a system / process to review cumulative effects – local context

Water quality improved because of less run off

Science can demonstrate definitively the impact of wetland drainage on water quality and water quantity

WETLAND / PEATLAND INVENTORY

Have a current and regularly maintained wetland inventory and a drained wetland inventory (trends)

Complete Wetland Inventory

Full Inventory of Wetlands

Strategy:

- 1) Identify wetlands
- 2) Evaluate
 - o Diagnostic
 - o Analysis
- 3) Conservation plan – Action Plan
- 4) Conservation Activities

Result

- 5) Sustainable Landscapes

Mapping / Planning Tools

Generate

- Wetland INFO – baseline Data
- Wetland monitoring – Support (Policies / Laws)
- Develop Planning Tools
- Mun | Watershed Scale
- Partners / Support – Buy-in
- Clear Objectives

Complete Wetland Inventory

Trends in quantity and quality

INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

North-South Collaboration

Still is a continental conservation plan (NAWMP) Canada-U.S. Cooperation

Canada resumes a leadership role in global wetland wise use

International Reputation Restored – The rest of the world is using Canada as the model for environmental protection of watersheds / wetlands

Canada – the recognized leader in responsible peatland maintenance

High percentage of protected natural wetland areas

DOMESTIC COLLABORATION

All sectors, gov'ts and FN are engaged in the conversation

Industry Government ENGO's collaboration cooperation to achieve common goal

Clear definition and integrated legal framework to protect and manage wetlands

Coordinated Legislation supports conservation at all 3 levels and First Nation Governments

Coordination and communication among NGOs, GOV, Business, with effective conservation where everyone has a harmonized role

Cross-sector understanding

Local / Municipal Gov'ts have the support they need to implement wetland conservation objectives

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT – CANADIANS CARING

Community engagement
Recognition of intrinsic values (it's not all about money)
Increased public support and awareness
Agriculture community accepts the wetland issue
Majority of Canadians can name 3 benefits of wetlands
Wetland health – human wellbeing
Canadian kids care about wetlands
My 10 year old kid has had lots of exposure to wetlands and understands their values
National communications effort on why wetland ecosystem services matter to peoples' lives
Common understanding – general public
Public recognition of wetland functions / values
Stakeholder involvement
Scarlett Johanson stars in "The Wetland"
Destruction / creation of the Wetland tops the news cycle

SHARED VISION

Public consensus on management goals for wetlands
We have achieved consensus on the "use" of our finite inhabited landscape that includes flexible and transparent mechanisms for trade-offs
Consensus on resource management
Wetlands recognized as part of an integrated landscape
No longer a need to "sell" wetland conservation to new Ministers
Regionally supported ecosystem service programs are wide spread
Deliberate conservation actions by land managers supported and enabled by markets / policy
We will have a standard / baseline (National) wetland strategy for Canada i.e. standards for conservation policies
Baseline expectations
Improved urban planning / densification to protect healthy watersheds
An integrated watershed with healthy ecosystems (that includes streams, grasslands, forests)
A cultural shift from an enhanced awareness and appreciation
National Policy on Wetland Conservation with supporting provincial policies
Wetland "Conservation" (+ wise Use) is B.A.U. – business as usual
Public is informed and supports wetland "conservation" and policy
Federal prioritization of wetland conservation
Effective mechanisms to exchange information
Active Canadian chapter of wetland scientists

PLANNING / LANDSCAPE LEVEL SCALE

Wetlands managed in landscape context at appropriate scale

Conservation Dollars & policies aimed at landscape – scale impacts and not species specific

Wetlands and conservation in context of landscapes

Regulatory system that maintains wetland function that is:

- Appropriate / equitable / fair
- Efficient
- Effective
- Accepted
- Has high compliance
- Flexible
- Clear

EFFECTIVE REGULATION

Effective wetland regulations that harmonize with other regulations

Good, clear, efficient regulations

Every dep. Minister has wetland protection in their performance targets

Equal treatment of sectors in regulations

WETLANDS LINKED TO LIVELIHOODS | WETLANDS ARE GOOD BUSINESS

Full costs and benefits of wetland retention and restoration internalized by resource / land owners

The cost of draining wetlands is well known in the Agriculture community

EG & S of habitat reflected in real costing of 'development'

Industry, especially Agriculture, must cross-comply to receive public financial support

Making the right choice for wetlands is the "easy" choice for everyone including industry

Fully understand the linkages between ecosystem processes and human well being at appropriate planning levels

Collaborative effort to advance and operationalize the "natural Capital Approach among business in Canada

1% HST dedicated to wetlands

Wetland decisions integrate environmental and economic effects

Perverse impact of policies on wetlands are considered

Consumers supportive of "Canadian" industry's action on wetlands

Linking of wetlands in community livelihood strategies

Conservation goals given equal weight as business goals

We will have:

- Effective market based incentives driving private land wetland conservation

Conservation in balance with development

Wetland conservation included in full-cost accounting

MITIGATION

Have a well-designed system in place to recognize and incentivize:

- Stewardship
- Retention
- Restoration

National Standards for implementing the mitigation sequence

Avoidance minimization and compensation of wetland impacts across board

Financing for Agriculture to support ecological practices

Compliance promotion and effective enforcement

Proliferation of market driven wetland conservation practices (let's find the common ground)

Sustainable incentives for producers

Workable offset program Supreme Court ruling to protect wetland

Increased public funding of research and restoration

Drainage in the grain sector is accommodated but impacts are mitigated

We will have:

- Comprehensive wetland policies in every province and territory that includes a mitigation hierarchy and sequence, i.e. (avoid, minimize, mitigate / offset) to manage wetland damage or destruction.

Appendix 2: Table Discussion Results – Day 2 Feedback

Group 1

- ∂ Think the draft is going in the right direction
- ∂ Highlight development of incentive programs to encourage wetland conservation
- ∂ All partners require sufficient resources/capacity: remove “government” from resources and capacity second bullet
- ∂ One additional statement needed: Improve knowledge on wetland biophysical and socio-economic knowledge and their linkages
- ∂ Funded comprehensive research
- ∂ Understand human well being in the context of wetland management
- ∂ The whole of “Effective Regulation” statement should be incorporated into “Wetlands as Good Business”
- ∂ Science and inventory are part of effective planning/management at a landscape scale
- ∂ Also address requirement for evaluation / modification of conservation programs – to ensure effectiveness towards goals

Group 2

- ∂ Generally going in right direction
- ∂ Incorporating wetland management approach needs to be part of entire landscape management approach; important that industry folks don’t want to have several documents to go to
- ∂ Consider aligning with 2020 biodiversity working group – already work being done, don’t have to start up something new

Group 3

- ∂ Going in right direction
- ∂ Change title of statement 3 to “inventory and monitoring” and add bullet regarding requirement for a common framework of wetland mapping standards
- ∂ Clarify statement 6: By whom? Who pays? Who’s responsible?
- ∂ Statement 7 needs some work: need to talk about capacity, governance, etc.
- ∂ One additional statement needed: “Develop implementation strategy”
- ∂ More we can make it similar to other frameworks, the better

Group 4

- ∂ Generally in the right direction
- ∂ BC framework notes importance of prioritizing wetlands – our outcomes don’t include this
- ∂ Stress incentives as preferred policy in first statement, should be first bullet
- ∂ Include reference to wetland area and function in second statement
- ∂ Just use term “wetlands” in third statement and better define wetlands as including peatlands
- ∂ Add to text box results statement: “enabled by and integrated and informed by wetland integrated management system”

- ∂ Add idea of cumulative effectiveness – could fit into management, research, landscape, inventory, etc.
- ∂ Under “effective regulation” – ensure integration of wetland regulation under overall ecosystem and general land use planning and management.

Group 5

- ∂ Right track, but document could be more action-oriented
- ∂ Is net gain realistic? Area and functionality? Across all regions? We want final goal to stretch us but isn’t unrealistic
- ∂ Text box results statement should refer to sustaining area and function of healthy wetland ecosystems
- ∂ How are we going to go to politicians with collective voice if we can’t all buy into “results”/ goal?
- ∂ Who is this vision for, who owns it? Stakeholders in room have to buy in here: it must be credible, believable, and attainable. It is a really critical piece. No net loss is a lower bar than net gain, and is a concept that is antagonizing certain stakeholders.

Group 6

- ∂ Outcomes are on track
- ∂ Shared vision in Canada is the basis for all these other elements. Need to define this. Important to have all players in the room at the time, for developing shared vision.
- ∂ Net gain is unrealistic – need to spend some time with this. This is the key element, need consensus on this before move on. Who is it for? Who owns it?
- ∂ Ducks has led way in incorporating adaptive management in program: are we getting value for money on the landscape? Need evaluation of programs.
- ∂ A lot of the other statements are part of the shared vision, but “community caring” should be split from shared vision

Appendix 3: List of Participants

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS					
2	Title	FirstName	LastName	Organization	Role	E-Mail
3		Amanda	Affonso	Canadian Energy Pipeline Association		aaffonso@cepa.com
4		Michel	Allaire	Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal		michel.allaire@cmm.qc.ca
5		Ian	Barnett	Nature Conservancy of Canada		Ian.Barnett@natureconservancy.ca
6		Jason	Beaulieu	Ducks Unlimited Canada		j_beaulieu@ducks.ca
7	Dr.	Peter	Boxall	University of Alberta		peter.boxall@ualberta.ca
8	Dr.	Ian	Campbell	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada		Ian.Campbell@AGR.GC.CA
9	Dr.	Patricia	Farnese	University of Saskatchewan		patricia.farnese@usask.ca
10		Bill	Ferreira	Canadian Construction Association		bferreira@cca-acc.com
11		Kathryn	Folkl	Nature Conservancy of Canada		Kathryn.Folkl@natureconservancy.ca
12		Chris	Fordham	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers/Suncor		cfordham@suncor.com
13	Dr.	Alan	Hanson	Environment Canada Atlantic Region		Al.Hanson@EC.GC.CA
14		Loretta	Hardwick	Association of Consulting Engineers/Stantec		Loretta.Hardwick@stantec.com
15	Dr.	David	Howerter	Institute for Wetland and Waterfowl Research		d_howerter@ducks.ca
16		Peter	Joyce	Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment		peter.joyce@gov.sk.ca
17		Arlene	Kwasniak	University of Calgary/Canadian Institute of Resources Law		akwasnia@ucalgary.ca
18		Rhonda	McDougal	Manitoba Conservation		Rhonda.McDougal@gov.mb.ca
19		Kieran	McDougal	University of Waterloo		kieranmcdougal@gmail.com
20		Randy	Milton	Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources		miltongr@gov.ns.ca
21		Dennis	O'Grady	South Nation Conservation Authority		DOGrady@nation.on.ca
22	Dr.	Nancy	Olewiler	Simon Fraser University		olewiler@sfu.ca
23		Mark	Partington	FPIInnovations		Mark.Partington@fpinnovations.ca
24		Lou	Riccoboni	CH2M Hill		Lou.Riccoboni@ch2m.com
25		Luc	Robitaille	Holcim Inc.		luc.robitaille@holcim.com
26		Tara	Shea	Mining Association of Canada		tshea@mining.ca
27		Paul	Short	Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association		paul.short@peatmoss.com
28		Etienne	Soulodre	Saskatchewan Water Security Agency		Etienne.Soulodre@wsask.ca
29	Dr.	Nicholas	Stow	City of Ottawa		nick.stow@ottawa.ca
30	Dr.	Marian	Weber	Alberta Research Council / University of Alberta		marian.weber@arc.ab.ca
31						

List of Participants (cont'd...)

Steering Committee and Project Team

	A	B	C	D	E	F
31						
32	STEERING COMMITTEE and PROJECT TEAM					
33	Title	FirstName	LastName	Organization	Role	E-Mail
34		Andrea	Barnett	Ducks Unlimited Canada		a_barnett@ducks.ca
35		Jim	Brennan	Ducks Unlimited Canada	(Co-chair)	j_brennan@ducks.ca
36		Sandy	Connell	Ducks Unlimited Canada		s_connell@ducks.ca
37		Neil	Fletcher	B.C. Wildlife Federation		wetlands@bcwf.bc.ca
38		David	Hintz	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources		david.hintz@ontario.ca
39		Fawn	Jackson	Canadian Cattlemen's Association		jacksonf@cattle.ca
40		Pat	Kehoe	Ducks Unlimited Canada	(Co-chair)	p_kehoe@ducks.ca
41		Kate	Lindsay	Forest Products Association of Canada		klindsay@fpac.ca
42		Pauline	Lynch-Stewart	Consultant		pauline@lynchstewart.com
43		Robert	McLean	Environment Canada		robert.mclean@ec.gc.ca
44		Greg	Northey	Canadian Federation of Agriculture		envsci@cfa.ca
45		Dennis	Prouse	CropLife Canada		proused@croplife.ca
46		Barbara	Robinson	River Road Creative		barbara@riverroadcreative.com
47		Dean	Smith	Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies		dsmith@fishwildlife.org
48		Mike	Sullivan	New Brunswick Natural Resources		mike.sullivan@gnb.ca
49		Chris	White	Insurance Bureau of Canada		cwhite@ibc.ca
50		Warren	Wilson	Intersol		wwilson@intersol.ca

