

Place-Based Decision Making

Regional Perspectives on Federal Roles

Evert Kenk

Program Director

Pacific Marine Analysis and Research Association (PacMARA)

Carlton University, Ottawa

March 22, 2010

ILM Data Needs Assessment

- Visited four Place-Based Initiatives
 - Humber River Valley, NL – SAR, marten
 - Bras d'Or Lake, NS – inland sea, pollution
 - Eastern Ontario Model Forest, ON – cultural heritage
 - Foothills Research Institute, AB – forestry, oil and gas cumulative effects on caribou
- How data/information turns into knowledge for planning and decision making
- Lessons learned and good practices

The Regional Challenge

- Lack of jurisdictional clarity / well defined roles
- The need to be both flexible and adaptable to regional variances
- Improved data/knowledge sharing
- Support for place-based systems and tools

Lack of Jurisdictional Clarity

- Issue:
 - Overlapping jurisdictions (private, municipal, provincial, federal)
 - Exacerbated by federal departmental and program overlap (DFO, EC, Agr, Trans...) and independent actions by departments
- Examples: Alberta Caribou; Bras d'Or Lakes shoreline
- Opportunity:
 - A federal (holistic) vs. departmental approach to place-based management
 - For federal mandates (e.g. fish, SAR,...) a well defined, collaborative process for place-based management

Flexible and Adaptable

- Regional place-based management is NOT uniform across the country – varies between and within provinces:
 - Bottom-up processes: Foothills Research Institute, Bras d'Or Lakes – informal (not legislated) governance
 - Top-down processes: BC LRMP process, Alberta LUF/RAC process – formal (legislated) governance
- Federal approach to place-based management needs to be flexible and adaptable, “one size” does not fit all – but still needs to be well defined

Improved Data/Knowledge Sharing

- Issues:
 - Access to federal place-based data holdings is still a challenge (both finding and retrieving)
 - Access to federal research and project place-based data products is still a challenge (both finding and retrieving)
- Need to look at Opportunities:
 - Research/project-based extension and outreach for better uptake – including collaboration when it makes sense
 - Opening up internal place-based applications/tools to regional partners
 - Geospatially enabling federal social/economic data for integration into place-based management processes (StatsCan data was structured for urbanscapes but not landscapes (watersheds))

Support for Place-based Systems and Tools

- National (vs. federal) place-based programs and systems have had notable successes:
 - Programs: GeoConnections, Agriculture Policy Framework CLI/BCLI (meeting regional/local needs)
 - Systems: Geographic Names, Species at Risk, CanSIS... (meeting national information/knowledge needs)
- Need to compare with place-based programs and systems that did not have national uptake: CISE, NLWIS
- Data and standards are in place – need desktop and group tools that support place-based decision making (policy, planning, operational levels)

What really works for regional place-based management?

- Bottom-up informal processes
 - Participation, collaboration and building trust
- Top-down formal processes
 - Engagement [vs. consultation] with workable well-defined processes
- Goal or Target Visions
 - Improving Quality of Life (Well-being) meaning a positive balance
 - Society, Culture, Economy and Environment