Based on conversations to date at the Integrated Salmon Dialogue Forum

Thinking Out Loud: Cross –Cutting Questions

Developed to draw in from our own experience key issues, gaps and lessons for moving forward.

1. How have ('or should') governments (federal, provincial, First nation, Municipal) participated as 'partners' in Collaborative Governance Structures with other sectors while respecting their jurisdictional responsibilities and mandates?

    ("CGS" as a 'placeholder' term to represent efforts to move the nature of engagement beyond consultation/advice/input into decisions to a deeper level of involvement as partners in decision making.)

2. How have ('or should') different rights and interests of all partners been respected and reconciled within CGSs? Are there other experiences in other places similar to the specific rights and entitlements of aboriginal Canadians, and what guidance do they provide?

3. What language has been used ('or should') to express the relationships within a CGS that participants have found acceptable?

4. What implications has ('or will') the establishment of these CGSs have for the partnering organizations within their internal structures and "the way business has been traditionally done"? What internal organizational changes have ('or will be') be necessary (within both governmental institutions and each of the interest based participating organizations and groups) to operationalize CGSs? What implications has ('or will') this have for the roles and responsibilities of people within them, and the competencies required to fulfill them?

5. How have ('or should') these CGSs been provided the financial and other resources required to enable them to fulfill their obligations? What are the institutional mechanics through which this can be done? Is legislative change necessary, or can these changes take place within existing legal structures?

6. How has ('or should') information been provided and developed (and specifically scientific and traditional knowledge) to inform decision making and issue resolution within the CGS? How has ('or should') this information be developed and provided? By whom? In what way? How has ('or should') this information been shared /exchanged across participants/sectors?

7. Have parameters, preconditions, or precursors been identified as critical, significant, or helpful to successful CGS? What relationship, if any, has been identified between stability of access to the resource across the user communities of interest, and the operation and effectiveness of the CGS?

8. How have ('or should') decisions been made and differences resolved? What has happened when the differences have been irreconcilable? What strategies have been used to move through and beyond impasse? Has ('or will') broader participation and the inclusion of more perspectives and interests enhanced or impeded the ability to achieve resolution?

9. What elements have been identified as important to ensuring the resiliency of a CGS? E.g., What role if any has "adaptive management" strategies played? What is the track record of implementation – i.e. turning the words of commitments and agreements into actions? Have ('or should') feedback/review/evaluation/ adjustment mechanisms been used? In what way and to what effect?

10. Have key elements in success and in failure been identified? What implications has "scale" played in the structure and operation of CGSs? How have ('or will') decision making activities at different scales and levels been "linked"?