

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT**

**RETURN BIDS TO:**

Environment Canada  
Procurement & Contracting  
867 Lakeshore Road  
P.O. Box 5050  
Burlington, Ontario  
L7R 4A6

**Title: Integrated Great Lakes Nearshore Framework**

**Date: 17 July 2013**

**Request For Proposal No: KW405-13-0367  
Amendment Number: 003**

**Solicitation Closes**

**At: 14:00:00 HRS.**

**On: 24 July 2013**

**Address Enquiries To: Claire Cosentino**

**Telephone No: (905) 336-4992**

**Facsimile No: (905) 336-8907**

**E-Mail: claire.cosentino@ec.gc.ca**

**CONTRACTOR NAME & ADDRESS**

(Print or type complete legal entity)

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**Telephone No:** .....

**Facsimile No:** .....

I (We), the undersigned, hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Environment, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein or attached hereto, the services and/or supplies listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefor.

.....  
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of vendor (type or print).

.....  
**Signature**

.....  
**Date**

---

**Amendment No. 2 is being raised to provide questions and answers in regards to the requirement.**

- Q1.** In addition to the annual reporting workshops, how many in-person meetings are anticipated to be necessary and where would these meetings be held?
- A1.** The number of In-person meetings is unknown at this time and will be decided as the project progresses. It is anticipated that there will be at least 8-12 meetings in the first and second year with a smaller number in year 3. They will include:
- meeting the departmental representative to discuss contract deliverables, work plans, progress;
  - meeting with a project team which may include federal, provincial governments and other organizations to implement a project plan
  - meeting with First Nations and Métis along with project team members
  - technical/science meetings/workshops
  - potential meetings with “Lakewide Management” Workgroups (Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Superior)
  - potential meetings with “Area of Concern” committees (1-3)
- The need for in-person meetings will be high at start-up, but conference calls may be substituted as the project progresses. It is anticipated that most meetings will be in the Burlington and GTA region with perhaps 2 or 3 in other lake basins and potentially 1 in the United States per year.
- Q2.** Which costs associated with the implementation of the ‘awareness campaign plan’ should be accounted for in the budget of this project? We assume that: planning the best approach, preparation of materials (whatever the format), and presenting at meetings should be included in this budget, but that costs associated with publishing or hosting a public meeting (e.g., room rental, refreshments, printing materials etc.) should not.
- A2.** Costs for all of the above items should be accounted for in the “sample” work plan. Decisions on specific activities will be made based on the project team’s approval of a plan and the associated costs. As the project progresses, there may be opportunities to obtain support (funds or in-kind support) from partner organizations.
- Q3.** On page 11, the RFP states that “collaboration with the U.S. Nearshore Framework activities will be required” yet specific objective #5 uses softer language to the effect of exchanging information “to the extent possible”. Please clarify expectations for engagement with U.S. counterparts.
- A3.** Expectations are unknown at this time, however as also stated on page 11, “This project is to facilitate the collaborative effort...” and so to clarify: it is the responsibility of the Canadian federal government representative (Environment Canada) to ensure that the necessary collaboration with the U.S. occurs in a manner to be determined

---

through the course of project implementation and that the contractor will assist in this collaboration through the identification and facilitation of information exchange amongst the Canadian participants and their U.S. counterparts.

- Q4.** The project background on page 9 states that “there is a need to have a consensus based approach to the assessment, priority setting and integrated management which reflects the needs of society and natural environment in the Great Lakes.” This statement is not altogether consistent with requirement to “creat[e] public awareness strategies to obtain broad Great Lakes community support” on page 10, which suggests a one-way flow of information. Is the expectation for citizens’ values to directly inform framework development or that Great Lakes citizens will become informed about framework development activities?
- A4.** The need for broad Great Lakes community support will be met through an awareness campaign and the citizens will become informed about broader Great Lakes issues, programs, activities, nearshore issues and, to a lesser extent, the development of the framework. The need for a consensus based approach (for assessment, priority setting, management) will be met through the specific objectives 1) collaborative relationship with First Nations and Métis, 2) project charter and project plan 3) engagement of a project partner’s team, 4) regional stakeholder participation, 5) information exchange with U.S..
- Q5.** As per page 25, Section 6: 3.1, please clarify if all personnel on the project team need to provide reliability clearance identification numbers at the proposal stage or can this be provided to EC upon contract award.
- A5.** Upon contract award.
- Q6.** i. a project plan and charter endorsed by all Canadian partners (September 2013); This appears to be the Canadian committee noted in the RFP - but the RFP also notes that this committee has not been developed. Who is responsible for developing this committee? Will Environment Canada (EC) develop this committee? Does EC have a list of Canadian partners? What role is the contractor expected to play in the development of this committee? Is there a structure in place to distribute the draft project plan and charter, and to collect feedback? What draft materials describing the charter are available?
- A6.** The group is not established yet, but will likely include federal departments and provincial ministries and perhaps other organizations who will commit to roles and responsibilities in the development of the nearshore framework. Environment Canada is responsible for developing this committee. As stated in the RFP, “This project is to facilitate the collaborative effort and deliver agreed-to products and services. Unless specified, any items listed below under objectives and deliverables will not be undertaken as a sole effort by the contractor.” and the contractor will: “Support Canadian government efforts”; “Facilitate engagement” and; “Facilitate regional

---

stakeholder participation”. There is no structure in place at this time. A preliminary draft charter is available. See attached.

**Q7.** ii. an approved terms of reference for the partners (September 2013); Does EC have a draft terms of reference for the partners?

**A7.** No.

**Q8.** iii. a review of relevant policies, legislation and programs that relate to the health and protection of Canadian nearshore areas in the Great Lakes (September 2013); Lake Michigan is located wholly in the United States. Is this lake included in the framework and this instrument review?

**A8.** Lake Michigan is one of the Great Lakes and is included in the GLWQA Lakewide Annex 2.B.7. commitment for an integrated nearshore framework. The “review of relevant policies, legislation and programs that relate to the health and protection of **Canadian nearshore areas** in the Great Lakes” is clearly stated.

**Q9.** iv. a summary of consultations with existing Binational LAMP working groups and Canadian Areas of Concern teams on advice and needs for the Nearshore Framework (December 2013); Does EC have a schedule of upcoming Binational LAMP working group meetings? Does EC expect the contractor to conduct or attend these consultations? Or, are these consultations already being planned? If already planned, where/when are these consultations taking place? Are these consultations taking place as workshops, meetings, teleconferences, etc? Does this include Lake Michigan (the lake management plan for Lake Michigan is not considered a LaMP). Can EC provide a list of the LaMP working groups and the Canadian AoC teams?

**A9.** No schedule has been developed. Project Objective 4 as listed in the RFP indicates that the contractor will **facilitate** regional stakeholder participation. The activities require working with a committee of Canadian federal/provincial and other representatives. See responses to question 1 and 5. EC can provide a list of the LAMP working groups for each Great Lake and the 14 Canadian AOC teams when the contract is awarded.

**Q10.** vii. notes and summaries of Canadian government and partner discussions with First Nations and Métis on the establishment of a working relationship and on input to the Nearshore Framework (March 2014); Is the contractor expected to conduct consultations with First Nations and Metis, or are we expected to summarize discussions already done/or that are being done independently of the contractor's activities? How many government and partner discussions/meetings are involved?

**A10.** See response to A1 & A14.

- 
- Q11.** viii. an awareness campaign plan for the Canadian side of the Great Lakes to be coordinated with LAMPs, RAPs and other Great Lakes and local initiatives which may include website materials, conference presentations, fact sheets and other promotional materials (March 2014); How many conferences and workshop will be required to attend, what are the durations, and at what locations? This question is to try to get a sense of travel expenses that will be required.
- A11.** See response to A1 & A14.
- Q12.** Year one deliverables includes notes and summaries of discussions with First Nations and Metis – does this include setting up, facilitating and attending these meetings?
- A12.** Yes, see Project Objective #1.
- Q13.** Year two deliverables include continued collaborative implementation of the awareness campaign which may include additional materials and presentations. Does this also include the production of the written materials to support the awareness campaign, i.e. websites, factsheets, newsletters, presentations and the associated printing costs?
- A13.** Costs for all of the above items should be accounted for in the “sample” work plan. Decisions on specific activities will be made based on the project team’s approval of a plan and the associated costs. As the project progresses, there may be opportunities to obtain support (funds or in-kind support) from partner organizations.
- Q14.** It is not clear how much travelling will be required for this project. We are not clear on how many meetings, workshops and/or conferences (and locations) outside of the Burlington area the contractor would be expected to attend, so it is difficult to estimate travel expenses as requested in the RFP. Any clarification you can provide on this point would be helpful in developing the draft work plan requested. Also, if more or less travel is required over the course of the project, could monies be transferred between fees and travel expenses, provided the maximum proposed budget is not exceeded (i.e., any savings on expenses can be applied to fees)?
- A14.** A “sample” work plan is requested. Following the contract award, the contractor will submit estimated budgets for key activities planned with the project team on a quarterly basis (including time/costs by activity in relation to total costs) for approval by the departmental representative. Eligible expenses include: salaries, subcontractors, pre-authorized travel, and costs associated with organizing and facilitating meetings and/or workshops. Costs associated with administration of subcontractors will not be covered. The contractor shall not arrange or incur any expenditure on behalf of Her Majesty without prior authorization by the Contracting Authority.

The number of in-person meetings is unknown at this time and will be decided as the project progresses. It is anticipated that there will be at least 8-12 meetings in the first and second year with a smaller number in year 3. They will include:

- meeting the departmental representative to discuss contract deliverables, work plans, progress;
- meeting with a project team which may include federal, provincial governments and other organizations to implement a project plan
- meeting with First Nations and Métis along with project team members
- technical/science meetings/workshops
- potential meetings with “Lakewide Management” Workgroups (Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Superior)
- potential meetings with “Area of Concern” committees (1-3)

The need for in-person meetings will be high at start-up, but conference calls may be substituted as the project progresses. It is anticipated that most meetings will be in the Burlington and GTA region with perhaps 2 or 3 in other lake basins and potentially 1 in the United States per year.

## **DRAFT PROJECT CHARTER**

### Table of Contents

#### Section 1. Charter Introduction

##### 1.1 Document Change Control

##### 1.2 Executive Summary

##### 1.3 Authorization

#### Section 2. Project Overview

##### 2.1 Project Summary

##### 2.2 Project Goals

##### 2.3 Project Scope

##### 2.4 Milestones

##### 2.5 Deliverables

##### 2.6 Project Cost Estimate

##### 2.7 Dependencies

##### 2.8 Project Risks & Assumptions

#### Section 3. Project Organization

##### 3.1 Project Governance

##### 3.2 Special Governance Considerations

##### 3.3 Roles and Responsibilities

#### Section 4. Conclusions

##### 4.1 Proposed Governance Model

### **Section 1. Charter Introduction**

#### **1.1 Document Change Control**

This section serves to control the development and distribution of revisions to the Project Charter. It should be used together with a change management process and a document management system. It is recommended that changes to the charter be documented only by adding appendices to the original project charter. This will keep an accurate history of the original document that was first approved.

#### **1.2 Executive Summary**

Managing and protecting the Great Lakes is a complex task. Multi-jurisdictional land development decisions (Federal, Provincial, Conservation Authority and Municipal) covering a range of uses and users add to this complexity. The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) recognizing this complexity and the need for a management approach that would align resources and resource decisions across sectors and across jurisdictions in Canada and the United States of America. The GLWQA calls for the development of an Integrated Nearshore Framework for the Great Lakes, hereafter referred to as the Nearshore Framework. Previous versions of the GLWQA, the Lakewide Management Plans, and the existing Remedial Action Plans have focused either on specific Areas of Concern and the open waters of the Great Lakes. The recently re-negotiated GLWQA recognizes the need to assess, identify and play closer attention to sensitive areas in the nearshore of the Great Lakes and connecting channels that are or may become subject to high stress, require better protection mechanisms or require

---

restoration.

The Great Lakes Basin is a highly managed system. With more than 10,000 km of shoreline, the Great Lakes hold one-fifth of the earth's surface freshwater. Draining more than 500,000 square kilometres of land, these freshwater seas supports more than 35 million people who have come to call the Basin home. The future prosperity, growth and sustainability of the communities and the economies of the Great Lakes Basin depend on a healthy lake system. Current and mounting demographic pressure in some areas of the Basin is continuing to create stress. Industrial development, the hardening of the Great Lakes shoreline and the intensification of agriculture creates both challenges and opportunities.

Water is a shared resource and in a seemingly connected way, water management is shared among a variety of agencies and organizations. Looking to the future, the signatories to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement have acknowledged the need for an integrated Nearshore Framework that will serve as a platform for collaborative action focusing on the nearshore area of the Great Lakes. At this time, there are many agencies at the Federal, Provincial and Municipal levels with some degree of responsibility for the nearshore. While the GLWQA and the bi-national management of our boundary waters is a Federal responsibility; water quality is legislative responsibility for the Province of Ontario. Decisions on land use and development along shorelines is controlled by Provincial legislation but largely implemented locally at the Municipal level and by Conservation Authorities. Municipalities and Conservation Authorities also have an important stewardship and regulatory role in the nearshore. Despite the involvement of many, there is insufficient coordination and integration of effort. The Nearshore Framework would serve as a strategic foundation within which coordinated action could occur. As noted in the GLWQA, the Nearshore Framework will be implemented collaboratively through the Lakewide Action and Management Plans (LAMPs) in place for each Great Lake. The development of an integrated Nearshore Framework will:

- Assess the nearshore waters;
- Identify areas of high stress and high ecological value;
- Monitor, identify restoration opportunities and guide protection efforts; and
- Engage all stakeholders.

By determining factors and cumulative effects that are causing stress or threats, it will be possible to set priorities and to engage the appropriate agencies and entities to develop and implement integrated prevention, restoration and protection strategies. The Nearshore Framework is intended to provide an umbrella structure for this purpose, provide an overall assessment and use this baseline to measure the success of future restoration and protection efforts. The Nearshore Framework will allow all partners to identify the critical importance of the nearshore waters and environments of the Great Lakes to our human health, native biodiversity, shoreline lifestyles, recreational pursuits, and economic prosperity. The Nearshore Framework will advance an era of integrated management and enhanced land and aquatic stewardship in the Great Lakes Basin.

### **1.3 Authorization**

Environment Canada is leading this initiative with the support of its partners to the Canada Ontario Agreement (COA) but is of the view that it must be developed collaboratively with many partners. XXX have been retained to develop a Project Plan and Project Charter to advance work on the development of the Nearshore Framework for the Canadian portion of the Great Lakes over the coming three years. This Project Charter will continue to be a work in progress until such time as the signatories have



ratified it. During the three year planning phase, the Canadian work done on the Nearshore Framework development will be done cooperatively with the United States.

## **Section 2. Project Overview**

### **2.1 Project Summary**

There is a long history of government and stakeholder action to protect Great Lakes water quality. But despite the level of commitment, there continue to be challenges to Great Lakes nearshore water quality and aquatic ecosystem health. New and re-emerging threats to water quality caused by population growth and urbanization, agricultural intensification, aquatic invasive species and the impacts of climate change are in combination, having an adverse impact on water quality. Impaired water quality is contributing to the resurgence of toxic and nuisance algal blooms, beach closures, loss of habitat and species, and a lack of ecosystem resilience.

Federal, provincial and municipal legislation and policies currently address nearshore issues, but they lack adequate integration. Federal agencies including Environment, Transport, Fisheries and Oceans, and Parks Canada, provincial agencies including the Ontario Ministries of Natural Resources, Environment, Municipal Affairs, and Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs as well as Conservation Authorities and Municipalities across the Great Lakes Basin each address the nearshore through various regulations, permits and programs. Action Plans including Remedial Action Plans, Lakewide Management Plans, biodiversity conservation strategies, coastal wetland restoration initiatives and shoreline management plans are designed at different spatial scales and focus on different stresses. Simply put, they are not fully integrated. First Nations and Métis communities and organizations are seeking a greater role in governance and the use of traditional and local knowledge in decision making. Municipalities and Conservation Authorities have an important role in shoreline management and land use decision making as well as water quality. Non-government organizations, industries, the farming community, the development sector, environmental groups and individual landowners similarly have an important role to play in the wise stewardship of the Great Lakes nearshore and coastal areas. At the present time, many are doing work but these actions are not integrated or aligned. What is lacking is an overall consensus based approach to assessment, priority setting and integrated management that reflects the needs of the Great Lakes nearshore. The Nearshore Framework is a key component that will guide the broader integration of key actions in the nearshore area in the future.

### **2.2 Project Goals**

The purpose of the Nearshore Framework is to manage activities, uses and to promote decisions affecting the Great Lakes nearshore in a more integrated and participatory manner. The goals are as follows:

- a) Provide an overall assessment of the state of the nearshore waters of the Great Lakes;
- b) Identify nearshore areas that are or may become subject to high stress due to individual or cumulative impact on the chemical, physical or biological integrity of those areas;
- c) Identify areas within the nearshore which, due to their nature, are of high ecological value;
- d) Determine factors and cumulative effects that are causing stress or that are threatening areas of high ecological value;
- e) Establish priorities for nearshore protection, restoration and protection measures based on consideration of nearshore and whole-lake factors;

- f) Identify and engage appropriate agencies and entities that are developing and implementing prevention, restoration, and protection strategies;
- g) Include consideration of non-point source runoff, shoreline hardening, climate change impacts, habitat loss, invasive species, dredging and contaminated sediment issues, bacterial contamination, contaminated groundwater, and other factors where they are identified as a source of stress to the nearshore environment;
- h) Take into account the impact on human health and the environment;
- i) Include monitoring of the nearshore to support this framework, which shall be conducted on a frequency to be determined by the Parties, to assess changes in the nearshore over time; and
- j) Be regularly assessed and revised as appropriate.

## **2.3 Project Scope**

### **2.3.1 Goals and Outcomes**

#### **Summary**

The goal of the project is the development of an integrated nearshore assessment and management framework to ensure the ecological health of the Great Lakes is maintained, they remain a source of high quality drinking water, are attractive for swimming and other recreational pursuits, and permit the safe consumption of fish and wildlife. While focusing on a sustainable water supply, recognize and leverage the linkages between the Bi-national Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, the Canada Ontario Agreement, as well as the provincial Great Lakes Strategy. The primary reason for developing the framework is to ensure that the Great Lakes, through a new focus on the nearshore, are healthy, native biodiversity is protected and they are able to adapt to the challenges of population growth, nutrient loading, invasive species, water level fluctuations and climate change.

#### **2.3.2 Boundaries**

This project plan focuses on the Canadian side of the Great Lakes and includes the nearshore of the lakes, connecting channels and the tributary watersheds to the extent they influence the nearshore zone. There will be integration and coordination to some degree with a similar team on the USA side of the lakes through a proposed Bi-national Nearshore Framework Task Team, however, it is anticipated that much of the work between the two countries will proceed independently.

### **2.4 Milestones**

The Project Plan presented in the report by XXX outlines a series of tasks that will be executed in the coming three years. Significant activities and deliverables are noted below.

#### **Project Milestone/Description Expected/Date**

##### **Year One**

Secure Senior Level Buy-in/Ensure COA Signatories Support the Process/July 2013

Final Project Plan and Charter/Get Required Signatures/Sept. 2013

Define Nearshore/and Re-brand the Program/Priority Activity for the Project Partners/Sept. 2013

Project Partners Report/Year One Reporting Workshop/March 2014

Year One Report/Summary of Activities in Year One/March 2014

##### **Year Two**

Project Partners Report /Year Two Reporting Workshop/March 2014

Year Two Report/ Summary of Activities in Year Two /March 2015

### **Year Three**

Finalize the Nearshore Framework/Framework is Complete and Documented/Sept. 2015

Secure Final Approval of the Framework from Partners/Ensure Complete Support/March 2016

Project Partners Report/Year Two Reporting Workshop/March 2016

Year Three Report/Summary of Activities in Year Three/March 2016

## **2.5 Deliverables**

### **Deliverables in Year 1/Timing**

Finalize Project Plan and Charter/ End of Q2

COA Signatories Sign Project Plan and Project Charter/ End of Q2

Project Partners Year One Report/ End of Q4

White Paper on the Nearshore Framework/ End of Q4

### **Deliverables in Year 2/Timing**

Year Two Report /End of Q2

### **Deliverables in Year 3/Timing**

Finalize the Nearshore Framework and Document with Final Report /End of Q2

Apply Framework to Identify Priority Projects /End of Q2

Year Three Report /End of Q4

## **2.6 Project Cost Estimate**

### **2.6.1 Project cost estimate**

At this time, it is beyond the scope of this document to assess the full project costs for all the Project Partners.

## **2.7 Dependencies**

There are a number of important dependencies associated with the development of the Great Lakes Nearshore Framework. There are many initiatives in various stages of completion that are underway at the Federal and provincial levels. An outline of dependencies with other known programs includes:

- Bi-national execution of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement
- Implementation of the Canada Ontario Agreement
- Collaboration with the Provincial Great Lakes Strategy
- Effectiveness of the proposed Provincial Great Lakes Protection Act

## **2.8 Project Risks & Assumptions**

### **2.8.1 Risks**

#### **Risk Description/Probability (H/M/L)/Impact (H/M/L)/ Planned Mitigation**

1. Absence of funding for new initiatives and geographically focused projects/Probability: H to M /Impact: H / Ensuring collaborative work planning to maximize all partners' abilities to leverage the funds required
2. Lack of support from key government partners/ Probability: L/ Impact: H/ Environment Canada as the lead on the GLWQA and Ministry of the Environment as the lead on the COA

---

must garner support from key government partners.

### 2.8.2 Assumptions

The development of an integrated Great Lakes Nearshore Framework is premised on the following key assumptions:

**The following is assumed:**

1. There is a Federal commitment to advance an integrated nearshore framework for the Great Lakes.
2. There is willingness by the Province, with MOE as the lead agency for the COA and MNR as a strong partner to act as project leads.
3. There is willingness by Conservation Ontario to coordinate, disseminate and galvanize interest among Ontario's 36 Conservation Authorities.
4. There are partners who will coordinate, disseminate and galvanize interest in Ontario's north, where Conservation Authorities do not exist.
5. There is willingness, on the part of Aboriginal partners and Municipalities, to become engaged in the process and contribute.
6. There is a willingness at the community level to become engaged on specific projects to achieve action at the local level.

## Section 3. Project Organization

### 3.1 Project Governance

The Nearshore Framework process will be facilitated by Environment Canada. It will be guided by a shared or collaborative model that is founded on the principle of participatory governance. It will be guided by both a top-down and a bottom-up process that will inspire leadership among all participants and will engage and empower communities and individuals to action.

A Core Team is linked to the proposed COA Lakewide Annex Subcommittee and the proposed Bi-national Nearshore Framework Task Group, which is part of the Bi-national Lakewide Annex Subcommittee. The model proposed builds on the key lessons learned from other jurisdictions and acknowledges the models of success that have emerged across Ontario. As the literature suggests, locally driven governance models achieve success; hence the rationale in promoting both a top-down and a bottom-up process. The suggested governance model contemplates an integrated 'system of nested leads.' The model applies systems thinking and acknowledges the important role that all partners will play to promote the integrated management of the Great Lakes nearshore. Each element of the governance model is described in detail below:

#### Core Team

The model is premised on multiple lines of accountability. It is intended that a Core Team consisting of Environment Canada, MOE, MNR, Conservation Ontario and possibly a Northern Ontario lead. The Core Team will be responsible for overseeing the coordination and collaborative efforts, and ensuring that the process unfolds in a logical, iterative and evolutionary manner. The Core Team may also include some of the participants from a potential COA Lakewide Management Committee. Their roles are summarized below:

- Environment Canada – Chair, lead development of the Nearshore Framework, and facilitate bi-national integration;

- Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Natural Resources – Provincial Leads;
- Conservation Ontario – Liaison with individual Conservation Authorities and Project Partner Lead; and
- Northern Ontario Project Partner Lead – MNR, Sault Saint Marie CA or Lakehead CA.

**Project Partners Roundtable:**

Environment Canada will provide overall process facilitation and coordination for the Project Partner Roundtable by acting as lead facilitator/coordinator. They will also act as the key conduit to the Federal Government agencies, providing a central point of contact for Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Transport Canada, the Parks Canada Agency and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. Environment Canada will also link the Roundtable to a potential COA Lakewide Management Committee and the proposed Bi-national Nearshore Framework Task Group.

The Provincial Leads are MNR and MOE, who have strategic responsibility for many aspects of the nearshore zone (e.g., MOE for water quality and MNR for the regulation of the crown bottomlands and habitat/ecosystem management). Other key agencies at the provincial level include the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing, and the Ministry of Infrastructure.

Other critical members of the roundtable include Municipalities, Conservation Ontario, individual Conservation Authorities, ENGO's and other special partners. Presently, a blue ribbon panel is being suggested for the aboriginal partners but the ultimate method of engaging them is uncertain at this time.

Members of the Project Partners Roundtable will be responsible for:

- defining the nearshore zone (or re-branding it the coastal zone);
- defining the criteria or indicators for the baseline assessment, which will be a critical benchmarks upon which to measure success or failure of this initiative in the future;
- recommending an approach for a baseline assessment for the Great Lakes nearshore;
- using available baseline assessment information to identify areas of high risk and high ecological value worth protecting;
- identifying the methods by which data will become 'discoverable';
- identifying agreed-upon monitoring methodologies;
- reporting to one another annually on achievements to advance the project goals.

Representatives will be comprised of, but not limited to, the following agencies and organizations:

- Environment Canada (EC)
- Fisheries & Oceans Canada (DFO)
- Parks Canada Agency (PCA)
- Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada (AAFC)
- Chiefs of Ontario (COO)
- Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO)
- Union of Ontario Indians (UOI)
- Association of Iroquois & Allied Indians (AIAI)
- Independent First Nations
- NAN

- Grand Council Treaty #3
- Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
- Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing (MMAH)
- Ministry of Agriculture and Food (OMAF)
- Ministry of Infrastructure (MOI)
- Association of Municipalities of Ontario
- Academia
- Conservation Ontario
- Individual Conservation Authorities
- Great Lakes Cities Initiative (GLCI)
- Nature Conservancy of Canada (NCC)
- Others.

#### **Subcommittees:**

Subcommittees to the Project Partners Roundtable will be organized as required to work on special projects, solve technical issues and engage communities. For example, at this time it is clear a Communications and Outreach Subcommittee will be required to execute the Awesome Awareness Campaign. A Scientific and Technical Subcommittee will be required to recommend assessment approaches and methodologies for priority setting. Other Subcommittees will be formed as required. Subcommittee Leads would be responsible for acting as liaison between the Project Partners Roundtable and their Subcommittees.

#### **Local Collaborative Projects:**

One of the key elements that is currently missing from the GLWQA and the COA is a process that embraces bottom up as well as top down engagement. This bottom up effort is vital to long term success – an observation that has been made in the view of other jurisdictional best practices as well as the local success stories in Ontario. The model that is being suggested advances bottom up engagement through the creation of location-specific collaborative initiatives or geographically focused projects that either emerge at the community level or are heavily supported by community action.

At the community level, Conservation Ontario will act as the Project Partner lead and key conduit to Ontario's 36 Conservation Authorities, where they exist. It is anticipated that the Project Partner lead in Northern Ontario will be MNR (District Offices) and the Lakehead Conservation Authority and Sault Ste. Marie Conservation Authority. It is anticipated that on-the-ground action will be channelled through the Conservation Authorities and other suitable local organizations. Further, liaison with local community groups, environmental nongovernment organizations, stewardship groups as well as municipalities will also occur through locally supported Conservation Authorities or other organizations fulfilling similar roles.

### **3.2 Special Governance Considerations**

In addition to promoting a model of participatory or shared governance, the approach that is

being advocated to advance the Nearshore Framework is one premised on broad engagement and inclusion. Drawing the important connections between upper levels of government and local on-the-ground action is vital to long-term success. Also vital is the important connection with industry and community. An important and challenging element in the process is the ability to effectively engage Aboriginal groups. Some have expressed a desire to partner with upper levels of government to advance more community-based engagement and have suggested they have the ability to undertake a coordination function in this regard. An initiative of this nature will require dedicated funding to the Aboriginal groups.

There are a number of options to advance aboriginal engagement that could be considered:

1. Focused organization-level only engagement;
2. Coordinated community-level engagement; and
3. A Blue Ribbon Panel.

The three options are discussed in more detail below:

**Option 1:** Focused organization-level only engagement

Engage with aboriginal organizations only. No local level engagement.

Pros: Enables timely response

Cons: Does not engage at the community level

**Option 2:** Coordinated community level engagement

Work with partner organizations to advance community and/or regional level engagement.

Pros: Fulsome engagement; top down and bottom up.

Cons: Labour and time intensive. Costly. May not secure input from all communities despite outreach.

**Option 3:** Blue Ribbon Panel

Create a series of Blue Ribbon Panels under the direction of a core team (COO, UOI, AIAI and MNO) and elicit involvement from a small select group of water/Great Lakes Basin experts.

Pros: Timely. Cost effective. Would engage experts with knowledge of the Great Lakes.

Cons: Would not engage all community members.

Dialogue with aboriginal partners has suggested that engagement at the organizational level only will not be sufficient in their opinion and further, that engagement must occur at the regional and/or community level. While time did not permit discussions with the Independent First Nations, AIAI or NAN, the issue of a robust community and/or regional engagement approach was suggested.

It is important to note that the dialogue with several aboriginal organizations focused on the need for regional and/or community-level engagement. Given the vast geography, a focused engagement methodology may be the only feasible option and it is against this backdrop that a Blue Ribbon Panel is being suggested. Please note, the notion of a Blue Ribbon Panel would have to be discussed with aboriginal partners in detail but could be advanced through each of the identified organizations (e.g. one Blue Ribbon Panel coordinated by the COO, UOI, AIAI, GCT3, Independent First Nations, NAN and MNO) or one Blue Ribbon Panel could be created with representation across the political confederacy but also including representation from MNO.

### 3.3 Roles and Responsibilities

**Project Coordinator – Environment Canada**

Chair and process coordination; lead development of the Nearshore Framework; liaison with the U.S.; linkage to GLWQA Lakewide Management Annex Subcommittee; lead on international water quality negotiations; coordination of data assessment and monitoring; report back to the IJC on commitments and achievements on a lake and basin wide basis; coordination and partnership with Aboriginal organizations.

**Provincial Leads - MOE & MNR**

Provincial coordination of the Nearshore Framework; liaison with other provincial ministries; linkage to the Great Lakes Strategy and Great Lakes Protection Act (through MOE), conduit to Conservation Authorities; conduit to municipalities (through MMAH); conduit to the farming community (through OMAF).

**Core Team – EC, MOE, MNR, CO**

With the members of the Round Table, Subcommittees, and the public, oversee the development of:

- A shared vision for the Nearshore Framework;
- Execution of the Project Plan;

Coordinate the overall development of the Nearshore Framework. Serve as a resource team for the resolution of issues and concerns. Identify priority projects or geographically focused initiatives.

**Local Southern Ontario Project Partner Lead – Conservation Ontario**

Coordination with Conservation Authorities and all the stakeholders across the province

**Local Northern Ontario Project Partner Lead – MNR and CO**

Coordination with Conservation Authorities (SSM CA, LRCA), the Province (through MNR) and landowners

**Aboriginal Blue Ribbon Panel (proposed)**

Coordination of aboriginal (First Nations and Métis Nation) input. Potential members of the proposed Aboriginal Blue Ribbon Panel to include:

- Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO)
- Chiefs of Ontario (COO)
- Grand Council Treaty #3
- Independent First Nations
- Nishnawbe-Aski Nation (NAN)
- Union of Ontario Indians (UOI)
- Association of Iroquois & Allied Indians (AIAI)

**Project Partners Roundtable – Roundtable Representatives**

The purpose of the Project Partners Roundtable will be to support the Nearshore framework and to allow for collaborative discussion to:

- define the nearshore
- develop a shared vision for the nearshore;
- execute the Project Plan and future action plans

The Project Partners Roundtable may include: Federal Partners, Provincial Partners, Municipal,



Conservation Authorities, Academia, Other Partners (e.g. ENGOs) and members of the Aboriginal Blue Ribbon Panel.

**Subcommittees** – To be determined

Subcommittees will be organized on as a needed basis and report to the Project Partner Roundtable For example, the Communications & Outreach Subcommittee will be responsible for broader public and stakeholder engagement. They will be charged with developing an Awesome Awareness and Contagious Commitment campaign to raise awareness of the importance of the nearshore, the value of the Great Lakes and the need for individual and collective action targeting the nearshore. A Scientific and Technical Subcommittee will be required to recommend assessment approaches and methodologies for priority setting.

**Local Collaboratives** - CAs, Municipalities, Private Industry, Citizens, ENGOs, Federal Government, Provincial Government

Much like the community-based collaboratives that have emerged under the Healthy Lake Huron, LOISS and Grand River Water Management Plan, on-the-ground action will be carried out by locally-driven collaborative initiatives coordinated by members of the Project Partners Roundtable (e.g., local Conservation Authorities) and other entities. It is expected that locally empowered community groups and organizations may also have capacity and interest in acting as specific project leads.

**Section 4. Conclusions**

**4.1 Proposed Governance Model**

A more participatory and integrated governance model is proposed; one that is based on existing mechanisms but one that reflects the unique attributes of the Great Lakes nearshore. The proposed model is based on the following key principles:

**Social-Ecological Value** The Great Lakes have tremendous ecological, social and economic value. Protecting and restoring the nearshore is integral to preserving the ecological goods and services the Great Lakes provide, preserving the rich heritage they represent, and ensuring we have healthy coastal communities and sustainable economies.

**Commitment** The commitment of all parties is essential in order to advance the Nearshore Framework.

**Representation** Any model of integrated management must represent the range of interests. The ‘forum’ must ‘fit the fuss.’ The governance model must also promote a balance of power so that there is shared ownership and shared decision making.

**Respect for Jurisdictional Authority & Rights** The jurisdictional authority of government is respected under the GLWQA and under COA. Since the Nearshore Framework is voluntary, it must not infringe on recognized Aboriginal rights or treaty rights or comprehensive land claims, nor should it interfere with collective or individual rights.

**Informed, Collaborative Decision Making** Decision making must be based on the best available information and knowledge, be it scientific, traditional or technical and it must take into account the mandates and the responsibilities of the participants. Consensus-based decision making is the key to shared ownership.

The key components of the Nearshore Framework are:

- A top down process coordinated by EC with engagement from a Core Team comprised of EC, MOE, MNR and CO.
- A Roundtable of Project Partners, supported by Subcommittees.

- A process of Aboriginal engagement that is advanced by a Blue Ribbon Panel that engages representatives equitably from COO, UOI, AIAI, MNO, Independent First Nations, NAN and Grand Council Treaty 3.
- A bottom up process that advances local empowerment and community engagement, coordinated through the Conservation Authorities where they exist and in Northern Ontario through MNR, and the Lakehead and SSM CA.

The process acknowledges the excellent collaboration and partnership work that has been advanced across the Great Lakes Basin by community organizations and Conservation Authorities. The model that is being proposed promotes local participation and shared ownership.

If one compares the proposed governance model with the current management structure, there is an important integration and alignment that will occur through Environment Canada to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and through MOE and MNR to the Canada Ontario Agreement.