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**Introduction**

The following guide highlights several articles considered by the Assembly of First Nations in the creation of its 2010-11 Co-Management Survey and Co-Management Discussion Paper. This guide briefly summarizes several different interpretations of the term “co-management” as presented by academics and the Government of Canada. The definitions presented within do not represent any views or positions advanced by the Assembly of First Nations and are meant for discussion purposes only. Citations have been provided along with a list of suggested readings in order to further conversations regarding co-management between the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Assembly of First Nations.

**Term:** Community-Based Management

**Definition:** “…involves the people living closest to the resource in the design, implementation, and monitoring of management measures” (p. 80)

**Summary:** [FROM ABSTRACT] The purpose of this paper is discuss the role of government, primarily national government, in fisheries co-management. This paper investigates the critical role of decentralization in a strategy of co-management using a number of international cases. The experiences of co-management and decentralization provide for a number of policy implications to be drawn concerning the role of government. Pomeroy and Berkes suggest that co-management in Canada works on a “devolution” model between government and First Nations, primarily because land claims and treaties provide legally defined relationships between the two parties. The authors state that co-management regimes must be taken on a case-by-case basis.

**Term:** Community-Based Costal Resource Management (CBCRM)

**Definition:** “…“the sharing of responsibility and authority between the government and the community of local fishers to manage a fishery”

**Summary:** [FROM ABSTRACT] The purpose of this paper is discuss the role of government, primarily national government, in fisheries co-management. This paper investigates the critical role of decentralization in a strategy of co-management using a number of international cases. The experiences of co-management and decentralization provide for a number of policy implications to be drawn concerning the role of government. Pomeroy and Berkes suggest that co-management in Canada works on a “devolution” model between government and First Nations, primarily because land claims and treaties provide legally defined relationships between the two parties. The authors state that co-management regimes must be taken on a case-by-case basis.

**Co-Management Model:**

The level of co-management depends on the ability for a community to control its own resources, the degree possible within the legal system, the ability for fishers to coordinate and organize. Co-mgmt assumes an equal access to information, with community having traditional knowledge and government having access to academic knowledge. For a co-management regime to be successful, government must have a legal regime in place for support. In Canada, true co-management can only exist between government and First Nations because land claim agreements provide legally defined rights. Government must allow fisher groups to freely meet and organize and government must recognize legitimacy of community decisions. Co-management democratizes and empowers.

*Legal* – legal rights and authorities for devolution, authority legally delegated to communities

*Joint-action community/government at local level* – data gathering, logistical decisions (e.g., who can harvest/where), allocation decisions, protection of resources from environmental damage, enforcement, enhancement of long-term planning, more inclusion in decision making. (Pinkerton, 1989)
### Degree of Decentralization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Control</th>
<th>Degree of Decentralization</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deconcentration</td>
<td>Internal Policy Based</td>
<td>Power/authority is transferred from a central national authority to regional, district and field offices of the same national authority. Also known as administrative decentralization.</td>
<td>Magnuson Act (U.S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Policy Based</td>
<td>Some authority is passed to local officials but the central national authority retains the right to overturn local decisions and can reclaim power at any time</td>
<td>Lake Cariba/CAMPFIRE (Zimbabwe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devolution</td>
<td>Legal Based</td>
<td>Power and responsibility for specified functions is transferred to the local level without reference back to the national authority. The transfer is legislative, not policy, and is done geographically instead of sectoral.</td>
<td>James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inuvialuit Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nunavut Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privatization</td>
<td>Policy Based</td>
<td>Responsibility for some government functions are transferred to NGO, voluntary organizations, community organizations, or private companies.</td>
<td>Bangladesh and Dutch ITQ systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Studies Listing:
- Magnuson Act
- Lake Cariba
- CAMPFIRE
- Atlantic Canada
- Advisory Model
- James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement
- Inuvialuit Final Agreement
- Nunavut Agreement
- Dutch ITQ System
- Bangladesh ITQ System

**Quote:** The decision on what fisheries management functions should be handled at which level are best handled jointly by local-level organizations and national government fisheries agencies, and they will be location specific. The decision will be based on the capabilities of local-level organizations to handle certain management functions and the locus of user participation. (478)

**Term:** Co-management

**Definition:** “This relationship involves a change from a system of centralized authority and top-down decisions, to a system which integrates local and state level management in arrangements of shared authority, or at least shared decision-making”

**Summary:** Rusnak provides an overview of co-management regimes in Canada, touching on the concept of co-management, examples, specific agreements, participation, information and analysis, and decision making structures. Rusnak argues that “the history of political and legal struggles for Aboriginal title and land claims” (4) is a large part for current co-management regimes, and that power sharing structures are usually borne out of crisis resulting in unclear/overlapping jurisdiction or resource conflict stemming from depletion.

**Co-Management Model:** Rusnak provides no single model ideal but touches on aspects that may be included in a regime, including:

- ATK use/collection/authorization
- Co-management boards
- Quota restrictions
- Quota allocations
- Designing, administering, monitoring research programs
- Regulating commercial activities
- Enforcing regulations
- Legislation/policy analysis/recommendations
- Developing/implementing conservation plans
- Assessing resource development proposals
- Cooperating with other co-management bodies
- Consulting with community and harvester information
- Responding to requests for information/research/action
- Socioeconomic development programs
- Income security
- Mandatory impact assessments
- Royalties
- Compensation
- Joint coordinating committees
- Equally-shared decision making authority
- Authority to make recommendations for action
**Case Study Listing:** James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, Inuvialuit Final Agreement, Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, Gwich’in and Dene Sahtu Nations, Barrier Lake Trilateral Agreement, Beverly-Qaminirjuaq Caribou Management Board

**Quote:** “Co-management is an ideal management system which does not actually exist in practice but is aspired to and incrementally approached.” (3)

“While co-management arrangements offer potential to improve the participation of indigenous peoples in resource management, they run the risk of having little impact on the tradition of top-down state management since many of their decisions are merely passed on to government ministers as recommendations” (21)
6) Government of Canada Definitions

*Department of Fisheries and Oceans*


“Co-management is a process that brings together local hunters and fishermen, government agencies and public management boards to share management responsibility for fishery resources.” (Fresh Water Institute Factsheet #5: Co-Management of Fisheries Resources, 2001)

“Cooperative management, joint management, and collaborative management are all terms synonymous with co-management. These terms are used to define an institutional arrangement in which responsibility for resource management, conservation, and/or economic development is shared between governments and user groups; management systems in which users and other interests take an active part in designing, implementing, and enforcing management regulations; a sharing of decision making between government agencies and community-based stakeholders; management decisions (policy) based on shared information, on consultation with stakeholders, and on their participation: the integration of local-level and state-level systems; and/or institutional arrangements in which governments and other parties, such as Aboriginal entities, local community groups, or industry sectors enter into formal agreements specifying their respective rights, powers, and obligations with reference to, for example, environmental conservation and resource development” Canada’s Oceans Strategy (2002), referencing the definition reached at the 1998 National Round Table on Environment and the Economy (Sustainable Strategies for Oceans: A Co-Management Guide, 1998 NRTEE Ottawa).

*Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1997)*

“Co-management has come to mean institutional arrangements whereby governments and Aboriginal entities (and sometimes other parties) enter into formal agreements specifying their respective rights, powers and obligations with reference to the management and allocation of resources in a particular area of crown lands and waters.”
Suggested Readings:


