

OAAPH [known as the National Aboriginal Health Organization (NAHO)] receives funding from Health Canada to assist it to undertake knowledge-based activities, including education, research and dissemination of information to promote health issues affecting Aboriginal Peoples. However, the contents and conclusions of this report are solely that of the authors and are not attributable, in whole or in part, to Health Canada. Copies of this report may be obtained by contacting:

National Aboriginal Health Organization
220 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1200
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5Z9
Phone: (613) 237-9462
Toll-free: 1-877-602-4445
Fax: (613) 237-1810
Email: info@naho.ca
Website: www.naho.ca

ISBN 978-1-926543-07-9

(National Aboriginal Health Organization. PRINT)

© 2008 NAHO/ONSA Final Report Roundtable Discussion Exploring Community-Based Responses to Resource Extractive Development in Northern Canada

Under Section 35 of the Canadian Constitution Act, 1982, the term Aboriginal Peoples refers to First Nations, Inuit and Métis people living in Canada. However, common use of the term is not always inclusive of all three distinct people and much of the available research only focuses on particular segments of the Aboriginal population. NAHO makes every effort to ensure the term is used appropriately.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. PROCEEDINGS	6
2.1. DAY ONE.....	6
Opening.....	6
Presentations.....	7
2.2. DAY TWO	12
2.3. DAY THREE	17
Priority Issues.....	17
What Does a Healthy Community Look Like?	18
What We Need To Get There?	19
3. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS	22
4. APPENDICES	24
4.1. APPENDIX A – AGENDA	24
4.2. APPENDIX B – NOTES FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS ..	26
Social	26
Political.....	28
Cultural	32
Economic	34
4.3. APPENDIX C – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	40

1. INTRODUCTION

A roundtable discussion entitled *Exploring Community-Based Responses to Resource Extractive Development in Northern Canada* was organized by the National Aboriginal Health Organization (NAHO), and held in Ottawa March 5 through 7, 2008. The roundtable brought together representatives of First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities and organizations to discuss the broad health and well being impacts of resource extractive development projects (i.e oil and gas, mining) on Aboriginal people, their territories and their communities.

More specifically, the goals for the roundtable were twofold:

- To bring together representatives from First Nations, Inuit and Métis and community-based organizations, public health, social service agencies, and researchers to highlight the opportunities and challenges presented by resource extractive development in northern Canada, with a specific focus on the impacts to the health and well-being of individuals, families and communities, and identify strategies to enhance the opportunities and minimize the challenges presented by development.
- To hold an initial dialogue to develop a comprehensive follow-up plan with identified benchmarks for long-term monitoring that will be supported by Aboriginal stakeholders and supporters.

NAHO views the three-day roundtable as the preliminary step to developing a longer-term agenda. The hope was that the participants would identify means through which a network could be established where future work, ideas and suggestions could be shared.

This report represents a summary of the discussions over the three days. The report is structured to reflect the agenda. For some of the detailed, small-group discussions on Day Two (explained further below), detailed notes from the conversations are included in Appendix B to the report in an “as-said” format as to provide a record for future reference.

The remainder of this report provides an overview of what was addressed over the three days of discussions, as well as what specific tasks were identified by the participants themselves for next steps.

CONTEXT FOR THE ROUNDTABLE

Factors contributing to the fragile social landscape of First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities in northern Canada are complex and intersect with historical and contemporary challenges. The recent increase in non-renewable resource extraction activities on or near Aboriginal lands can facilitate both opportunities and challenges to community vitality. These competing outcomes are not easily reconciled, yet all sectors—Aboriginal organizations, government, industry, and analysts—predict continued growth of these industries into the foreseeable future.

In 2006, the Ajunginiq (Inuit) Centre at NAHO completed the paper *Resource extraction and Well-being in Canada’s North: A scan of the unique challenges of development in Inuit communities*. This paper identifies the potential impacts, both positive and negative, of resource extraction development on Inuit communities.

In 2007, the National Aboriginal Health Organization conducted a literature review focused on community-based mitigation strategies developed by First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities in response to the health-related challenges presented by the resource extractive development. There was scant literature on mitigation strategies in Aboriginal communities. This gap generated a desire to facilitate a preliminary dialogue with several key Aboriginal organizations in northern Canada.

It is within this context that NAHO organized this initial discussion on the opportunities and challenges to health and well-being as presented by resource extraction on First Nations, Inuit and Métis.

METHODOLOGY

Five issue papers introduced the participants to the potential health and well-being impacts of the resource extractive development based on patterns evidenced in current literature. The issue papers framed the roundtable discussions. They are arranged under the following themes: cultural impacts (traditional knowledge, access to land and resources); political impacts (resource governance, decision making); economic impacts (revenue sharing, community development funds, employment/training); and social impacts (family and community cohesion, sexual health, crime). A fifth issue paper on gender acts as a cross cutting theme to differentiate the impacts on men/women/boys/girls.

The five issue papers were sent to roundtable participants for review prior to the roundtable. The issue papers are not intended to be exhaustive; three-to-five pages in length and capture the important characteristics of development impacts, provide a definition of terms, and define the scope of the discussion. The issue papers provide context and posed preliminary questions for discussion at the meeting.

HEALTH IN AN ABORIGINAL CONTEXT

- A traditional Aboriginal concept of health incorporates the mental, physical, spiritual, emotional, and social aspects of health.
- The health and well-being of individuals and communities are interdependent and equally important.

NAHO recognizes that the social determinants of health contribute to the overall health status of First Nations, Inuit and Métis individuals, families and communities. The social determinants of health include: income and social status, social environment, genetic endowment, physical environment, healthy child development, personal health practices and coping skills, employment and working conditions, gender, social support network, culture, education, and access to health services. The social determinants of health must be viewed as interactive and complementary with a comprehensive influence on health and well-being.

Additionally, NAHO has identified a group of broader determinants specific to the Aboriginal population in Canada, which include: colonization, globalization, migration, territory, cultural continuity, access, poverty and self-determination. Woven together, these broader determinants are an important lens to observe and understand the health status of First Nations, Inuit and Métis in Canada.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE

The **National Aboriginal Health Organization** (NAHO) is an Aboriginal-designed and -controlled body committed to influencing and advancing the health and well-being of Aboriginal Peoples by carrying out knowledge-based strategies.

Incorporated in 2000, NAHO is a unique not-for-profit organization founded upon, and committed to, unity, while respecting diversity. With Aboriginal communities as its primary focus, NAHO gathers, creates, interprets, disseminates, and uses both traditional Aboriginal and contemporary western healing and wellness approaches. At all times, the organization reflects the values and principles contained in traditional knowledge and traditional knowledge practices.

NAHO's work is guided by five main objectives:

- To improve and promote Aboriginal health through knowledge-based activities.
- To promote an understanding of the health issues affecting Aboriginal Peoples.
- To facilitate and promote research on Aboriginal health and develop research partnerships.
- To foster the participation of Aboriginal Peoples in delivery of health care.
- To affirm and protect Aboriginal traditional healing practices.

CONTRIBUTORS

NAHO gratefully acknowledges the support of the following government departments, agencies and supporters for their financial contribution to the roundtable:

Northern Region (Health Canada)
Institute of Aboriginal Peoples Health (Canadian Institutes of Health Research)
International Development Research Centre
Aboriginal Affairs Directorate, Human Resource Social Development Canada
Public Service Alliance of Canada
Steelworkers Humanity Fund

2. PROCEEDINGS

2.1. DAY ONE

Opening

The roundtable began with an opening prayer by Inuit Elder Johanes Lampe, followed by opening comments from NAHO CEO Dr. Paulette Tremblay. Dr. Tremblay welcomed the participants, and provided an overview of some of the recent changes made at NAHO and its priorities for the short to medium-term, before wishing the participants well in their deliberations.

Following a brief presentation on the overall objectives of the roundtable and the agenda (see previous section), the participants were asked what they hoped to get from the roundtable. Their responses included to:

- “Get perspectives.”
- Hear more about the issues, particularly those in other communities.
- Learn more about healthy development.
- Hear about what’s happening.
- Collaborate more in order to move the work forward.
- Learn how you identify/deal with human rights issues.
- “Inform my work.”
- Bring information “back home.”
- Make new contacts.
- Learn more about “the other side.”
- Expand knowledge.
- Find out “where I can help?”
- Learn more about the community perspective.
- “Take information back home.”
- Learn.

These objectives were referred to as the group proceeded through the three days. Some adjustments were made to the specific agenda, particularly for Day Three, but the overall approach of moving from a broad discussion framed by five thematic issues towards the development of a more specific strategy and next steps was retained.

Inuit Elder Susana Singoorie was originally scheduled to provide an opening prayer. Although a storm delayed her arrival, she was able to offer words of encouragement and an additional prayer to the roundtable participants.

Presentations

The first day witnessed presentations from representatives of four organizations:

- NorthernWomen in Mining, Oil and Gas (NWMOG).
- Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada, Sexual Health Unit.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association.
- North-South Institute.

Northern Women in Mining, Oil and Gas (NWMOG)

Annemieke Mulders, project coordinator at the Status of Women Council of the North West Territories gave a presentation on the *NorthernWomen in Mining, Oil and Gas* (NWMOG). This research project, developed by the Status of Women Council of the Northwest Territories, (NWT) offers northern women a unique opportunity to enter nontraditional trades in the construction, mining, oil and gas industries.

The value of the oil and gas industry in the Northwest Territories is sky-rocketing. It is now valued at almost \$2.5 billion, and has moved from approximately 25 per cent to almost 50 per cent of the NWT's GDP. Yet, only three per cent of all of the apprentices in the NWT across all sectors are women.

The research question guiding this project is as follows:

Given the current population of unemployed and underemployed women in the NWT; will a dedicated, women-only, partnership-based and strategic approach to training and development be successful in increasing the interest level, participation and retention rates of women in industrial and trades based occupations in the northern mining and oil and gas industries?

The presentation outlined some recent successes, including the recent “exposure” courses and the offering of the Building Trades Helper program.

Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada Sexual Health Unit

Jeanette Doucet, Manager, Sexual Health Policy and Programs presented recent work Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada have done in the area of impacts of resource extractive activities on health.

In March 2007, Pauktuutit's sexual health unit sought direction from its Board of Directors to focus more of its efforts in the area of resource extraction and its social and health implications for Inuit communities. Pauktuutit aims to support communities in preparation for some of the challenges they may face in a number of areas, such as:

- Women bear the brunt of the negative impacts of development, including: increased violence, unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted infection.
- Prostitution catering to miners can elevate already high rates of STIs and increase the prevalence of HIV/AIDS in the North.
- There is an 'ethic of exploitation' of women, resulting in increased levels of sexually transmitted infections and unwanted pregnancies.
- Norms around sexuality and Inuit are consistent with the general community, but sex is not a topic that is easy to discuss. A framework for dialogue can help to transmit effective information.

Pauktuutit hosted a conference, entitled Sexual Health is Everyone's Responsibility, in Inuvik, NWT from February 12 to 14, 2008. Eighty participants spent three days in discussion and skills-building opportunities for community front-line workers. The conference showed that sexual health is a concern for Inuit, specifically within the context of resource extraction. Pauktuutit hopes that the event will send the signal to decision-makers across the North and beyond to include sexual health considerations in any resource extraction mitigation strategy.

National Aboriginal Forestry Association

Harry Bombay, Executive Director of the National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA), presented to the roundtable participants. After providing an overview of NAFA's role and mandate, the presentation outlined some areas of opportunity in the forest industry for Aboriginal people. These include:

- Primary processing of commodity wood products, high value specialty wood and engineered wood products.
- Secondary and value-added wood processing diversified to include the manufacturing of finished products.

- Non-timber forest products including the harvesting, processing and marketing of wild foods, medicinal plants, botanicals, landscaping and home decor products, etc.
- Forest bio-products development including food, fibre, heat, power, pharmaceuticals and carbon-based fuels, oils, and chemicals.
- Plantation management and agro-forestry.
- The development of new approaches to partnerships and resource co-management with the established forest industry and new businesses in the emerging sub-sectors.
- Forest management services including data collection and management, silviculture and restoration, GIS and planning support, auditing and field surveys, fire protection, road maintenance, etc.
- Parks and protected areas, and other forest conservation initiatives; management and services.
- Ecosystem/ecological/environmental services including forest carbon storage and sequestration and offset trading, watershed and forest hydrology management, biodiversity preservation and wildlife management.
- Nature based tourism, recreation and other non-consumptive forest use activities.

Nevertheless, Aboriginal individuals and communities face a number of important challenges which limit their ability to take advantage of some of these opportunities, such as:

- Forest policy is generally an area of provincial jurisdiction, so it is necessary to take the province's views into account.
- The role of Indigenous knowledge needs to be defined.
- Institutional arrangements and appropriate tenure arrangements need to be developed.
- Community capacity-building is required.
- Non-timber values and traditional use need to be fully considered.
- Capital requirements for Aboriginal economic development are a challenge.
- Globalization of world economy will have an impact on relative competitiveness.

North-South Institute

A final presentation was given by Viviane Weitzner, Senior Researcher at the North-South Institute. Through the Institute's work with Indigenous groups in both the Canadian (e.g., Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation in the NWT and the Independent First Nations Alliance in Ontario) and South American (e.g., the Amerindian Peoples Association in Guyana, the Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname, and the National Indigenous Organization of Columbia and the National Afro-Colombian Organization), a number of observations can be made to highlight the complexities and challenges of their work. These include:

- A severe power imbalance exists between Indigenous groups and industry.
- Weak governance, resources and capacities in Aboriginal communities.
- A lack of recognition of Indigenous rights.
- A lack of adequate environmental protection.
- A lack of implementation and enforcement where rights are recognized, and environmental legislation is in place.
- A disconnect between existing corporate policies and practice.
- Challenges with respect to attitudes, timeframes, technical language, etc.

The challenges which face the various actors who are involved in working with these issues are distinct. For partners, these challenges include:

- Political ‘marginalization.’
- For representative organizations:
 - Need to respond to ongoing situations/crises.
 - Research projects get put on hold.
- Lack of ongoing human and financial resources to represent their constituents, let alone embark on research to influence policy and practice:
 - Always in project fundraising mode rather than strategic planning mode.
 - Lack of core funding prevents institutional strengthening.
- Steep learning curves regarding:
 - Extractive industry, international standards, etc.
 - Rights regarding research.
- Technical issues:
 - E.g., working with remote communities who often do not have access to telephone, Internet, electricity, etc.
 - Ensuring appropriate materials are used and produced.
- Not appearing “anti-development” when describing negative impacts.
- Managing expectations.
- High costs of working with remote communities.
- North-South exchanges present a range of distinct challenges:
 - From physical well-being of visitors to large amounts of administration and appropriate briefings and preparation.

The challenges for donors include:

- Lack of awareness regarding issues affecting Indigenous organizations.
- No understanding of the expense of working remotely, and the need for face-to-face meetings.
- Recognizing that impacts may take years to manifest themselves.

For the North-South Institute, the obvious challenges include:

- Constant learning about the nature of the extractives sector.
- Working with Indigenous organizations requires:
 - A long-term commitment.
 - An investment of time (funding does not cover actual time spent on the work).
- A need for clarity regarding roles, responsibilities and expectations:
 - Facilitating and empowering rather than creating dependence.
 - Enabling partners to speak for themselves based on rigorous research.
 - Understanding that you are working yourself out of a job.
- Fostering understanding regarding the importance of working in a North-North context, as well as a North-South context.

This context is not without opportunities. Indigenous-designed, driven and executed research on the extractives industries is critical in order to:

- Pave the way towards self-determination.
- Develop appropriate strategies:
 - Do we negotiate or not?
 - Understanding and monitoring impacts.
 - Understanding community concerns, aspirations and vision for the future.
 - Negotiating content of agreements.
- Network, instill solidarity, share and build on lessons learned.

Following the presentations, time was available for general discussion. Among the reflections made by the participants were the following:

- Exploration is moving too quickly and limits the use of the land under exploration.
- No obligation by the provinces to notify where exploration is taking place. Consultation with communities often takes place after exploration.

- Pre-development sites are not covered by reclamation.
- There is a lack of clear protocols. Who do companies go to? Band Council, Regional Tribal Council. Federal/Provincial/Territorial governments are in discussing devolution. Their roles are still being defined.
- Before development goes forward there should be a process for paced development. For example, Berger in the 1970s said that it takes five years to get ready for development. Presently 70 per cent of the community representatives' time is spent protecting what the community has. The capacity of the community representative is considerably less than the capacity of company human resources. Community representatives end up in negotiation fatigue.
- Economic analysis does not measure the real cost of development or its cumulative effects.
- There needs to be a lasting benefit, not just immediate financial gain. The long-term vision is currently not there.
- Lack of land use planning part of boom and bust cycle threatens food security. The North is vulnerable to supply shortages and food security comes with access to traditional foods. The health of the land affects the health of community members.
- Does Canada really need this level of resource development or is it to feed the US?
- China and India are presently mining and it will be in approximately five years that Canada will see the impact of these activities.

With respect to barriers to employment, the discussion touched on the following points:

- Can't expect people to self-actualize when basic needs such as housing, food and medical are not being met.
- Existing social problems such as addictions are a challenge.
- Racism.
- Lack of training, and appropriate skills.
- Lack of formal education impacts literacy level and ability to access employment opportunities.

2.2. DAY TWO

The second day of the roundtable was organized around four small group discussions. These discussions were held on four themes as they relate to the impacts of resource extractive developments in the North:

- Social.
- Political.
- Cultural.
- Economic.

Concise issue papers were prepared for each theme to frame some of the macro-level issues, pose questions and to trigger discussion. A fifth theme – gender – was considered within each of these discussions; an issue paper on this theme was prepared and presented to participants.

Each small group discussion is generally summarized below. More detailed notes from all four small groups are included in Appendix B to this report.

Social

The participants of this group discussed a range of issues. Below is a general summary of some of the main elements:

- **Existing social problems are barriers to employment** – it is not just about the direct impacts of resource extractive activities on individuals and communities, but it is also about how existing social challenges (addictions, mental health) are making it difficult for many people and their communities to take full advantage of the opportunities these activities offer.
- **Racism and discrimination** – there is still a strong degree of racism and discrimination that make it difficult for First Nations, Inuit and Métis individuals to take advantage of the economic opportunities. For example, the high use of illegal drugs combined with the required drug testing can disqualify people from potential employment opportunities and yet there is no assistance to help ‘get clean’.
- **Quantifying social impacts** – it is a constant challenge determining how to measure the very real social impacts in a manner that will allow the issues to be discussed or monitored. Qualitative research indicates that social impacts include: increases in family violence, gambling, and drug use. In Aboriginal communities, resource extraction does not create social problems; rather, increased revenue can exacerbate existing social frailty.
- **Impacts on family patterns and gender roles** – work in the resource extractive sector has an obvious impact on both family patterns (e.g., shift work and access to daycare) and gender roles (e.g., men are away at camp leaving women to assume non-traditional roles such as dual parenting).
- **The need to deal with issues holistically** – breaking off one piece of the puzzle, such as the social impacts, is inadequate for the needs of Aboriginal communities. Issues need to be dealt with holistically in order to mitigate the challenges and focus on obtaining the maximum benefit from resource extractive development.
- **Need for specific and community based research** – much still needs to be known regarding the comprehensive impacts of resource extraction, and research is required that is tailored to the unique needs of First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities.

- **Programs to deal with massive migration** – communities near resource extractive activities can expect massive in-migration with the growth of development projects in the North. Attention to creating specific programs, services and other supports that will be required to deal with a rapid and large influx of people will facilitate a more efficient transition.
- **Food security** – access to quality food, including healthy country food, in sufficient quantities to support a community must be a paramount concern throughout all phases of resource extractive activities. “When you involve the Elders in any process, the first thing they think of is food sources and how to feed their people into the next generation.”
- **Long-range planning** – detailed and well-researched planning needs to be done at the community level to allow First Nations, Inuit and Métis to better prepare for the long term effects of resource extractive activities, including planning which prepares communities for the post-boom or bust period.

Political

The political discussion group debated a wide range of issues corresponding to the political considerations of resource development. Below are some of the principle elements:

- **Consultation fatigue** – there have been many projects and consultations: some communities are simply tired of participating in consultations making it hard to engage the public on issues that will affect individuals, families and entire communities.
- **Scope of proposed activities** – there are multiple resource extractive projects proposed across the provincial and territorial North. It was asked if communities really grasp just how much development is being talked about and the extent of the impacts of these activities on the future.
- **Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development mandate** – it was suggested that, in the current context, there appears to be a conflict between the Northern Development aspect of the mandate of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, which is focussed on promoting industry and economic development, and the “Indian Affairs” mandate, which is supposed to be about doing what is in the best interests of Aboriginal people.
- **Confidentiality clauses hinder an ability to learn** – a great deal of discussion surrounded the challenges presented by the requirement of industry that the provisions of Impact Benefit Agreements (IBAs) be kept confidential. This impedes the ability of communities facing similar challenges to learn from what other communities were able to achieve in their negotiations with industry, a measure which only benefits industry.
- **Need for a strong community voice** – time was spent discussing the need for a strong community voice throughout all phases of planning and development of extractive activities, and the need for mechanisms to represent the interests of individuals and the community as a whole.

- **Need to see Aboriginal governments as governments** – a point was made that we are still referring to Aboriginal governments as groups. We need to recognize that many of these “groups” are in fact duly elected Aboriginal governments, many with their own self-government arrangements and law-making powers. We need to respect these institutions to the same degree as we do other governments, or industry.
- **Need for a long-term vision** – as in the social discussion, it was stressed that there is a tremendous need for a long-term vision when it comes to planning for challenges and opportunities presented by resource extractive activities and look beyond the potential for short-term gains.

Cultural

The cultural discussion covered many of the same elements as the other small group discussions, but from its own perspective. Below are some of the main elements:

- **What is culture?** It was asked on more than one occasion what culture really means. Is it traditional baskets and bead blankets? Or is it an evolving process which reflects how people are living today. The perspective one has on this question may play a role in how they see the options and challenges with respect to resource extractive activities.
- **Connectedness to the land** – there was no denying, however, that a significant facet common to all Aboriginal cultures is the connectedness to the land. Land is life. This must be remembered in the context of any industrial activity on Aboriginal lands.
- **Traditional knowledge** – as a result, it was stated that traditional knowledge held by Aboriginal people needs to be given the same importance as other scientific knowledge in the context of research relating to proposed projects. It was mentioned that recent court decisions have started to recognize the weight of traditional knowledge.
- **Role for Elders** – Elders have diverse knowledge and experiences and they should be included as much as possible in the planning process of development projects. It was said that many Elders want to do more than simply doing opening prayers at meetings, but rather, to be engaged in dialogue and debate.
- **Need for informal networks to share and learn** – it was stated that there is a need to learn from each other, from other communities in different parts of the country who have experienced similar threats to cultural continuity in their territories. There is much we can learn from each other about specific examples of practices aimed at cultural reclamation.

Economic

The fourth small group discussion focussed on economic impacts of resource extractive activities. Below are some of the main elements:

- **Need for land use planning** – almost unanimously, the participants of this group agreed that the current land use planning processes in their communities are insufficient. Better land use planning that is long-term and holistic is required if the effects of resource extractive developments are to be mitigated.
- **Cumulative impacts** – similarly, it is important to look at the big picture. While one project may not have a significant impact to the land or the community, a number of such projects in a general area could have a profound impact on the lives of surrounding communities. Cumulative impacts need to be considered and responded to with strong alternatives.
- **Unresolved land claims** – the current status of land claims in Canada is undermining the ability of Aboriginal communities to participate fully in economic development initiatives in the resource sector, as well as other sectors.
- **Communications** – better communications are required between communities and industry, between community and government, between communities, industry and government together, as well as between communities who are facing similar challenges. “We need to learn from each other.”
- **Division/jealousy between regions/communities** – it was pointed out that access to the economic opportunities associated with resource extractive activities may lead to rivalries, divisions or jealousies between communities and/or regions. This could cause political problems, and may require extra consideration of redistributive programs and institutions.
- **Women are not full participants** – it was highlighted on a number of occasions that the economic opportunities associated with resource extractive activities are not fully shared with women. The nature of the work in these activities remain male-dominated and extensive training of women, and other supports, are required to help to create a more balanced employment picture.
- **You don’t always know what you’re getting into!** – it was stated how difficult it is to enter into Impact Benefit Agreement negotiations when most communities have very little information and expertise available to them. This relates both to information regarding the scope and magnitude of the development and impacts that can be expected from proposed activities, as well as to what has been learned by other communities. The latter is made even more difficult because of the confidentiality requirements imposed on most Impact and Benefit Agreements.

2.3. DAY THREE

The third day of the roundtable was devoted to bringing the discussion of the previous two days to a common point, to clarify what the major issues are and to develop the process through which the participants can work together to help alleviate some of these challenges while maximizing opportunities.

The approach taken to structure this discussion was to first identify the priority issues based on the discussions in the small groups on the second day. Then, the groups worked to visualize what a healthy community would look like, one which has successfully navigated the challenges presented by resource extractive activities nearby, and has been able to leverage the opportunities they present. Then, the group identified some of the specific things that would be required to help bridge the gap between the known issues and the vision.

Priority Issues

The main issues identified by the participants were summarized as follows:

- **Our economy is based on today** – we need to take a longer-term view of our economies, and consider the impacts on our “capital”: our people, our families, our traditions, our cultures, our lands.
- **Impacts on women** – not enough attention is paid to the social, economic, cultural and political impacts of resource extractive activities on Indigenous women in communities, both in terms of specific projects, and the cumulative impacts over time.
- **Self-determination** – a key to preparing for the challenges presented by resource extractive activities, as well as many other challenges, is self-determination. Each community and each region is unique. The people who live in each community and each region are best situated to determine what issues need to be addressed and how.
- **Aboriginal rights, impact on human rights** – the impacts of resource extractive developments have an impact on Aboriginal rights, as well as on fundamental human rights that should be monitored.
- **Treaty rights** – similarly, the treaty rights of First Nations with activities proposed on their lands need to be respected and protected.
- **Impact Benefit Agreements** – the approach taken in negotiating IBAs, and the specific options open to individual communities who are negotiating IBAs are an issue, and a challenge.
- **Wildlife/refuges** – the impact of resource extractive developments on the wildlife, even those within protected areas, is an issue of critical importance to Aboriginal communities.
- **Training/capacity/education** – education is critical to preparing individuals and communities to adapt to opportunities and challenges, ranging from general education to specific technical training in the trades to the development of capacity within organizations and businesses.

- **Role for Aboriginal Human Resource Development Agreements** – there is a greater role that can be played by the AHRDAs in helping to prepare more Aboriginal people for meaningful positions in resource extractive projects, and in working with employers to better connect them with Aboriginal workers.
- **Voice for Aboriginal interests** – generally, there needs to be a better voice at the table for First Nations, Inuit and Métis interests when issues relating to resource extraction development are being discussed.

What Does a Healthy Community Look Like?

The group tried to visualize a healthy community; one which has successfully navigated the challenges presented by resource extractive activities nearby, and has been able to leverage the opportunities they present. In this context, a healthy community would:

- Be unique!
- Have well-developed links to their traditional forms of governance, adapted to the needs of the current environment.
- Enjoy a strong degree of community cohesion.
- Be given an adequate opportunity to plan for change.
- Have adequate resources and supports to plan effectively.
- Enjoy sustained community development, beyond the specific project-by-project approach which would help individuals develop a sense of:
 - knowing where they come from (e.g., values, spirituality, etc.).
 - where we are going (e.g., identity, leadership).
- Be assertive and proud.
- Be well-informed.
- Be passionate about themselves and their future.
- Have full, true community participation at all stages in the process.
- Share the benefits of opportunities across all segments of the population (e.g., across ages, genders, socio-economic status, etc).
- Be made up of healthy families.
- Be made up of healthy individuals.
- Make the commitment!

What We Need To Get There?

Finally, the group was asked to identify what they felt was needed to begin to bridge the gap between the vision articulated in the previous discussion and the current challenges and issues. Thoughts included:

- Equal power for men and women.
- Meaningful “buy-in” from the leadership.
- Greater input and involvement from Elders.
- An education system that the community can embrace (and not just based on the standard school-model).

More specifically, the participants felt that the following tools are required:

- **“Power” tools** – those that give people and their communities the tools they need to participate fully in all processes to make informed decisions, and to articulate their needs and interests. An example might be the campaign schools offered by the Status of Women Council of the NWT to women who are considering running for public office.
- **Community-based research** – support to community-based research was identified as another critical tool. More specifically, research is required on issues relating to:
 - Health (as defined by an Aboriginal lens).
 - Food insecurity.
 - Land use plans.
 - Wildlife populations.
 - Situational analysis.

The role of NAHO in supporting community-based research was discussed as well, and is summarized below.

- **Support groups** – individuals and their families still need healing from their pasts, such as those dealing with the impacts of residential schools, family violence, addictions, etc. Assisting people to become stronger individuals will better prepare them to deal with the impacts anticipated as a result of resource extractive projects.
- **Methods to share information** – communities and their organizations need the channels through which they can share the information they need to advance their interests, both in terms of research, and in terms of their engagement with industry and government (e.g., when negotiating IBAs).

- **Capacity building** – capacity building within communities and organizations working on these issues on their behalf needs to be developed to better articulate their needs and interests. Specifically, capacities need to be developed in the following areas:
 - Working with data.
 - Education of the population on the issues.
 - Culturally and gender-appropriate training.
 - Infrastructure (telephones, housing, etc.).
 - Policing, emergency services.
 - Communications and distribution systems.
- **Basic Needs** – adequate support for basic needs, such as housing and quality food.

The question of who should do what, and the specific roles to be played by various stakeholders was then discussed:

- **Community** – participants felt that the primary role for the communities is to take the initiative, and to begin – in whatever way they can – the work required to put into place appropriate policies and procedures to guide their work, and to ensure proper accountability mechanisms are in place.
- **Governments** – there is a strong role to be played by the federal (including Indian and Northern Affairs), provincial and territorial governments to ensure adequate resources and supports are available for the communities to fulfill their role as regulators.
- **Industry** – there is a role for the resource extractive industry to provide resources – with no strings attached to allow community organizations to participate fully in negotiations, and to “level the playing field” as much as possible.
- **National Aboriginal Organizations** – the primary role for the national Aboriginal organizations is to contribute to Aboriginal-specific strategies, to assist and provide a framework for the work being done at the community level, as well as to engage with industry and governments on issues relating to impacts of development activities near First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities. Participants urged that we use existing resources, such as the mining information bulletin as a source of current information on activities in the mining sector.

- **National Aboriginal Health Organization (NAHO)** – there was considerable discussion of the possible role for NAHO in this regard. The role for NAHO envisioned by the participants included supporting communities in their community-based research, building local research capacities, and assisting with the identification of research requirements. A particular focus was placed on community-based research:
 - A “research technical assistance” service was discussed, where answers to specific research problems could be “just a phone call away,” modeled on similar services currently available in other contexts.
 - Supports/tools to assist with proposal writing.
 - Assistance in making access to research funding money easier and more flexible.
 - Advocacy on behalf of communities with respect to appropriate research funding arrangements.
 - A database of existing Impact Benefit Agreements from Canada and around the world which could be drawn upon as models for communities entering into negotiations.
 - Information bulletins.
 - Contact/network lists.
 - A “who’s doing what?” scan of Aboriginal specific initiatives in resource extractive development activities such as: research and special initiatives such as the Assembly of First Nations/Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada MOU .
 - Advice and support on how to monitor the impacts from resource extractive activities.
 - A northern portal through which relevant information could be easily accessed and shared.

3. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

The next step for this dialogue, following the finalization and distribution of the facilitator’s report, is to begin work on specific themes. This includes meeting again, moving from the broad to the specific, and bringing in the expertise required to explore more technical and detailed knowledge in the areas of:

- Land use planning.
- Community based research needs.
- Implementation of IBAs.

While the participants of this roundtable all expressed a desire to meet again, and to establish more permanent modes of communication between meetings, it was also suggested that other stakeholders also be brought into the conversation. Other groups with whom a dialogue would be desirable include:

- The various regional Inuit organizations in Nunavut (the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, the Kivalliq Inuit Association, and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association).
- Non-government organizations and research institutes such as Mining Watch Canada.
- The Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC) and other industry-based organizations with a reach to First Nations, Inuit and Métis organizations and communities.
- The Canadian Aboriginal Minerals Association.
- Representatives from relevant Aboriginal governments.
- Generally, a network of those working in social, economic, and environmental assessments.

It was said that it was “nice to have a candid discussion with Aboriginal groups and governments.” Although more engagement with industry and government will be necessary, the sense of the group was that it is important to have opportunities such as that made possible with the roundtable for this kind of dialogue to occur from the community perspective.

The roundtable was closed with a prayer by Inuit elder Johanes Lampe.

4. APPENDICES

4.1. APPENDIX A – AGENDA

Roundtable Discussion Exploring Community-Based Responses to Resource Extractive Development in Northern Canada

Day One **Wednesday, March 5, 2008**

9:45AM

OPENING PRAYER

Welcome by Dr. Paulette Tremblay, Chief Executive Officer, National
Aboriginal Health Organization

Overview of agenda and roundtable process, objectives and goals

10:30

**PRESENTATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL INITIATIVES FOLLOWED BY
QUESTIONS/DISCUSSIONS**

Annemeike Mulders, Project Coordinator, Northern Women in Mining and
Oil and Gas Project, Status of Women's Council of the Northwest Territories
Jeanette Doucet, Manager, Sexual Health Policy and Programs, Pauktuutit
Inuit Women of Canada

LUNCH

1:30

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON NATIONAL INITIATIVES

Harry Bombay, Executive Director, National Aboriginal Forestry Association
Viviane Weitzner, Senior Researcher, North South Institute

BREAK

Presentation on the Highlights of the Issue Papers
Social, Political, Cultural, Economic and Gender
Overview of Day Two

Day Two Thursday, March 6, 2008

BEGIN 8:45 AM

Overview of Day Two structure/activities
Concurrent thematic sessions: Social/Economic
Plenary discussion/key issues

LUNCH

Concurrent thematic sessions: Cultural/Political
Plenary discussion/key issues
Summary of the day and Overview of day three

Day Three Friday, March 7, 2008

8:45AM

Review of key issues/points raised during thematic sessions
Collaborative identification and prioritization of overall key challenges/opportunities,
suggested interventions, and next steps

BREAK

Discussion and strategizing re-establishing a communication network for sharing
experiences/expertise

LUNCH

Brief discussion of structure for the follow-up activities and final report
Roundtable evaluation
Closing remarks and prayers

4.2. APPENDIX B – NOTES FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

This section of the report includes the notes taken from each of the four small group discussions held on Day Two. Very little editing was done to these notes, as the goal was to provide a direct record of the conversations had by the participants.

Social

Observations

- Mackenzie Gas Pipeline:
 - contributing to addictions.
 - need funding for mental health issues.
- Yukon Mental Health:
 - Residential Schools.
 - Intergenerational impacts.
- Barriers to employment:
 - Drug testing – need to address drug issues before people get employed.
 - Addictions are a symptom of larger issues (e.g., self-esteem/oppression).
 - Causing some people to move toward harder drugs (to avoid detection in testing).
 - There is still systemic racism in the industry, and these tests are being used to phase out the Aboriginal workers.
- Challenges:
 - How does your socio-economic factors affect monitoring – lifestyle/values?
 - How do you quantify those changes?
 - Economics usually trump social issues.
- Funds come from industry/governments.
- Environmental Impact Assessments should prepare Aboriginal people.
- How do we make decisions?
 - Involve Elders – food security/lands for future generations – environment considerations (fish, caribou, salmon, moose).
- Climate change/environmental degradation:
 - Has an impact on access to healthy/low cost, country food, longevity of people in arctic.
 - Need for food strategies, more support to research is required.
- Land claims – driven by social issues: governance, education, jobs, children.
 - But they can be undermined.

- Governments have money; more cash is required to change the community vision.
 - A terrible social landscape. The existing social landscape exacerbates the social issues – addictions/suicide etc.
- No one is addressing the “root” issues, social programs not working.
- Excess money: toys/technology – they take away from the present.
- Culture is what happens now!
- Community-based initiatives.
 - Scrap-book project – Yukon.
 - Residential school project/before the RS.
 - Money gone to rejuvenate culture.
 - Best practices.
- Culture as entertainment.

Recommended Solutions

- Mitigation – lessons from the Berger Inquiry.
- Research – services, housing, compensation.
- Developing programs for onslaught of transient people.
- Land use plans at the local level.
- Food planning.
- Training and education to prepare for development.
- A lot of resources go into preparing and it doesn't happen.
- After (post-mines) bust – need to adequately plan in all areas (social, cultural, political, economic, gender).
- Voisey's Bay – money, training/traditional foods/time to hunt, all are included EXCEPT culture.
- Union agreements and government agreements trump IBAs.
- Food and water security strategies/greenhouse.
- Alternative foods.
- Gender – we know that women are at the bottom of society.
- Impact on males too – changing roles.
- Need to engage young men with roles and responsibilities – prevent high risk behaviours (injuries, incarceration, suicide).
- The fundamental traditions of our people – the woman has to be healthiest in all levels – holistic approach.
- Men negotiate, Women implement!
- Health and social issues are viewed as women's issues.
- Leaders also have to fight for the interests of Women.

- Children learn from parents.
- Mine-cycle profoundly affects the community – decisions and participation by those in the community when mine workers are absent does not allow for whole community to participate in daily life.
- Volunteer/community action is not there.
- Unsustainable for a community.
- How do we make peace with that?
- How do we build healthy/happy communities?
- How do we adapt?
- Child discipline – parenting, needs to be discussed in our families/communities because women take on dual roles when their partners work on a mine cycle.

Political

Representatives from the NWT, Nunavut and the Yukon each briefly discussed the political environment in their respective provinces/territories. The following is a summary:

- NWT: Roles and responsibilities of Aboriginal, territorial and federal government are still being negotiated. Roles are not clearly defined and there still exists some struggle for control. This can lead to confusion and contention which makes things difficult (decision making and negotiations) when industry wants to move fast – boom/bust. Communications are not clear or organized.
- Nunavut: Resource development/extraction responsibilities lie primarily with regional community associations. There are three regions; two which are pro development and one (Baffin) which is more conservationist – based lack of resources, etc. Therefore there is some division between regional groups. Environmental issues get some attention – uranium mining, violating game sanctuary lands etc. There appears to be the desire to balance protected areas with the desire to support future development projects. Many of the community members that inhabit smaller communities do not understand the land claim process which impacts their say when negotiating an IBA. Community members are not aware of the impact and power that they could have. Voter turn out is super low and community participation is also low. This impacts the community consultation process. There are many small communities with high rates of unemployment and low political participation. It is difficult to formulate or promote community opinions. Therefore the community consultation is often inadequate and development projects are moving ahead with an incomplete understanding of what the community wants.
- The Yukon has a variety of internal organizational situations and conflicts. The demographics of the North have changed. The Yukon consists of 33,000 non-Aboriginal people and 7,000 Aboriginal Peoples.

Broad Issues:

Community Perception and Awareness

- In many cases people (especially in smaller communities), and community members do not understand the level of development that is being proposed. There is a need for more education projects on land claim information and the impact of resource extraction on the land – including historical and cultural perspectives. Children are the future leaders – they need to access this information.
- It is difficult to encourage communities members to participate in the decision making process – especially when community leaders are not speaking for the people. There is a need to campaign in schools – encourage women to get involved in the political process. Encourage the public to ask candidates about women’s issues in the North.
- There is a hidden division between traditional ways and non-traditional ways driven by money. Communities are losing good people to industry. There is a need to plan to keep community leaders in the community to support the health and well being of our communities. Currently, many of the employment opportunities do not offer a pension, benefits, etc.
- There are also instances where there is too much consultation within a given community which leads to fatigue, disinterest or feelings of being overwhelmed by process.
- Some participants felt that it would be beneficial to take training out of the hands of industry and place this responsibility/opportunity back into the community or other organizations that do not have stakes in the money making process i.e. Status of Women.
- When an exploration project begins – community expectations are high and mining communities encourage the hype around job creation, etc. Federal and provincial governments contribute to this through political messaging. When it is determined that development cannot occur there exists a fall out in the community. Participants felt that communities need to be brought up to speed –and prepared for the fall out and disappointment. There needs to be more discussion and education regarding the realities of a boom/bust industry – how this will impact the lives of the community – impact of promises broken. For example; you can access these opportunities only IF you get six months training and are willing to spend time away from your family and community. And then MAYBE you can access an entry level position. This message is more accurate compared to the message that because you are Inuit, you can get this job. This is often communicated as the only pre-requisite.
- Participants agreed that there is a need to communicate the issues in plain/culturally meaningful language in order for community members to make informed decisions. Especially in cases where the political environment of a province/territory/community is still in flux i.e. settled and unsettled land claims. Specifically, there needs to be more education regarding the history of land claims and how land claim agreements impacts their communities. In Nunavut – there is an established process – however people – community members are not informed and do not know their options.

- Arctic environment is dying: we need to involve all parties – Chief and band council, regional and federal governments. Leaders are speaking for industry without considering the long term impacts. There is a need for more research.
- There was much discussion about the Berger Inquiry and the importance of examining this pre-existing document as a model. Place it back into curriculum. It cannot be shelved.
- NWT: Ownership and control over education. Methods of research more culturally appropriate – students are being grossly underserved. Federal government gets royalties.

Food Security and Preservation and Protection of the Land

- Participants felt that food security is a huge issue. The North is running out of land. There is a need for indigenous research and capacity building when determining when, how and if more development should occur in the North. Involve the federal government and implement CEIA.
- Pace setting was an issue discussed at length. There is a need to slow down the pace of development happening in the North – it is happening too fast. Government and industry want to go fast – to make more money all at once. There is a need for one voice with community and regional participation – to enforce the need to slow and set the pace development.
- Participants felt there should be community sustainability plans in place before development occurs – and more specifically sustainability plans that addresses food and water issues.
- Funding was also discussed. It was stated that there is a need to prioritize to better suit the needs of people by diverting funds back into the community by provincial and territorial commitments. Funding is allocated for based on status Indians and non-status Indians not considered.

IBAs and the Federal Government

- As long as the federal government receives royalties – they will continue to push development even if it is not in the best interest of people living in the North.
- There is a conflict of interest in regards to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development dual responsibilities; Indian affairs and development in the North (cannot be mandated to do both).
- Union Agreements versus IBA: Union officials interpret IBAs as confidential whereas union documents are public and therefore more easily implemented. The union agreement holds more weight and therefore the conditions of an IBA are not always completely enforceable.
- There still remains some question regarding the definition of Indian/Aboriginal. Their focus is development – environmental and social issues do not receive a lot if any attention.
- Federal government decides how and who should work together – it is important to identify who is FN, Inuit and non-status. The federal government decides who sits at the table – lines drawn based on land claims – boundaries a colonial concept. For example: speech from the throne – Harper has plans for the North without consulting people in the North.

- Nunavut: Some government models in place have been able to address some of the issues. There exist negotiating periods for IBA's . The fact that IBA's are confidential make information sharing difficult. Each time an IBA is developed, the community is starting from scratch whereas the system should be strengthened each time by review of important lessons learned and promote promising practices in the realm of Impact and Benefit Agreements.

Socio Political Issues

- When communities are not thriving, it is easy to influence with money. A community cannot thrive unless certain social issues are addressed: addictions, suicide, low graduation rates, FASD etc.
- Consider the impact of globalization and investigate the involvement of other countries.

Participatory/Consensus vs. Electoral/Democratic Models

- Participants felt that decision making must be participatory and not democratic. Leaders are adopting electoral process and leaders are making decisions for and not with the people. This reinforces post colonial structures. People with money have the power to campaign the issues and they do not always take into consideration the interests of the community as a whole.
- There is also a concern that beneficiaries that live outside land claims still have a vote?
- There is a need to provide funding for political campaigns. It is important to examine what we have and what we need. Consider that there may be room to work within the system.
- Land claims may not be the solution (implementation issues and inadequate funding). Participants agreed that communities should increase pressure on government – a move towards self determination and self-government. There is a need to reinforce terminology that recognizes the political independence of Aboriginal Peoples.

What Do We Do Next?

Participants felt there is a need for more community-based and initiated research in the following areas:

- Health and Social.
- Food Security.
- Climate Change.
- Long term Community Planning and Community Sustainability.
- Including pace setting for development – slow the pace when developing the North.
- Capacity Building – we cannot plan for the future when in survival mode.

What Happens Next?

- Community leaders need to support/educate communities.
- Expectations must be realistic and based on information that is realistic.
- Preparation can begin in schools – education to support expectations example: mining companies will target those with a minimum of a grade 10 education.
- Training programs should not be governed by mining companies – but outside organizations without stakes in mining operations.
- Collective review and discuss regarding existing IBA – to develop promising practices.
- Collective agreement to not sign confidential IBAs. IBAs should be public.
- Review and audit on existing Canadian owned and operated mining companies.
- Examine the impact of globalization and the role of the U.S.
- Examine the impact of graduation rates, suicide and FASD. Develop a long term plan.
- Examine the impact resource extraction has on a community with a trade economy versus a wage community.
- Five years of research, review and consideration before development occurs.

Cultural

- Cultural issues under umbrella of health.
- Cultural camps on the land would help to reconnect people to their culture.
- Traditional Knowledge, Ownership, Control, Access and Possession (OCAP) in the Yukon own frame – work to strengthen the framework.
- Traditional Knowledge, property rights & knowledge.
- Traditional Knowledge as another way to pursue self-determination, as authors of research.
- Who owns knowledge? A continued debate.
- Elders usually not fully compensated – dependent on honoraria to make ends meet.
- Cost of living is high in the North, impacts nutritional choices and options.
- Elders care for children without compensation, parenting while grand parenting.
- Elders still in high esteem in Yukon and they are getting tired of limited involvement i.e. prayer at the beginning and at the end of events.
- Some Elders refuse to work with government funding organizations – re: use knowledge in favour of industry.
- Traditional Knowledge and teaching of what it incorporates.
- Cultural pieces into agreements: access to ports.
- The sooner you develop process (cultural protection) legislative process, the better.
- Traditional Knowledge in Yukon regarded as same level of scientific evidence.
- Traditional Knowledge acceptance into courts varies across the country.

- Research: what we know and what science accepts, determine levels of measurement.
- Quebec – roads to mine is public access.
- BC different: exploit the industry.
- Quebec: bring mining company to table – avoid confrontation – zero impacted same as BC.
- Network among own group (informal).
- Yellowknife – high migration. Leave behind knowledge and way of life.
- Creates different kinds of classes of people “street people” starting to be present in Inuvik and Yellowknife.
- Leaving behind important way of life tied to culture and language.
- Communities: older generation, children leaving, why are Elders staying?
- Media – popular culture influences attitudes/behaviour.
- Consumerism – not necessarily result of mining but contributes here.
- Language – retention difficult (children and even adults).
- Difficult to use deconstructionist model to address issues.
- Support for youth; cultural education – modern & traditional (influence on culture).
- Industry to contribute to infrastructure. Elders excluded from this process.
- Still does not address migration issue and impact on caribou, fish.
- Quebec – culture.
- Export culture – sell dog-team trips, etc. long process.
- Recognition of opportunities.
- Arctic Winter Games.
- Competitive edge cultural themes.
- Endorsed by mining companies and others.
- Yukon – recreation fund for low-income families.
- Research dynamics.
- Nunavik.
- Hockey program in schools.
- Too much of a “hand-out” syndrome.
- Wants to be more independent financially.
- Power imbalance among group.

Diet/Nutrition

- Camps (luxury hotels).
- Desserts.
- Quebec allowed to hunt/fish but supported via hunters’ program, re: long hours, uncertified food not allowed in kitchen.

- Yukon – partnership with renewable resource sector. Via leadership support.
- Accusations of poaching.
- Benefits outweigh risks.
- Diabetes and heart disease.
- Genetic pre-disposition.
- Yukon – use of land mass foods not being used by youth.
- Food insecurity – address rapid change in diet.
- IBAs build process and have food resource available.
- Shortage is supplies – food, gas.
- People take shortage.

Action Items

- Provisions built into supply of country food.
- Support underlying issues so people get employed (i.e.: drug testing).
- Avoid stigmatization etc. versus trust.
- Applied to everyone to be tested.
- Different in regions.
- Voisey’s Bay/IBAs.
- Comm. – 100c/year – administered by volunteers to address cultural and economic.
- Example: Royalties – one-time household payments of 200k.
- Similar: residential school payments.
- Hard to address when comparing current experience.
- Is still being felt to determine future thresholds.

Economic

Broad Issues

Property Rights and Land Claim Issues:

It is difficult to guide decisions or negotiations related to resource development projects by existing land claim agreements because of the following issues highlighted by participants:

Property Rights:

Either no property rights established – comprehensive claims versus specific claims. Some land claims are unresolved or there are implementation problems. In these cases the federal government operates as if they own the land, which in turn lead to issues of community consultation and consent.

Community Consultation & Impact Benefit Agreement Issues:

The biggest issue regarding Impact Benefit Agreements is that they are confidential and cannot be shared to promote promising practices.

Participants stressed the following concerns regarding IBA negotiations:

- Ultimately mining companies do not care what the rules are. Many participants felt that it should be up to the community to determine the rules. However, as long as IBAs remain confidential, the “divide and conquer” and competitive nature of the business will prevent communities from exploring protocols and promising practices together.
- Some mining companies are not clear on the rules a community has set out – in most cases they operate under the easiest interpretation of the community consultation which translates into the IBA.
- The mining companies are strategic in the way they collect information from the community. Participants highlighted the following examples: the mining company will give the community little notice to adequately plan for community consultation or they will strategically plan a community consultation when other significant events are happening in the community – which inevitably guarantees low attendance and low participation.
- The mining companies are banking on communities not communicating – and they make sure they (mining companies) have adequate representation on various community panels and consultation groups.
- Some participants cited instances in which there had been too many small organizations dealing with the issues – nothing getting done.
- Impact of globalization must be noted and taken into consideration when developing IBAs and negotiated royalties, such as considering the increase in gas prices etc which impact costs and benefits.
- When an IBA is first negotiated all people must have all the information available. Royalties are negotiated before all parties are aware of the outcome. A project can make significantly more or less money than what was initially communicated during negotiation.
- Life cycle of the mine sites must be considered – payment for reclamation of sites should be upfront. No letters of credit – only trust or cheque. Incorporate this in land use planning and IBAs.

Community Expectations:

Many of the participants discussed the impact of community expectations based on misinformation. Some key points highlighted in the discussion include:

- People assume that with mining activity occurring in a community there will be a huge influx of jobs/job creation. Not so. Most of the job creation happens in the operation stages. Not a lot of work in the extraction phase because work is so specialized. Workers qualified to support the extraction phase will go elsewhere for work for better pay.

- Participants stressed that there is a need to explore the following question: what are the long term positive and negative outcomes of new money in a community?
- When a community goes from having a low employment rate to having the opportunity to access paying jobs and at times high paying jobs – there are socio-economic implications to consider. This should be taken into consideration in terms of community consultation and land planning.
- There is a fight between people wanting to access jobs and this creates competition for lands. People are put on the defensive when exploration is considered.
- Most of the employment created by mining projects is short term – what are the implications of this boom/bust scenario. How does a community recover?
- In most cases, there are many competing groups for example regional groups in Nunavut etc. It is difficult to work together which results in a divide and conquer tactic in which the mining companies benefit from the competition. There is a reluctance to share promising practices for fear of losing the big opportunity to make money. This may lead to the exploitation of community resources by the mining company. It is important that we overcome this and create a dialogue between regions etc.
- When a development project crosses regional boundaries (Mackenzie Valley Pipeline) – who should economically benefit? Who determines this?
- It is difficult to communicate a collective review of protocols – community consultation, IBA, etc because protocols are different in each community (different in settled versus non settled areas), and are determined by different groups ranging from band councils to regional governments and representative organizations. Also, where projects can benefit multiple parties negotiations are even more challenging and can lead to a competitive environment – McKenzie Gas Pipeline project stretches across different geographic regions.

Equity and Education Issues:

Participants also stressed that in order to create an environment that fosters equal opportunity to access work opportunities, the following issues require attention:

- IBA must consider equity issues in terms of addressing employment issues.
- There should be partnerships with high schools and regional government to promote industrial trades and ongoing training initiatives.
- Mining companies do not offer women the same economic opportunities as men. Child care is an issue when a training program starts at 8:00 p.m. This is especially true for regions with a high number of single mothers or sole support parents.
- Mining companies have time and money to throw at community problems – however this perpetuates the amount of control the company has over communities and influences the way communities communicate about important issues.

- Training needs to happen within the community or by other groups not necessarily provided by industry. For example, the Status of Women’s Council of the Northwest Territories provides access to trades training programs.
- There is a need to review retention issues (social issues) – addictions a barrier to benefit long term from development projects.

Land Planning

Discussions regarding land planning (economic and environment) overlapped much of the other issues discussed. The following points were highlighted by participants:

- The exploration phase of a project may limit the community’s use of land and traditional occupations and practices – hunting and gathering, etc. As a result food security is compromised and country foods are at risk. This must be taken into consideration when land planning.
- Participants stressed the need to consider putting an economic value on land use – value of traditional foods, tourism, commercial fisheries, etc. There is a need to evaluate the cultural costs and benefits of resource extraction. Are there methods to determine and explore the cultural costs and benefits to northern communities?
- Land planning must take into consideration and evaluation process. There is a need to advocate for development to slow down or cease until appropriate land planning and evaluative measures are drawn up. The uranium and gold are not going anywhere. Development in the North should be paced appropriately in order to protect the land and the people.
- Some provincial governments i.e. Quebec government are not required legally to tell communities where exploration projects are taking place. In some cases i.e. permits to conduct exploration are granted before any community consultation occurs. In this case, the community does not have a voice – for example: to indicate which lands are sacred versus which lands could be used or considered for development.
- There is the combined need to know where development is happening and the desire to limit or pace development in order to address the negative impact on the community and the environment. Communities need to communicate and have knowledge of where all exploration is taking place. For example, a community may not agree to mining activity if there are many exploration projects happening in close proximity. There needs to be dialogue between territory, community and industry to communicate the cumulative effects – environmental effect.
- In discussing the economic impact of resource extraction in various communities – it is important to consider different economic models embraced by different communities. The trade economy versus wage economy and the impact on Aboriginal communities of shifting from one to the other.

- Much of the communication between communities and mining companies happens fast – communities are not given time to learn from the past and to develop promising practices. Communities are often forced to say yes and this impacts the community for future generations.
- Participants stressed that there should be five years of planning and community education before development occurs – planning before industry is on the scene.

What Can Communities Do

Examples of successful models to build from:

Nunavut – Band lays out how activity is conducted in all four stages of resource extraction – this band model could be a model for land planning and community consultation.

James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement: very community based working models in place that focus in large part on environmental commissions.

What Do We Do Next?

The following points were raised as creative solutions to address the broad issues illustrated above:

- Create and make available a national inventory of land planning, including water and ice use. This inventory must be shared regionally and nationally. Such an initiative would support localized – regional land planning.
- One way of creating dialogue is to conduct a collective review of all (30 PLUS) IBAs in Northern Canada. There are creative ways to address the issue of confidentiality.
- It was also stressed that there is the need to establish initiatives that support education in communities and more specifically children and youth, on the economic, historical, political, social and cultural impact of resource extraction. Future generations need to have the information to make informed choices.
- Explore the possibility of developing a national or regional Memorandum of Understanding with industry.

There was much discussion regarding the creation of a regional/national committee/governing body/coalition/network committed to sharing information and best practices be established.

- It would have to be determined whether the group acts as an advocacy group or an info sharing network or both.
- To overcome time and resource challenges “get-togethers” should be coordinated so that they piggy back on pre-existing summits, national forums, trade shows, events, conferences. Coordinate an informal but facilitated “get-together” the day before and/or after another pre-existing event.

- There needs to be a paper trail for future generations to review – there needs to be evidence that the round table occurred.
- Experts in various fields should be considered for committee membership– geologists, economist, sociologists, researchers, professors etc – industry representatives, developers and someone to access funding. These players will gather information – to support communities in making informed decisions.

There was also some dialogue regarding an online clearinghouse/network of new and existing information. The following points were discussed in relation to an online initiative:

- There is a need to develop a dissemination strategy – to combine regional, national level info into one comprehensive information resource.
- Look at and make available pre-existing resources, for example; University of McGill and Laval have good collections on resource extraction. Press clippings, parliamentary outlook, ITK resources, e-mail listservs, national court rulings (Amnesty International) – that highlight appropriate behaviour for corporations and right to community consult.
- Access and share information on what other mining companies are doing regionally, nationally and internationally – legal and human rights information.
- A listserv that acts as a watch dog monitoring the actions of mining companies and sub contractors.

Finally, the participants stressed that before establishing a national network/group or online initiative, each region/community must get together in the spirit of self government and economic independence to explore their respective situations. There is a need to get our houses together regionally before a national alliance is formed. All regions are at different points with the issue – some regions have developed infrastructure where others do not. Develop regional association and possibly a national association with open/optional membership.

Barriers:

- no time or no money due to multiple priorities and minimal funds.
- HR support to make information sharing/advocacy projects unfold.
- E-mail not always a viable solution.
- Need communication methods that will keep communities engaged. Fax and phone are better for some communities that are not connected.
- Confidentiality clause prevents information in IBAs from being shared with other communities who could benefit from other's experiences.

4.3. APPENDIX C – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Exploring Community-Based Responses to Resource Extractive Development in Northern Canada- March 5-6-7, 2008

Participant List

Northwest Territories

Sheryl Grieve, B.Sc.

Environment and Resource Manager
North Slave Métis Alliance
32 Melville Drive
Box 2301
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P7
Phone: (867) 873-6762
Fax: (867) 669-7442
Email: lands@nsma.net

Bill Erasmus

Dene Nation
5125 – 50th Street
Box 2338
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P7
Phone: 867-873-4081
Fax: 867-920-2254
Email: berasmus@afn.ca

Amanda Cliff

Planning and Policy Coordinator
Community Development Division
Inuvialuit Regional Corporation
Bag Service #21, Inuvik, NT X0E 0T0
Phone: (867) 777 7075
Cell: (519) 897 2545
Fax: (867) 777-4506
Email: acliff@idc.inuvialuit.com

Annemieke Mulders

Project Coordinator
Status of Women Council of the NWT
4th Floor, Northwest Tower, Box 1320
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2L9
Phone: (867) 920-8994.
Email: am@statusofwomen.nt.ca

Denise Kurszewski

Special Projects Manager
Gwich'in Tribal Council
Box 1509
Inuvik, NT X0E 0T0
Phone: (867) 777-7900
Email: dkurszewski@gwichin.net.ca

Nancy Peel

Executive Director
Native Women's Association of the
Northwest Territories
Box 2321
Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P7
Telephone: (867) 873-5509
Email: excerector@nativewomens.com
**could not attend due to flight problems / winter storm*

Yukon

Norma Kassi

Arctic Health Research Network-Yukon
#209 – 100 Main Street
Whitehorse, YT Y1A 2A7
Phone: (867) 668-3393
Fax: (867) 668-5543
Email: nkassi@whtvcable.com

Liz Walker

Director of Health Partnership
Council of Yukon First Nations
11 Nistulin Drive
Whitehorse, YT Y1A 3S4
Phone: (867) 393-09245
Email: liz.walker@cyfn.ca

Nunavut

Natan Obed

Director, Social and Cultural Development
Nunavut Tunngavik Inc
Box 638
Iqaluit, NU X0A 0H0
Phone: (867) 975-4962
Email: nobed@tunngavik.com

Bruce Uviluq

Assistant Director
NTI Implementation
Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.
Iqaluit, NU X0A 0H0
Phone: (867) 975-4925
Email: buviluq@tunngavik.com

Quebec/Nunatsiavut

Theresa Hollett

Impact Benefit Agreement Coordinator
Nunatsiavut Government
Phone: (709) 896 8582
Email: thollett@nunatsiavut.com

Johannes Lampe

Regional Interpreter/Translator
Nunatsiavut Department of Health and
Social Development
Box 250, Nain, NL A0P 1L0
Phone: (709) 922-2185
Fax: (709) 922-2216
Email: johannes_lampe@nunatsiavut.com

Terry Rice

Town Manager
Makkovik Inuit Community Government
Makkoviup Inuit NunatuKait kavamanga
Box 132
Makkovik, NL A0P 1J0
Email: townmanager@makkovik.ca

Neil Greig

Department Head
Economic Development & Fisheries Division
Makivik Corporation
P.O. box 179
Kuujuaq, QC J0M 1C0
Phone: 819-964-2925 ext. 225
Fax: 819-964-2613
Email: n_greig@makivik.org

Susie Bernier, M.Sc.

Executive Director
Nasivvik Centre (Laval ACADRE)
2875, rue Laurier, Delta 2, Suite 600
Québec, QC G1V 2M2
Phone: (418) 656-4141, (ext 46516)
Email: susie.bernier@crchul.ulaval.ca

Amnesty Sponsored Delegate

Oscar Dennis

Kablona Keepers

Box 16

Iskut, BC V0J 1K0

Phone: (250) 234 3999

Email: oscardennis@mac.com, oscardennis@hotmail.com

National Aboriginal Organizations

Jeannette Doucet

Manager, Sexual Health Policy and Programs

Pauktuutit Inuit Women of Canada

56 Sparks Street-Suite 400

Ottawa, ON K1P 5A9

Phone: (613) 238-3977

Email: jdoucet@pauktuutit.ca

Soha Kneen

Senior Researcher

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami

170 Laurier Avenue West-Suite 510

Ottawa, ON K1P 5V5

Phone: (613) 238-8181

Email: kneen@itk.ca

Gail Gallagher

Research and Policy Analyst

Health Secretariat

Assembly of First Nations

472 Albert Street, Suite 810

Ottawa, ON K1R 5B4

Phone: (613) 241-6789 (285)

Email: ggallagher@afn.ca

Hazel Harrison

Youth Suicide Prevention Coordinator

Socio Economic Development

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 510

Phone: (613) 238-8181

Email: Harrison@itk.ca

Observers

Marcelle Gareau

Researcher
Aboriginal Strategy Policy
Human Resources and Social
Development Canada
140 Promenade du Portage
Gatineau, QC K1A 0J9
Phone: (819) 956-8020
Email: marcelle.gareau@hrsdc-rhdsc.gc.ca

Tara Scurr

Amnesty International
Business and Human Rights Campaigner
#430-319 West Pender St.
Vancouver, BC V6B 1T4
Phone: (604) 294-5160
Cell: 778-893-6481
Email: tscurr@amnesty.ca

Staff: Mark Buell, Marlene Larocque, Heather Ochalski, Lorena Solomon
Dianne Kinnon, Cathleen Knotsch

Facilitator: Ian Kenney