

**MEETING NOTES
CAPACITY WORKING GROUP
OF NATIONAL FOREST STRATEGY TEAM 3**

Thursday, December 14, 2006
Holiday Inn, Ottawa

These notes include some key decisions taken by the discussion paper editorial team in a follow-up meeting held at the NAFA offices on December 15, 2006. These points are identified as such in the text that follows.

Participants

Nicole Lavigne, Cree-Québec Forestry Board

Harry Bombay, National Aboriginal Forestry Association

Gary Anka, Canadian Forest Service

Peggy Smith, Lakehead University

Marc Stevenson, University of Alberta

Trena Allen, Aboriginal Strategy Group

Julia von Hahn, First Nations Forestry Program

Kareen Holtby, First Nations Forestry Program

Alastair MacPhee, Congress of Aboriginal Peoples

Larry Stanley, Saskatchewan Environment

Pamela Perreault, Researcher and Consultant

Beverly Bird, Tl'azt'en First Nation

Melissa Cooper, Assembly of First Nations

Don Sharp, Métis National Council

David Crevier, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

Martin Larose, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

Tim Leclair, Métis Settlements General Council

Keith Deering, Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Natural Resources (morning only)

Lorraine Rekmans, National Aboriginal Forestry Association (afternoon only)

Dan Bulloch, Manitoba Conservation (by teleconference at selected moments)

Nadine Roach, Union of Ontario Indians (by teleconference at selected moments)

Jean-Francois Gravel, Québec Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife (by teleconference at selected moments)

Bob Stanton, New Brunswick Natural Resources (by teleconference at selected moments)

(facilitator) Mark Kepkay, National Aboriginal Forestry Association

(notetaker) Rosalind Kee

Regrets

Valerie Courtois, Innu Nation

Stephen Harvey, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

David Flood, Nishnawbe-Aski Nation

Lori Borth, British Columbia Ministry of Forests and Range

Gary Ducommun, Métis Provincial Council of British Columbia

Nadine Roach, Union of Ontario Indians

Meeting Context and Objectives

The objectives of the meeting were:

1. Revisit workplan for March 31, 2007 deliverables
2. Review components of discussion papers under development
3. Revise key elements of discussion papers
4. Review and adjust plans for publication, presentation, and policy impact of discussion papers

The short-term goal of the Capacity Working Group is to produce a series of discussion papers on the topic of “capacity building for Aboriginal rights and participation in the forest sector of Canada”. The deadline for these deliverables is March 31, 2007. For the meeting of December 14, the Coordinator (Mark Kepkay) prepared initial drafts of the discussion papers, with specific elements flagged for in-depth discussion by the group. These drafts were based upon discussions and feedback from previous meetings and teleconferences of the working group, as well as a literature review and data collection process. Case study presentations at the meeting were also a key launching point for the discussions.

The topics of the four discussion papers as presented in rough draft form were as follows:

- Paper #1: Rationale, Framework, Needs – What capacity is, why we need to build it, what the needs are
 - Rationale: mutual benefits from capacity to pursue Aboriginal rights and participation
 - Definition and model of capacity
 - Functions for which we need capacity
 - Discussion of capacity status and needs in the areas of 8 types of resources/capitals
 - Estimate of funding needs for a national capacity program
 - Principles of good capacity building
 - Capacity Assessment Tool
- Paper #2: Roles and responsibilities for capacity building
 - legal and policy framework for Aboriginal forestry (on-Reserve, off-Reserve, etc.)
 - historic trends in funding
 - who is responsible for what
- Paper #3: Case studies in capacity building, and how capacity gets built
 - Using to test the capacity model from Paper #1
 - Cree-Quebec FB
 - Tl'azt'en First Nation
 - Innu First Nation
 - Iisaak Forest Resources
 - Mitigonaabe Forestry Management
- Paper #4: Trends in capacity building for Aboriginal rights and participation in the forest sector.
 - Funding for Aboriginal forestry over the past 25 yrs
 - Effectiveness of the programming

- broken down by province

These are to be considered a joint authorship of the members of the working group. Based on the discussion papers, the working group will also develop recommendations for making progress in building capacity for Aboriginal rights and participation in the forest sector.

Upon completion, the papers and recommendations will be submitted to a number of different organizations and processes for consideration in future policy making. Likely destinations include:

- The Canadian Council of Forest Ministers process to develop the 2008 version of the National Forest Strategy
- The First Nations Forestry Program process to develop a proposal for renewal/enhancement of the program in 2008
- The National Recruitment Steering Committee of the Canadian Forestry Institute/CCFM
- Other organizations and processes to be determined

Meeting process and agenda

The meeting proceeded mainly as a facilitated plenary discussion. In addition, two case studies of capacity building were presented as a means of stimulating thinking and dialogue about the issues: The Tl'azten First Nation (Beverly Bird, Pamela Perreault) and the Cree-Québec Forestry Board (Nicole Lavigne). Breakout groups were also used to develop preliminary lists of recommendations for priority action on capacity building.

A number of decisions about deliverables for March 31, 2007 were taken, and immediate action items were agreed. These are described below.

Decisions about the writing process and content of the discussion papers

- The scope of the draft discussion papers, as presented during the meeting, needs to be narrowed considerably as relates to deliverables with a deadline of March 31, 2007. However, we should also keep on file the current scope to return to for more work in the new fiscal year (April).
- For the March 31 deadline, many components of the papers should be dealt with in briefer form and in less detail than indicated in the drafts. Many redundancies need to be reduced, as well.
- The papers will be co-authored in the sense that they will be published as a package with our names on it, as the Team 3 Capacity Working Group. However, individual papers within that package, and sometimes individual sections of a paper, will have more specific and direct authorship attributed to them.
 - At follow-up discussions of some of the editorial team on December 15, it was proposed that the package be “bookended” by an Introduction, Executive Summary, and concluding chapter with a set of recommendations. These bookend pieces, amounting to maybe 20 pages in total, would need to be a Team 3 consensus.

- In a lot of ways, the actual papers could be considered backgrounder for the Team 3 consensus material.
 - The Introduction would include a description of the process and methods used to develop the package.
 - The conclusion and recommendations should also include a 3-4 point workplan for the Capacity Working Group in FY 2007-2008.
- This approach should enable the papers to be less rigidly integrated as was first contemplated – therefore taking less time to complete.
- The package of papers should include a piece about the paucity of formally structured data to support capacity-building efforts.
- (**In the following, the names of people who have committed to help in some way are provided in parentheses.**)
- Paper #1 – Rationale, Needs, and Model of Capacity Building (**Mark K., Pamela P., Marc S.**)
 - Very academic right now. It is helpful, but not sufficient as a means of describing key issues in capacity.
 - The model (also was referred to as a “framework”) needs to be critiqued using the case studies (Paper #2) as a source of bottom-up, grounded theory.
 - But this paper does serve as a uniting structure for the various pieces, and is the most complete self-contained argument.
- Paper #2 – Case Studies
 - This paper is important as a grounded test and revision of the model developed in Paper #1.
 - Each case will have different authors, including:
 - Innu First Nation (**Valerie Courtois**)
 - Tl'azt'en Nation (**Beverly B. and Pamela P.**)
 - Iisaak Forest Resources (**Mark K.**)
 - Cree-Québec Forestry Board (**Nicole L.**)
 - Métis General Settlements (**Tim L.**)
 - Mitigonaabe Forest Resources Management (**Mark K.**)
 - Pikangikum First Nation Whitefeather Initiative (**Peggy S.**)
 - Grassy Narrows First Nation (**Peggy S.**)
 - Possibly use Team 3 itself as a capacity-building case study?
 - In follow up discussions of some members of the editorial team on Dec. 15, it was proposed that the cases can be written in a narrative form that the authors find most amenable, simply with the requirement at some point to answer all of the questions provided in the case study framework. Then all of the analysis and comparison of the cases according to the capacity model in Paper #1 would be a separate section. It would essentially involve a coding exercise structured according to the model, then displaying the structured data in a matrix. (**Mark K., Pamela P.**)
- Paper #3 – Jurisdiction and Accountability, Roles and Responsibilities (**Mark K.**)
 - This paper needs to set out a broader vision than to faithfully implement the legal and legislative framework as it exists right now. We need to have a sense of how it is changing, and how that is based on rights.
 - Also need to increase the attention to treaties.

- The legal material needs to be reviewed by an expert. Also, might borrow heavily from Peeling and Stevenson's backgrounder for the FSC. (**Mark K.** to secure this legal advice.)
- In follow up discussions on Dec. 15, the editorial team proposed that this paper should include sections written by various parties to represent their own perspectives on the conclusions about roles and responsibilities to be drawn from the material and data presented. (**Mark S.** will contribute some wording on community responsibility; additional input will come from the provincial/territorial trends piece, see below). This would essentially be a condensed version of one part of Paper #4.
- Paper #4 – Trends in Investment and Effectiveness
 - The current form of this paper is too ambitious relative to a March 31 deadline.
 - The quantitative data collection on financial contributions to Aboriginal forestry that is proposed would be interesting. However, more important is to have a qualitative understanding of various parties' perspectives on their roles and responsibilities for contributing to capacity building, under a vision of mutual benefit. This would also be more feasible to complete in the short term. (**Larry S., Dan B., and Jean-François G.** to lead the development of a provincial/territorial piece.)
 - Also need an inventory of initiatives that exist today. (**Mark K., Melissa C.**)
 - (**Kareen H. and Laura MacKenzie** at FNFP can provide numbers on funding and measured outputs for the FRDAs and the FNFP to date.)
 - Need a critical assessment of the effectiveness of the existing initiatives relative to an ideal program, or to a model of capacity building such as that developed in Paper #1.
 - This needs to be based upon a capacity measurement tool that would take longer than March 31 to develop. Probably should be one of the workplan items for the Capacity Working Group in FY 2007-08.

Draft vision statement for the Capacity Working Group (generated during plenary discussions)

This statement will be re-worded as a vision and circulated to the working group email list for comment and buy-in

We are working together – Aboriginal communities, industry, governments, and NGOs – to build a mutually beneficial relationship to promote the capacity and engagement of Aboriginal peoples to contribute to their full potential and in keeping with their aspirations, rights, and values, to achieve sustainable forest management.

Draft priorities for action (generated from meeting breakout groups)

This list will be organized into overlapping topics and circulated to the working group for prioritization.

- Develop a framework to measure trends, and implement
- Form an advisory group – which should assess existing capacity
- Compare the ideal to reality for direction on better programming
- Community-level visioning and needs assessment

- Community-level plans to act on the visions
- Institutions to implement the plan
 - Revenue sharing, etc.
- Support for the 3 pillars of sustainability
- Cultural development
 - Language
 - Traditions
 - Continuity
 - Link to institutional development
- Research institute
- Cultivate balance
 - Delineate role of FNs in a balanced land ethic
 - Define ways of ensuring continued traditional land use
 - Promote an approach that encourages communities to document and express their land use ethic.
 - In any capacity building initiative, ensure a balanced approach to contemporary economic development and traditional land use.
 - Short-term - Develop a paper to create awareness of the need for balance and outlining best practices and evaluation methods.
 - See Bombay in Cultural Survival journal re: balanced approach
- Mid-term – Work with federal government to clarify their role in FN involvement in forest lands and resources.
 - On-Reserve management integrations with provincial Crown land management
 - Fiduciary responsibility to implement rights and ensure effective consultation.
- Promote Aboriginal education in forest-related programs, including management. An HQP (high quality personnel) strategy
 - Attract students to forestry school programs
 - Revamp forestry school programs to account for Aboriginal interests and learning styles
- Funding
 - Find creative ways to recognize Aboriginal rights in funding arrangements based on the principle of shared access to lands and resources, e.g. revenue sharing
 - Also including a critical assessment of current practice in funding for Aboriginal forestry.
- FN leadership
 - Raise awareness among FN leadership about how to develop capacity in forest-based activities.
- Indicators
 - Develop set of indicators to measure success in capacity building from both individual and community and government/industry/NGO perspectives
 - A means to communicate
 - Compare differing views
 - Harmonize them
- Understand legal obligations (long-term)
 - And how to implement
- Institutional development (long-term). . . leading to increased access to resources (short)

- Coordinate existing programs – provincial and federal
 - Clarify responsibilities for programs
- Self-sufficiency
- Skills and training
- Business development and partnering – also at the international level
- Research – labour market

Action Items

- **Mark K.** will circulate the draft vision statement developed at the meeting to the Capacity Working Group email list, ask for comments. (It is actually a mission statement, and needs to be converted to a vision statement before circulation.)
- **Valerie Courtois, Beverly B., Pamela P., Mark K., Nicole L., Tim L., and Peggy S.** will complete the case studies that they have committed to and help with the process of producing an analytic matrix to summarize and compare them to the model of capacity building.
- **Pamela P., Marc S., Mark K., Tim L., and Beverly B. (possibly also Gary A.)** will act as the editorial team for the deliverables. Pam will set up a teleconference of this group for the week of December 18-22. They will decide how to scope down the deliverables (by about 30%) and coordinate the writing process according to the commitments to contribute by WG members in this meeting.
- **Larry S. and Dan B.** will lead the development of a paper that represents the provincial/territorial perspective on shifts over the past 3 decades in the roles taken by federal and provincial/territorial governments to support capacity building for Aboriginal rights and participation in the forest sector. This will need to include a tie-in with Paper #3, the jurisdiction and accountability paper. **Jean-François G.** also has committed to contribute data to this paper. **Mark K.** will attempt to find people to lead a similar writing task for the federal, Aboriginal, and industry perspectives on trends in roles and funding.
- **Mark K.** will amalgamate and circulate to the WG the list of priority actions generated during the breakout session, asking for prioritization. These could potentially form the basis for recommendations to be made as a WG consensus.
- **Mark K.** will ensure that a report on progress in implementing NFS Action Item 3.4 is available for March 31. **Melissa C.** has offered to help with this. This is an overlap with work being done under the **Data Collection Working Group** of Team 3. The report should be suitable for wide circulation and as part of the package of discussion papers – possibly as a part of Paper #4, Trends.
- **The Métis Working Group** – Don S., Tim L., Alastair M., and others – will explore the potential for developing a paper for the package that highlights Métis-specific issues in the general consideration of Aboriginal capacity-building.
- **Mark K. and the Data Collection Working Group** will also complete a brief paper on the rationale and options for improving the system for tracking and reporting on Aboriginal rights and participation in the forest sector. Marcelo Levy has been contracted to do most of this.
- **Harry B.** will write up a history of NAFA's engagement in capacity building strategy since its inception.
- **Mark K.** will schedule a series of teleconferences for January-March at the earliest reasonable point – hopefully the scheduling will be initiated before Christmas.