
Appendix C: Participant Worksheets

**Workshop on the
Cumulative Impact Monitoring
Program (CIMP) and Audit**

March 12 & 13, 2002
Katimavik Rooms, Explorer Hotel
Yellowknife, NWT

**WORKSHEETS FOR WORKING GROUP SESSIONS
PARTICIPANT RESOURCE BINDER, TAB 6**

Introduction

On the following pages, you will find a set of questions that will serve as the foundation for the working group sessions at the workshop and enable the Working Group to move forward based on input from all interested parties and participants. They are included in the Participant Resource Binder for two reasons:

- to prepare participants in advance for the kind of feedback and insights that the CIMP Working Group will seek during the workshop discussions; and
- to allow participants to provide the Working Group with additional comments in written form, either prior to or at the workshop.

Please review the questions in advance of the workshop in order to assist you in preparing for the working group sessions. If your time is limited, you may wish to focus your efforts on those topics of particular interest to you.

In order for you to provide a contribution to this process, *the Working Group is asking you to submit your completed worksheet to the CIMP Secretariat at the workshop.* If you require time for additional consultation within your community or organization, you may also send your comments to:

Meredith Seabrook
CIMP Secretariat
Environment and Conservation
DIAND
Box 1500, Yellowknife NT X1A 2R3
Phone (867) 669-2594
Fax (867) 669-2701
seabrookm@inac.gc.ca

When reviewing the worksheets and in preparation for the workshop, you may need to refer to the following documents included in the Participants Resource Binder:

- Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Work Program for the CIMP and Audit (Chapters 1 – 4) (Participant Resource Binder Tab 2)
- “Implementation Framework for Part 6 of the MVRMA (DRAFT – October 19, 2001)”, and comments received to date (Participant Resource Binder Tab 4)
- ‘VEC State of Knowledge Reports’ and ‘Proposed Work Plans’ (Participant Resource Binder Tab 5)

Specific sections of the documents are referenced on each worksheet, as they relate to the particular questions.

The workshop purpose and objectives, and a detailed agenda, are provided in Tab 1 of the Participant Resource Binder.

It should be noted that all of these documents are ‘draft’ and in various stages of development and review by the Working Group and other organizations. They are presented as drafts for discussion, and do not necessarily reflect the views of individual organizations represented on the Working Group or the Working Group as a whole. Subsequent review and consultation will occur following the workshop, both within the Working Group and its member organizations, at a community level, and with other organizations with an interest in the CIMP and Audit.

General Comments

The individual worksheets focus specifically on aspects of the Cumulative Impact Monitoring Program and Audit. *Any general questions or comments you may have can be provided below⁶:*

***Thank you for taking the time to review and respond to the questions!
It will make for a more successful workshop.***

⁶ Note: spaces for writing comments have been deleted from this appendix version due to space limitations.

Working Group Session #1: Cumulative Impact Monitoring Program – Proposed Framework (Agenda Item No.6)

Please take a few moments to consider the proposed framework for the Cumulative Impact Monitoring Program and, in particular, the structure, role and purpose of the Responsible Authority (RA)⁷.

For the questions below, you will need to refer to Sections 2 and 3 of the draft “Implementation Framework for Part 6 of the MVRMA (‘DIF’) (DRAFT – October 19, 2001)”, and comments received to date (Participant Resource Binder Tab 4). Some of the relevant elements of the draft Framework are also summarized in the Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Work Program for the CIMP and Audit (‘DSPWP’) (Tab 2).

1. The RA is to be established through regulations; pending regulation, the RA is the Minister of DIAND. Until regulations are developed, it has been proposed that a partnership entity - an ‘Interim Coordinating Committee’ (ICC) be established to advise the Minister (the RA) on the development of the regulations that will establish the RA, and in the interim period will take on the functions of the RA (DSPWP S. 4.4.1). Do you have any comments on the membership or mandate of the ICC?
2. a) Do you agree with the proposed membership for the RA outlined in the draft Implementation Framework (DIF S. 3.1.2-3.1.3; DSPWP S. 4.4.1)? (You may wish to consider, for example, what specific organizations should have membership, which organizations should have observer status; and how non-member organizations can be effectively involved). *Please explain why...*

b) Do you have a preference for a concentrated or decentralized approach to the operation of RA? (e.g., considerations of economies of scale and efficiencies vs. the need for a regional and community focus). For example, how can a balance between effective regional involvement and an element of coordination across the NWT be achieved?
3. a) Is the operational aspect of the Responsible Authority as described in the proposed “Implementation Framework” (S. 3.1.4 – 3.1.8), e.g. committees/sub-committees, decision making, advisory groups, Secretariat services, funding, etc. appropriate? If not, what needs to be added, omitted, or changed? *Please explain why.*

b) In your view, will the proposed approach with respect to the RA ensure appropriate regional and community involvement / partnership in the monitoring of cumulative impacts? (DIF, S. 3.1.4; DSPWP S. 4.4.1 and 4.4.2)
4. The draft Framework proposes a number of monitoring and reporting activities for the RA. These include monitoring plans (S. 3.2), funding of monitoring programs (S. 3.3), monitoring reports (S. 3.4), promotion of improved cumulative impact monitoring (S. 3.5). Will these activities ensure that the RA fulfills its mandate with respect to cumulative impact monitoring in the NWT?

⁷ The Responsible Authority will plan, coordinate, implement and report on the Cumulative Impact Monitoring Program.

Working Group Session #2: Environmental Audit and Auditor – Proposed Framework (Agenda Item No.8)

Please take a few moments to think about the purpose, components and timing of the Environmental Audit and the Auditor in relation to the Cumulative Impact Monitoring Program.

For the questions below, you will need to refer to Sections 2 and 4 of the draft “Implementation Framework for Part 6 of the MVRMA (DRAFT – October 19, 2001)”, and comments received to date (Participant Resource Binder Tab 4).

1. a) In your view, is the process for appointment of the Auditor and fixing the Terms of Reference as proposed in the draft “Implementation Framework” (Sections 4.1 – 4.2), appropriate? If not, what needs to be added, omitted, or changed?

b) Do you have comments on the suggested content / scope of the Terms of Reference (S. 4.3)?
2. Section 4.4 of the draft Framework outlines the powers and duties of the Auditor. Do you have any suggestions as to whether items need to be added, removed or modified?
3. The Audit process is described in Section 4.5 of the draft Framework. Do you have any comments on the involvement of various parties (e.g., first nations, the RA, in the Audit, or the proposed approach of an interim report that will be subject to review and consultation?
4. The scope /level of detail of the initial audit report produced in 2003 may be limited relative to those in subsequent monitoring / audit cycles, as the information available from the monitoring program will not likely be developed at that early stage in the process. Given the time lines and other constraints, what should be the focus of the initial audit?

Working Group Session #3: Feedback on the VEC Team Activities (Agenda Item No. 12)

Please take a few moments to consider the work conducted by the Valued Ecosystem Components (VEC) Teams to date, as presented in Agenda Item 11.

You may wish to refer to the documents in Tab 5 of the Participant Resource Binder:

- February 25, 2002 letter from D. Livingstone to VEC Team Leaders, re: community partnerships in CIMP
 - ‘VEC State of Knowledge Reports’ and ‘Proposed Work Plans’ (February 2002)
1. In your view, how does the work that has been conducted by the VEC Teams to date (i.e., state of knowledge reports, identification of gaps, and proposed work plans) contribute to further development of the CIMP and Audit? *Please elaborate.*
 2. Please share your insights and views on the priority monitoring and knowledge gaps that the CIMP must address. Are these gaps adequately reflected in the proposals prepared by the VEC Teams? If not, what are your specific suggestions?

Working Group Session #4: Regional and Community Involvement in the CIMP/VEC Activities (Agenda Item No.14)

Please spend some minutes reflecting on the material presented in Agenda Item 11, regarding the role of the communities and regions in the CIMP and VEC activities. You may also want to refer to:

- February 25, 2002 letter from D. Livingstone to VEC Team Leaders, re: community partnerships in CIMP (Tab 5, Participant Resource Binder)
 - Section 4.4.2, Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Work Program for the CIMP and Audit (Tab 2, Participant Resource Binder).
1. Please share your ideas on the needs and expectations of the communities and regions, and how they can be best reflected in the CIMP? How can the regions/communities be involved to the fullest extent possible? *Please explain.*
 2. How can the partnerships with regional and community organizations needed for the CIMP be initiated and / or maintained? Can you identify any barriers, but more importantly, opportunities, in this regard?
 3. What are your thoughts on how to best integrate traditional and local knowledge into the CIMP?

Agenda Item No. 16 (Plenary Discussion): Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Work Program for the CIMP and Audit

Please take a few moments to consider the draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Work Program for the CIMP and Audit (Chapters 1 – 4) (Tab 2 of the Participant Resource Binder).

1. Do you have any comments, general or specific, on the Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Work Program for the CIMP and Audit?
2. Do you have any suggestions with respect to the elements of the Strategic Plan contained in Chapter 4 (i.e., purpose and objectives [S. 4.2 – 4.3], key partners and contributors [S. 4.4], the 'strategic functions' [S. 4.5], or Key Outcomes/ Deliverables / Schedule [S. 4.6])?

Agenda Item No. 17 (Plenary Discussion): Next Steps

You may have some concluding thoughts on items to be discussed as part of Agenda Item No. 17 - 'Next Steps'.

1. An NWT-wide approach to the CIMP and Audit is being proposed – to include the settled and unsettled claims areas of the Mackenzie Valley, as well as the Inuvialuit Settlement Region. Do you have any comments on this approach?
2. DIAND will begin formal consultation with the regions/communities and other organizations following this workshop. Do you have specific suggestions or ideas with respect to the how and when consultations should occur?

3. DIAND will be making a submission to the federal Treasury Board for the funding of the CIMP and Audit later this year. The general assumptions for the budget are stated in S. 4.6 of the Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Work Program. Do you have any comments on the budget that will be needed, or other aspects of the budgeting process?

Assumption	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Approximately \$5 million/year for Years 1 through 5 (total of \$25 million) – CIMP and Audit, entire NWT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">20:80 funding ratio of “Operations and Maintenance”: “Grants and Contributions”	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Budget for Administration limited to a 15% ceiling of the total CIMP budget	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Other Comments	