

### **3 Workshop Conclusions**

#### **3.1 General Observations**

1. There is a need for better understanding among organizations, co-management bodies, and in the communities with respect to the role of the CIMP and Audit, and the benefits and potential contributions they can offer.
2. Community involvement and community capacity building must be considered key to the success of the CIMP. Communities must be full partners at all stages: research and monitoring design, implementation, evaluation and reporting of the monitoring program.
3. Information about the CIMP and Audit needs to be made available in 'plain language' formats, in order to ensure constructive feedback and input from all parties.
4. Monitoring priorities (locations, focus) must be clearly defined, in particular in the light of competing demands for limited funding and resources.

#### **3.2 Suggestions for Next Steps**

##### **3.2.1 Regional and Community Involvement**

The workshop concluded that it is necessary to more meaningfully engage community and regional organizations in completing the development of the CIMP and Audit, and in moving ahead to implementation. The communications and consultations necessary to do so must recognize the unique circumstances of each region; as a result, each region needs to assist the Working Group in developing a consultation/communication program that best meets their needs. The Working Group intends to conduct regional and community consultations during April and May 2002. Following these consultations, the Working Group will request funding to implement the CIMP and Audit from the federal Treasury Board.

1. The first step needs to be that of clarifying 'what' is to be consulted upon, and 'who' (e.g., Working Group members, DIAND, organizational leadership, community members) is to participate in the consultations later this spring.
2. Groundwork needs to be laid, in terms of preparing communities for the consultations – plain language information should be provided and contact points in the communities established.
3. The fact that different communities have different needs and priorities must be acknowledged and the consultation process adapted accordingly.
4. Working Group members need to play an active and key role as liaisons to the communities.
5. Support and 'buy-in' is needed from communities and regions, as well as other organizations, prior to the funding submission to Treasury Board.

### **3.2.2 The Responsible Authority (RA) and the Proposed Interim Coordinating Committee (ICC)**

1. Maintain the Working Group for the interim period until formal regulations are established, rather than creating a new body (the ICC). Expansion of the current WG membership should be considered, e.g., to include co-management boards.
2. The membership structure and decision-making process of the Responsible Authority should be evaluated in greater detail. A balance between all-inclusive membership/representation and practical manageability must be struck.
3. Regional representation and effective linkages between the RA and regional/local constituencies and co-management bodies should be sought.
4. In order to consult more effectively on the preferred structure of the RA, a discussion paper should be prepared, examining organizational options for the RA and evaluating them on the basis of comparative criteria.

### **3.2.3 Environmental Audit and Auditor**

1. The initial Audit should focus on the capacity and the effectiveness of co-management boards and the federal and territorial government agencies in fulfilling their mandates with respect to environmental management. Performance indicators and benchmarks need to be established in this regard.
2. Communities need to be involved in the audit process and provided due preparation time and information in order to participate effectively. Traditional Knowledge should contribute to the Audit.
3. The audit must take into consideration the extent to which communities have been effectively involved in resource management activities to date, and whether Traditional Knowledge has been used as per existing policies and legislation. The factors limiting or prohibiting participation must be determined and appropriate remedies sought.

### **3.2.4 Valued Ecosystem Component (VEC) Activities**

1. Communities need to play a central role in the identification and monitoring of VECs. Capacity building and training are fundamental to ensuring appropriate local participation.
2. The use of Traditional Knowledge throughout the CIMP is important, and ensuring that this happens must be a priority.
3. There is a need to prioritize among VECs. Prioritization should be based on identified gaps in available information, community values, and impending development pressure. Resources must be focussed on priorities.
4. Linkages between VECs need to be emphasized, including linkages between the biophysical and the human components.

Immediately following the workshop, the Working Group met to discuss the workshop findings and the actions needed in the near future to address them.