



Sustainable Development
Working Group



ARCTIC COUNCIL

GOOD PRACTICES

For Environmental Impact Assessment
and Meaningful Engagement in the Arctic

INCLUDING GOOD PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS



Arctic EIA project

worked under the auspices of the Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) of the Arctic Council during the Finnish Chairmanship 2017-2019.



Leads of the project

Finland

Canada

Kingdom of Denmark

Gwich'in Council International



Sustainable Development
Working Group



ARCTIC COUNCIL

Arctic EIA

► Page 8

The Arctic EIA project worked under the auspices of the Arctic Council and its Sustainable Development Working Group. The aim of the project was to improve the application of environmental impact assessments (EIA) in the Arctic region. The project gathered examples of existing good practices across the Arctic, identified areas where improvements are needed and formulated associated recommendations. These recommendations and good practice examples are being shared here with proponents, authorities, consultants, other stakeholders and the public to raise awareness, while relying on the Arctic states' governments to enhance their application.

Models for Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples

► Page 48

Indigenous-led Impact Assessment

Indigenous Knowledge-based Impact Assessment

Specific Impact Assessments

Collaborative Mitigation

Environmental Impact Assessment and Meaningful Engagement

IN THE ARCTIC

Photo: Ole Geertz-Hansen

The Arctic is undergoing rapid environmental and economic change. The growing interest in the north and its resources is evidenced through an increase in the number of large-scale development projects. Planning and design of such projects should be done in a competent way, where Arctic ecosystems and their people are respected and engagement is meaningful. EIA is an important planning tool that can help to balance environmental and economic considerations and facilitate making sustainable development decisions in the context of the changing Arctic.

All eight Arctic states have EIA legislation. Each legislative process is unique, but a common EIA framework can be identified across the Arctic.

IMPROVING ARCTIC EIA

Meaningful engagement



1. Meaningful engagement proposes a relationship between proponent, authorities and the public that is characterized by dialogue, respect and trust. ► Page 16



Use of different types of knowledge

2. A comprehensive understanding requires the consideration of indigenous knowledge and local knowledge in addition to acquiring data by conventional ways. ► Page 18

Transboundary environmental impacts



3. Providing neighboring jurisdictions the possibility to engage in EIAs in cases where there is likely significant transboundary impact is important. ► Page 20

GOOD PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

► Page 22

- 1 Seek true dialogue to meaningfully engage
- 2 Utilize Indigenous knowledge and local knowledge
- 3 Build internal capacity and provide resources to meaningfully engage in EIA
- 4 Allow EIA to influence project design and decision-making process
- 5 Strengthen circumpolar cooperation on transboundary EIA

CASES

Good Practice Examples Across the Arctic ► Page 26

Country Specifics

EIA LEGISLATION

► Page 58

Canada | Finland
Iceland | Kingdom of Denmark:
Greenland and Faroe Islands
Norway | Russian Federation
Sweden | United States





MEANINGFUL ENGAGEMENT



USE OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE



TRANSBOUNDARY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

© Terry Kruger

© Mads Peter Heide-Jørgensen

GOOD PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 Seek true dialogue to meaningfully engage
- 2 Utilize Indigenous knowledge and local knowledge
- 3 Build internal capacity and provide resources to meaningfully engage in EIA
- 4 Allow EIA to influence project design and decision-making process
- 5 Strengthen circumpolar cooperation on transboundary EIA

CASES

Good Practise Examples Across the Arctic

Models for Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples

Indigenous-led Impact Assessment

Indigenous Knowledge-based Impact Assessment

Specific Impact Assessments

Collaborative Mitigation

RECOMMEN- DATIONS

1

Seek true dialogue to
meaningfully engage

.....

2

Utilize Indigenous knowledge
and local knowledge

.....

3

Build internal capacity and provide
resources to meaningfully engage in EIA

4

Allow EIA to influence project design
and decision-making process

.....

5

Strengthen circumpolar cooperation
on transboundary EIA

RECOMMENDATIONS

.....

1

Seek true dialogue to meaningfully engage

Start building a relationship with the affected communities at the earliest possible stage.

Find out in cooperation with communities what kind of engagement would be meaningful for them.

Commit to continuous dialogue.

RECOMMENDATIONS



2

Utilize Indigenous knowledge and local knowledge

Take steps to become more familiar with the principles of Indigenous knowledge systems.

Find sources of local knowledge.

Be inclusive of experts from different knowledge systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS



3

Build internal capacity and provide resources to meaningfully engage in EIA

Authorities and proponents, with their consultants, should be trained to work with Arctic communities.

Authorities and proponents should increase the capacity and resources of communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

.....

4

Allow EIA to influence project design and decision-making process

Engagement with communities, their views and the inclusion of complementary knowledge should be well documented and influence in a transparent manner project design choices and the final decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS

.....

5

Strengthen circumpolar cooperation on transboundary EIA

- Apply the principles of the UNECE Espoo Convention.
- Draft agreements or Memorandums of Understanding to guide transboundary processes.
- Strengthen cooperation under the Espoo Convention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Before the formal EIA process officially starts



*It's about building a relationship with people.
You are not going to get our actual opinions if you don't
have a relationship, if you don't have trust.*

MODELS

Models for Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples

- *Indigenous-led Impact Assessment*
- *Indigenous Knowledge-based Impact Assessment*
- *Specific Impact Assessments*
- *Collaborative Mitigation*



MODELS

.....

Indigenous-led Impact Assessment

Indigenous-led impact assessment provides Indigenous oversight of a planned project's EIA. It is an approach where the impact assessment is driven by Indigenous Peoples' needs for information, priorities, worldview, and custom.

MODELS

.....

Indigenous Knowledge-based Impact Assessment

An approach that can secure the use of Indigenous knowledge in decision-making processes and allows Indigenous Peoples to assess impacts on their language, culture and traditional livelihoods.

MODELS

.....

Specific Impact Assessments

Health impact assessment (HIA) is an approach for estimating the potential impacts of proposed projects specifically on health and well-being of inhabitants.

Ethnological expertise is a model that can be carried out in places where projects can impact on Indigenous Peoples' traditional lands and socio-cultural situations.

Cumulative impact assessment means the overall impacts that are likely to result from a designated project in combination with other projects.

MODELS

.....

Collaborative Mitigation

Collaborative mitigation aims not only to mitigate risks but also to maximize the benefits of affected Indigenous communities.

The collaborative process and involvement of Indigenous Peoples are intended to ensure that mitigation measures take into a consideration Indigenous concerns.

Build internal capacity and provide resources to meaningfully engage in EIA

- Authorities and proponents, with their consultants, should be trained to work with Arctic communities.
- Authorities and proponents should increase the capacity and resources of communities.



ARCTIC EIA ORGANISATION

Project leader: **Seija Rantakallio**, Ministry of the Environment, FINLAND
Project coordinator: **Päivi A. Karvinen**, Ministry of the Environment, FINLAND

Editorial Group

CANADA: **Kim Pawley**, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada | Alternate: **James Neary**

KINGDOM OF DENMARK: **Ole Geertz-Hansen**, Greenland Institute of Natural Resources

SWEDEN: **Egon Enocksson**, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

UNITED STATES: **Edward A. Boling**, Council on Environmental Quality

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: **Marina V. Nenasheva**, Northern Arctic Federal University at Arkhangelsk | Alternate: **Alexander Saburov**

NORWAY: **Fredrik Juell Theisen**, Ministry for Climate and the Environment

ICELAND: **Jakob Gunnarsson**, National Planning Agency

FINLAND: **Timo Jokelainen**, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment for Lapland | Alternate: **Eira Luokkanen**

INUIT CIRCUMPOLAR COUNCIL (ICC):
Vernae Angnaboogok | Alternate: **Parnuna Egede Dahl**

SAAMI COUNCIL: **Gunn-Britt Retter**

GWICH'IN COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL: **Adam Chamberlain**

ALEUT INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION: **Liza Mack**

ARCTIC ATHABASKAN COUNCIL: **Cindy Dickson**

RUSSIAN ASSOCIATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES OF THE NORTH:
Sergey Sizonenko

ARCTIC ECONOMIC COUNCIL: **Kjerstin Skeidsvoll Lange**

Assisting the Arctic EIA project:
ARCTIC CENTRE, UNIVERSITY OF LAPLAND: **Pamela Lesser**

Steering Committee

FINLAND: **Seija Rantakallio & Päivi A. Karvinen**,
Ministry of the Environment

CANADA: **Sarah Cox & Jyoti Bhargava**,
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada

KINGDOM OF DENMARK: **Ole Geertz-Hansen**, Greenland Institute of Natural Resources

GWICH'IN COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL: **Sara French**

Find the report:
www.sdwg.org

THANK YOU!



© Kaisa Sirén

