****

**Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in Marine Activities**

Part II Report

Findings for Policy Makers

September 4, 2018**Table of Contents**

1. Executive Summary for Policy Makers 3 Introduction 3

What is Meaningful Engagement? 3

Good Practices 5

Lessons Learned 6

Next Steps 7

1. Introduction 8
2. Purpose 9
3. Supporting Documents and Resources 9
4. What is Meaningful Engagement? 11
5. Context 12

5.1 How can we produce new and better knowledge in and about the Arctic 12

5.2 How to build mutually beneficial research relationships 17

5.3 Understanding Tlingit knowledge and collaboration experiences with

Coastal Tlingit Elders 17

5.4 The Chief knows what he has to do. 19

5.5 Meaningful Engagement from Outside the Arctic Indigenous Community 21

1. Underpinning Analyses 25

6.1 Phase I October 2016 26

6.2 Phase II March 2018 26

6.3 The Analysis Used 27

1. Findings 28

7.1 Concepts, Elements and Foundational Components 28

7.11 Foundational Components and Elements of Engagement 31

7.2 Approaches to Engagement by Different Actors 33

7.2.1 Stages of Engagement 35

7.2.2 Sectors 36

8. Arctic Council’s Approach to Engagement 40

9. Good Practices 46

9.1 Pre-engagement 46

9.1.1 Beginning the Process 46

9.1.2 Issues, Factors, Participants 47

9.1.3 Legal and Established Practices 47

9.1.4 Participation in Engagement 47

9.2 Communication 48

9.3 Stage of Engagement 49

9.4 Supportive Measures 50

9.4.1 Record Keeping 50

9.4.2 Review of Processes 50

9.5 Dispute resolution mechanism 51

10. Lessons Learned 51

11. Conclusions 51

12. Next Steps 52

13. Bibliography 53

**Executive Summary for Policy Makers**

**Introduction**

Indigenous Peoples and local communities located in Arctic coastal areas depend on the sea for food, transportation, and for cultural and spiritual identity and social well-being. Industrial activities, marine management regimes, scientific research, shipping, emergency response and tourism in Arctic marine and coastal areas have impacts on these people, and it is vital that they are involved and engaged in a meaningful way to benefit and mitigate negative consequences of such activities. The Arctic Council has provided recommendations and guidance on how government and industry can engage Indigenous Peoples and local communities. In addition, local communities, indigenous organizations, industry and governments have also provided guidance and rules. However, these are spread across Arctic Council working groups, various sectors, reports, governments and other documents, and present a variety of perspectives.

Compiling and examining existing information on requirements, guidance or recommendations for engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in marine activities can help identify principles, processes, and mechanisms for achieving meaningful engagement. The audience for this Arctic Council report is the Arctic Council itself, governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, industry, NGOs, and academics. The hope is that this report will help readers find ways to improve relationships and interactions with Indigenous Peoples and local communities who are most affected by their maritime decisions, actions and activities.

**What is Meaningful Engagement?**

The term “meaningful engagement” has no single definition and does not have a “one size fits all” approach for all activities. It is understood to include a range of practices by government, industry and other actors seeking to operate in the Arctic region. What is considered meaningful engagement can be a matter of perspective by different entities.

An engagement approach can be considered meaningful if it achieves the purposes for which the engagement is initiated. The purposes of engagement should be determined prior to the engagement, and that they are done so in partnership. It is important that both sides – those engaging and those being engaged – feel that engagement has been meaningful.

Meaningful engagement can be shown by respect for culture and values, inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge, or recognition of the need for sustainable development. What is needed for meaningful engagement to be achieved is based on various factors such as the actors being engaged, culture, temporal and spatial scales of the project and communities impacted, the location of communities, and the nature of a proposed activity.

It can also be understood as a requirement or obligation to be fulfilled as part of a project or activity. Legislation, treaties, land claim agreements, and other regulations in Arctic countries can place an obligation on governments to engage with Indigenous People and local communities. The legal basis for engagement can include rights of indigenous participation in decision-making, to be consulted, rights to self-government and government-to-government engagement. These laws place minimum requirements on governments to engage and should serve as a basis when determining an appropriate approach to engagement.

Ultimately what constitutes meaningful engagement is determined by the Indigenous communities that are being engaged. Indigenous tribes in the Bering Strait region have described it as, “an ongoing and meaningful relationship between tribes and a federal agency that has the mutual objective of collaboration and should not be issue-based, it should be a relationship that is maintained even where no major issues of contention arise”.



**Good Practices**

A review of the approaches to engagement outlined in the documents have highlighted practices that governments, industry sectors, and other actors are currently using to engage with Indigenous People and local communities.

These practices will vary according to the circumstances surrounding the proposed activity, plans and/or policy.. These approaches have been used to determine good practices outlined below. Good practices for meaningful engagement can be applied within any sector or activity to meet the context of the situation.

Summary of Good Practices for Meaningful Engagement

* Identify the issues and factors requiring engagement and which issues/factors require engagement strategies to be established.
* Identify potentially affected participants and those with whom to engage.
* Consider legal obligations for how to engage, if applicable.
* Consider cultural differences, location of community, and resources available.

### Employ mechanisms for engagement by use of multiple strategies and early and proactive engagement at all levels.

### Develop an engagement plan or agreement, and report back to the community.

* Identify how best to communicate with Indigenous people and local communities.
* Identify the appropriate time to begin any engagement and the processes of engagement over the lifetime of an activity.
* Establish supportive measures includingrecord keeping, review of processes, and dispute resolution mechanisms, as appropriate..
* The relationship between actors and Indigenous peoples based on trust and respect, and conducted in a transparent and culturally appropriate manner.

**Lessons Learned**

The MEMA workshop found that making mistakes trying to practice meaningful engagement should be considered a learning process. Some key lessons learned from this project can be summarized as follows:

General

1. There is no single approach to meaningful engagement; it is a contextual process.
2. Consider outlining what is meant by a meaningful role for all actors.

Relationship Development

1. Understanding communities and indigenous culture, heritage and traditions is essential for meaningful for engagement.
2. Relationship building and engagement should be ongoing in order to be meaningful.
3. Collaboration and coordination among partners, including those that do not normally communicate directly with one another, builds relationships and communication. .
4. Develop capacity in communities through the provision of education, training, infrastructure, and funding.
5. Efforts should be taken to incorporate and apply Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge through engagement approaches.
6. Develop a foundation of trust that create clarity, certainty, and reliability through constructive dialogue and by including time for events and activities not directly related to issues.

Process

1. Planning for engagement while being flexible with the process can lead to outcomes that are more fruitful.
2. Engagement processes should aim to balance interests and achieve positive outcomes for all partners.
3. Aim for equal representation on advisory councils and decision-making boards.

**Next Steps**



The review of recommendations and guidance by the Arctic Council reveals that the Council generally has recommendations for meaningful engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and along with clear statements for involving the Permanent Participants. However, one challenge with these recommendations and guidance is that they are found within many documents and present a variety of perspectives.

The review of documents from all sectors identifies certain practices or elements of meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities that the Arctic Council may find useful in its work.

The review of documents from all sectors identifies certain practices or elements of meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities that the Arctic Council might consider for examination and possible addition to its body of guidance.

This final report and the supporting documents can be used by the Arctic Council for guidance and, if decided, in possible follow-up project(s) to update and expand existing guidance, identify areas where additional guidance may be needed, or as a value-added resource for other projects focused on engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

The Arctic Council could be a forum for discussions on good engagement practices. The Arctic Council working groups can consider developing templates that outline protocols for effective engagement and the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge in the work of the Council. These templates might also be useful for other actors who wish to pursue more meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The Arctic Council can consider synthesizing and outlining current practices of engagement as a way to encourage engagement practices around what has already been established, taking into account local conditions and cultural practices. The Arctic Council could consider defining broad elements of engagement as communities are developing their own protocols. From this, a “reference guide” on how to engage could be considered to assist meaningful engagement.

**Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in Marine Activities**

Part II Report

**Findings**

**1.0 Introduction**

Indigenous Peoples and local communities located in Arctic coastal areas depend on the sea for food, transportation, and for cultural and spiritual identity and social well-being. Industrial activities, marine management regimes, scientific research, shipping, and tourism in Arctic marine and coastal areas have impacts on these people, and it is vital that they are involved and engaged in a meaningful way to benefit from, and mitigate negative consequences of, such activities. The Arctic Council has provided recommendations and guidance on how government and industry can engage Indigenous Peoples and local communities[[1]](#footnote-2). In addition, local communities, indigenous organizations, industry, and governments have also provided guidance and rules. However, these are spread across Arctic Council working groups, various sectors, reports, governments and other documents and present a variety of perspectives.

Compiling existing information on requirements, guidance or recommendations for engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in marine activities can help identify principles, processes, and mechanisms for achieving meaningful engagement. The audience for this report is the Arctic Council, governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, industry, NGOs, and academics. The hope is that this report will help readers find ways to improve relationships and interactions with Indigenous Peoples and local communities who are most affected by their maritime decisions, actions and activities. This report, supporting documents, and the information database will potentially serve as useful sources of information and as resources for other Arctic Council projects.

This report starts with context section written by guest authors on the importance of meaningful engagement. These authors describe the importance of meaningful engagement from indigenous and project proponent points of view. The report then goes through a summary of the methodological approaches used by the researchers. A summary of the findings from the analyses of existing public sources on engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities for marine activities is presented. Next, the report provides a comparison of practices used by all sources—governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, industry, United Nations bodies and NGO/academia—with recommendations and guidance by the Arctic Council. Finally, a set of good practices and lessons learned are listed.

Previous Arctic Council documents have recognized engagement of Indigenous Peoples as an important issue. The MEMA Part I report analyses the recommendations and guidance on engagement of Permanent Participants from Arctic Council reports and declarations[[2]](#footnote-3)

**2.0 Purpose**

The purpose of this project is to take stock of existing practices for engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in marine activities and perform analyses by source of the information, sector of activity and stages of engagement. To accomplish these tasks, existing requirements, recommendations, guidance, policy statements and protocols for engagement were compiled into a database and analyzed. Documents were drawn from publicly available sources, including the Arctic Council, Arctic governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, industry, academia, Non-Governmental Organizations, and the United Nations. The analysis of the database has highlighted the recommendations/policy of the Arctic Council[[3]](#footnote-4) and helped to identify some common approaches /good practices for meaningful engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Although this project primarily focuses on marine activities there are documents within the database which are more broadly applicable (for example fresh water and land) to engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

This final report and supporting documents could be used by the Arctic Council, if decided, in a possible follow-up project(s) for updating its existing guidance.

**3.0 Supporting Documents and Resources**

This report is supported by an informational database, a workshop and several analytical background documents. Key documents and resources include;

* MEMA Informational Database. The database consists of documents contributed to the project by the Arctic States, Permanent Participants, project leads, and others. The MEMA database contains information on each entry, including its name, date, author, a summary, and key words among other things. The MEMA database is interactive and it is a living updatable file. It is suggested that the reader visit this valuable resource at (location to be confirmed).
* Background Document on Engagement with Indigenous Peoples for MEMA workshop (September 17, 2016)[[4]](#footnote-5).A background document was prepared by researcher Layla Hughes. This report contains a discussion of the meaning and benefits of meaningful engagement and interpreted information on the legal obligations and common good practices for engagement. 52 pages. (location to be confirmed)
* Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Communities in Marine Activities (MEMA) – Workshop Report[[5]](#footnote-6), Elizabeth Edmondson, September 17, 2016, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine. Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment Working Group. This report summarizes the MEMA workshop including presentations and discussions as well as conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. It is recommended that the reader read this summary to gain insight into the perspectives of a variety of actors. (location to be confirmed)
* Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in Marine Activities Part I Report – Arctic Council and Indigenous Engagement: A Review[[6]](#footnote-7), Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment Working Group of the Arctic Council May, 2017. This report to the Ministers contains a breakdown and analysis of Arctic Council recommendations and guidance on engagement of Permanent Participants and Indigenous Peoples. (location to be confirmed)
* Annex 3 MEMA Part I Report, May 2017[[7]](#footnote-8). This Annex contains all of the recommendations and guidance on engagement of Permanent Participants and Indigenous Peoples from 11 Ministerial Declarations and 18 Arctic Council documents.
* Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in Marine Activities (location to be confirmed).
* Information Database Analysis Phase I Narrative Summary[[8]](#footnote-9). Elizabeth Edmondson, Dalhousie University Halifax, Nova Scotia, October 2016, Prepared for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment Working Group of the Arctic Council. This report summarizes the analysis 370 documents from the Arctic Council, governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, industry, NGO/academia, and the United Nations. It is recommended that if the reader has any questions that they consult this report. (location to be confirmed)
* Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in Marine Activities:Phase 2 Analysis[[9]](#footnote-10)--Report to the PAME Working Group of the Arctic Council. Brendan Boyd, Jessie Arthur, and Jennifer Winter, School of Public Policy, University of Calgary March 2018. This report summarizes the analysis 240 documents from the Arctic Council, governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and industry. It is recommended that if the reader has any questions that they consult this report. (location to be confirmed)

**4.0 What is Meaningful Engagement?**

The term “meaningful engagement” has no single definition and does not have a “one size fits all” approach for all activities. It is understood to include a range of practices by government, industry and other actors seeking to operate in the Arctic region. What is considered meaningful engagement can be a matter of perspective by different entities.

An engagement approach can be considered meaningful if it achieves the purposes for which the engagement is initiated[[10]](#footnote-11). The purposes of engagement should be determined prior to the engagement, and that they are done so in partnership. It is important that both sides – those engaging and those being engaged – feel that engagement has been meaningful.

Meaningful engagement can be shown by respect for culture and values, inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge, or recognition of the need for sustainable development[[1]](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "m_-2925392748694064238__ftn1" \o "). What is needed for meaningful engagement to be achieved is based on various factors such as the actors being engaged, culture, temporal and spatial scales of the project and communities impacted, the location of communities, and the nature of a proposed activity.

It can also be understood as a requirement or obligation to be fulfilled as part of a project or activity. Legislation, treaties, land claim agreements, and other regulations in Arctic countries can place an obligation on governments to engage with Indigenous People and local communities. The legal basis for engagement can include rights of indigenous participation in decision-making[[11]](#footnote-12), to be consulted[[12]](#footnote-13), rights to self-government[[13]](#footnote-14) and government-to-government engagement[[14]](#footnote-15). These laws place minimum requirements on governments to engage and should serve as a basis when determining an appropriate approach to engagement.

Ultimately what constitutes meaningful engagement is determined by the Indigenous communities that are being engaged. Indigenous tribes in the Bering Strait region have described it as, “an ongoing and meaningful relationship between tribes and a federal agency that has the mutual objective of collaboration and should not be issue-based, it should be a relationship that is maintained even where no major issues of contention arise[[15]](#footnote-16)”.

**5.0 Context**

This section showcases first person accounts by individual authors of how engagement has been initiated in the Arctic region. It illustrates how engagement and collaboration can be beneficial to Indigenous Peoples and local communities, as well as to those conducting projects and research. The following sections are for setting the context for the analysis and reflect the experience of the authors. These accounts reveal that there are multiple ways to bring people together to exchange thoughts, ideas, and perspectives. This section begins with a discussion by Lene Holm, a researcher and project leader in Greenland, who outlines key components in successful engagement and co-production of knowledge. Next, a narrative about collaboration in Greenland from scholar Heather Gordon, who wrote her Master’s thesis about engaging Indigenous communities. Gordon’s experience with the Inuit of Greenland is a great illustration of the relationships that are established within the communities, as well as the importance of reciprocating back to that community and showing that their time and participation are truly appreciated. These are followed by a description of a project that took place in Alaska with the Gwich’in people, written by Dr. Norma Shorty. Again, the collaboration is presented as an important building block in the engagement of an Indigenous community. Dr. Liza Mack, from the University of Alaska Fairbanks and the Interim Executive Director of Aleut International Association (AIA), who serves as the AIA Head of Delegation to the Sustainable Development Working Group, offers a dialogue about Aleuts and the complexities and the social capital required to be involved at these multiple levels of governance and collaboration. It is finished with a dialogue given by Henry Huntington, a researcher with an extensive background working with and for Indigenous communities.

**5.1 Lene Holm, Greenland**

Lene Holm is from Kalaallit Nunaat and works as researcher and project leader at the Greenland Climate Research Centre; she is based at Pinr gnrtitaleriffik, Greenland Institute of Natural Resources. During her keynote address to the May 31 – June 2, 2016 Arctic Horizon’s group workshop she addressed the question, “How can we produce new and better knowledge in and about the Arctic.” Here are the ten concepts and ideas she presented:

*Language*

Linguistic skills are of great importance for constructive and inclusive collaboration. Not only in order to have conversations with community members, but also in order to understand their universe and their understanding of their environment, whether it is about how they perceive their own existential questions, but also in accordance with where they are (dialects and local conditions) and what they are making a living from, i.e. fishermen; what fish? Hunters; what prey? Farmers; farming what?

*In-situ sensors: People who are actually living there*

Recognize that we have Indigenous Knowledge and our Indigenous Knowledge has monitoring methodologies. Understanding our way of seeing the world and our language helps you to begin to understand that our knowledge is systematic and brings together different pieces of our environment. This is what we need; scientists need to bring natural and social science together. Indigenous Knowledge can help scientists learn how to do that.

*Knowledge co-production through Inter- and transdisciplinary research*

Integrating an inter-disciplinary approach within natural and social scientific research and Indigenous Knowledge for policy development in the 21st century is of immense importance to global issues. Here the views of the Indigenous Peoples can and will have a key role, and the world cannot turn a blind eye.

Collaboration is not only about information sharing, it is about a process that allows us to share knowledge. The concept of knowledge co-production will have great importance to the future results of research. To reach this we need to, "Develop capacity building for, and educate people about, co-production of an approach that builds equitable and collaborative research partnerships from different ways of knowing[[16]](#footnote-17)."

In the past few years there has been a movement away from the concept of Traditional Ecological/Environmental Knowledge (TEK) and work has been done to introduce a better concept, illustrating the knowledge of Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic in a more flexible and understandable way. This will, in my opinion and from my own experience, lead to a smoother way of building collaborations among different ways of knowing, i.e. the Western way of Science and Arctic Indigenous Knowledge. The inclusion of the insightful knowledge and wisdom that our people have about the environment of the Arctic will not only benefit the scientific research done in and about the Arctic, but also benefit the peoples of the Arctic.

**"Allaannginnami Sila Assallatseq"**

(The Sila, the mind has twisted! Meaning also the Sila, the outdoors has twisted!)

**– Henrik Enoksen, Narsarmijit**

In the joint statement from the recent U.S. - Nordic Leaders' Summit[[17]](#footnote-18), it speaks about the Arctic: *"We are committed to deepen the knowledge and understanding of the Arctic, both inside and outside of the region, to strengthen Arctic research and transdisciplinary science, and encourage cooperation between higher education institutions and society as well as synergies between science and traditional and local knowledge."*

**"Tassami allanngoriarterneq, soorlu sarfap ilummut kuuttorsuasiip kinginerisaanik aalisagaarannguaninngaaniik aalisagakuluunut tamakkiivillitik qaangijikkaluarput. Soorlu aalisagarpassuasiit taagersinnaavarput; Saarillinninngaaniik, kigitillit, nataarnat, suluppaakkat, qalerallit, ammassat, ammassassivit, kanassit, tamakku soorlu uukkatl"**

(Yes the changes, like when the current changed direction, going from the ocean inwards land, all our fishes, from the smallest ones to the biggest ones, disappeared. The fish species of question are; Cod, Wolf fish, Halibut, Redfish, Greenland Halibut, Capelin, Herring, Sculpin and Polar cod.)

**– Henrik Enoksen, Narsarmijit**

**"Tassa tamakku allannguutit iniip malersugai qangaaniilli, salami ... malersorlugu aamma naleqartarput tamarmik!"**

(These changes are what the human beings have been following from times past, and following the Sila has a crucial effect on being human.)

**– Henrik Enoksen, Narsarmijit**

*Paradigm Shift*

To see our knowledge as equitable to science requires trust, relationship building, and capacity building, allowing for multiple directions and overall a paradigm shift in how we are monitoring, how we are doing research, and how we are working together.

*Education and training of researchers and communities*

The key here is not translating one type of knowledge into the other. Both knowledge systems have to be respected for what they are and they must be considered equal for obtaining the best results. It is important to have both knowledge holders in the process from conception through to analysis and output. Not all research will need both Indigenous Knowledge and science. The dissemination of the scientific results will always have utmost importance for the Arctic residents in their thriving for understanding the environmental changes happening in their regions.

*Two or multiple ways of capacity building*

Both the non-conventionally educated, for example, hunters, fishermen, and others with knowledge unique to Indigenous Peoples conventionally educated academics, will have to rethink their way of understanding the entities surrounding them. I think this will have much more powerful results than what we have today. This of course will have implications of how we conduct research today, but again I think that is the only way to proceed. We have to include children and youth, by showing good examples of how to do community-based research. They have to be 'reintroduced' to their own culture, since this is a necessity for the survival of our peoples. Here, all of us, as researchers, scientists, policy makers, developers/businesses, funders and educational institutions, have a responsibility to help. We have the resources and knowledge that can help make these endeavors a success.

*Human relationships in research*

Consultation is important, but engaging with communities prior to even writing a research proposal is vital to the research process. Community members need to be research partners and feel they have part ownership of the project - they must be able to discuss research topics and issues and contribute to the formulation of research questions.

For more people to benefit from science, it is also very important to consult with communities when choosing parameters for what to measure. Today, we often see that inappropriate choices of parameters are making the beneficiary of research very limited, many times only to the research and not to the communities. Often such research has been developed within some very narrow entities, where, when the communities find out what it is all about, are told that the researchers would have the same results, maybe even better, if they had been consulted, and would have been to the benefit for the community as well. Many times research, especially in the Arctic, is to a great extent, cost and resource consumptive. If we can turn this trend into multiple beneficiary research, that would make the results better and create sustainable programs. We have throughout modern history been lending our environment to the humanity, through giving researchers freedom to do whatever they find interesting, for free. We have reached a point where this has to be turned into multi-beneficiary research including the communities.

Many communities have their own research priorities, and many are interested in conducting their own research projects independently - there are communities that are interested and well able to do this (on all kinds of topics). There needs to be funding to communities directly for these kinds of efforts - funding directly to communities without putting conditions on them or tying them to someone else's research agenda. Many communities want to have ownership and leadership of the research process, in other words to conduct their own research process (decolonizing science).

*Coproduction and Community-based research*

The measuring of a fiord, for example, by oceanographers and the locals, would be a good platform for a coproduction of knowledge, since locals are making a living from hunting and fishing the resources and since they have knowledge about the system (holistically) that has been handed to them through generations. The Inuit living in these places know a lot about the weather conditions, the ice conditions, the currents in the area, the cycles of the animals, the contents of the stomachs of the animals they catch, the tastes of the meat according to where and when these have been caught, just to mention a few things.

Community-based research works best when community members have a major role in the actual work that produces the data and when they apply the results of that research in everyday contexts. Community-based research is not simply a matter of scientists employing local people to help them transport equipment or work as research assistants! Community-based research requires an element of capacity building in terms of local training and guided by the community leaders.

*Sustaining community based research*

Community-based research needs to be sustained on a long-term basis. Research projects have a specific period of funding, but community needs often extend beyond the lifetime of a project.

Information and data needs to be accessible to communities, put in a way in accordance to their culture, to address different questions and issues. Nevertheless, they also have to know how it is being used outside of their community.

*Free prior and informed consent*

For me a true community-based research is the one using free, prior and informed consent. Free, since the community always has the right to say no. In accordance with the international rights that Indigenous Peoples have achieved, through hard work and international cooperation amongst Indigenous and governmental institutions and states. The plans for the research have to be announced to the right institutions of the communities, prior to the initiation of such a research project, in order for them to take part on an equal basis, with those that want to do research in the areas of the communities in question. Last, but not least, it has to be on an informed consent approach. Informed means that the community has all the given information they need in order for them to make an informed decision. This includes how information gathered will be used, stored and what it will be used for. The community in question has the right to approve such plans, since they will be the ones that will have the right to review the plans and the results, in accordance with the before mentioned internationally achieved rights.

This is a good reason to have regional protocols, so that communities can define what free, prior, and informed consent will mean for them. At the U.S. - Nordic Leaders' Summit it was stated: *''The United States and the Nordic countries are committed to recognizing the rights of the Indigenous and local peoples and we reaffirm our commitment to the unique role played by Arctic Indigenous and local communities and their traditional and local knowledge[[18]](#footnote-19)."*

**5.2 Heather Gordon, Greenland**

Heather Gordon, an Indigenous Studies PhD student at University of Alaska Fairbanks, interviewed North American researchers and Inuit Greenlanders about how to build mutually beneficial research relationships for her Master’s research at the University of Wisconsin. Trust was a key component of her findings. Here is Heather’s discussion about trust:

“Both the researchers and Greenlanders spoke of a research relationship needing trust. I realized that the vital question to address was, “how can researchers build trust with the community they are working in?” Through interviews and focus groups, key elements emerged as to what researchers can do to build trust with community members. Researchers need to: know community culture and history prior to visiting the community, display proper etiquette by acting with honesty and reciprocity toward community members, act ethically within the culture of the community, exchange knowledge with the community to build social capital, and give back project results in a manner to be understood by the community and put to practical use. These actions, according to the Inuit Greenlanders and North American researchers I interviewed, build trust.

One experience I had in Greenland exemplifies trust building through reciprocity with community members. Even though it was unrelated to my project, I built stronger relationships with some elder community members. I attended the community choir whenever I could; it included some of my interviewees, but was mostly people I had not interviewed. Greenlandic is a phonetic language, so even though I could not speak it, I could sound out the words and sing it.

The accompaniment is often an accordion, not quite a traditional instrument but brought with colonialism. I cannot remember if the choir asked me, or if I asked them, if they would want to be recorded so I could make CDs of their music for them. Regardless, I recorded one of the choir practices and took a picture of the whole group. After I got home to Wisconsin, I edited the sound, separating the songs into separate tracks. I made CDs and made copies of the picture I had taken of the choir and mailed it all to Greenland where my community contact handed them out. Getting the opportunity to give back to the community that supported me through my work was fulfilling and enriching.”

**5.3 Norma Shorty, Canada**

Dr. Norma Shorty works with a community of Tlingit and has focused efforts on understanding Tlingit knowledge and collaboration experiences with Coastal Tlingit Elders.

“I work with 30 Tlingit coastal elders towards articulating Tlingit knowledge on Tlingit history, literacy, stories, language, ceremonies, thinking, medicines, foods and values such as perseverance, balance, and respect. These discussions are ultimately led by Tlingit thinking on Tlingit learning and teaching methods, Tlingit philosophies and so much more.

With respect to research engagement, it is the elders who lead our discussions and the course that our discussions will take.

As the facilitator and professional researcher, it is my responsibility to ensure that Indigenous Peoples remain at the center of research paradigms. What is meaningful community engagement? What is Indigenous led research?

* The topic is discussed with a Tlingit lens; the depth, the meaning, the stories, the applied philosophies, the Tlingit language is represented in its entirety.
* Elders together discuss the topics, how the topics are understood.
* Our shared and respected histories are key.
* There is a person taking minutes.
* Elders agree with the articulation of their meeting minutes (a work in progress).
* Elders agree with the curriculum framework in discussion.
* Meetings are video recorded and archived.
* Curriculum frameworks are developed.

Our first curriculum topics include the boarding school experiences of local elders due to the broader social implications of healing ourselves through our Tlingit language and culture. Out of the boarding school topics grew a contact and colonization timeline, which articulated how we thought about ourselves as Tlingit people, *“Before the great floods we had already been through a lot”*[[19]](#footnote-20).

Broader social impacts are experienced at curriculum development tables at the local school district levels, including professional development and our teacher training institution[[20]](#footnote-21). Elders together see themselves as teachers and agree that Tlingit subject matter needs to be taught by Tlingit people[[21]](#footnote-22). In this model, there is balance infused into the teaching world. Western worldview and Tlingit worldview are allowed to stand together side by side[[22]](#footnote-23).

Our next curriculum round table will have an emphasis on Haa Kusteeyi (Our Tlingit Way of Life). How Western science is understood may be gleaned through broader discussions of food and food sovereignty[[23]](#footnote-24).”

**5.4 Liza Mack, United States (Alaska)**

***The Chief knows what he has to do.***

***Tukux maax matanakiim idaxtakux***

The Aleut people have lived and thrived in the dynamic region situated between the Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea for over ten thousand years. During this time, their culture and their societies have flourished and changed. In pre-contact times, the Aleut society was a structured one with a class system that included chiefs, commoners and slaves. The chiefs were knowledgeable and skilled. Today, there is no longer this class system, however, the Aleut leaders are still dynamic and skilled and working hard to see that the communities in the Aleutians are thriving.

When you talk about hunters, fishermen, or chiefs, in Nuugiim Tunuu, the Atkan dialect of the Unangam Tunuu, the Aleut Language you would say, *Tukux maax matanakiim idaxtakux,* or *“The chief knows what he has to do.”* He has to know about the weather and the presence or absence of animal species, he needs to understand the tides, and the terrain, and the tools at his disposal. This is the same today as it was in the past, except today he has to know even more than before. He or she needs to understand everything that they have traditionally known, and also be aware, or recognize and navigate, the political structures that are now in place that dictate how our people are allowed to hunt and fish. This includes, but is not limited to, knowing what the regulations are, what the bag limits are, what the boundaries are, and how to get the right permission to even participate in hunting and fishing activities. This is only the beginning of the process and doesn’t touch on the other roles they are required to fill at the same time.

In the Aleutians, as is the case in many Arctic communities, marine life is the center of the subsistence and cultural practices. Our societies were built on the oceans, the waterways, the tides and all of the beings within them. At one point in time, some of these societies were numbered in the tens of thousands, today; the population in our coastal communities is a fraction of this. However, the workload has not decreased; it has increased in Indigenous communities. Not only are the men and women living in their traditional lands still hunters and fishers, but they are also teachers, lawyers, politicians, businessmen, pilots, health professionals and government officials. The small populations often dictate that people play multiple roles within the communities. The person who is the maintenance man at the school is also often on the City Council and the Native Corporation Board, running a fishing boat and hunting and gathering for his family. The woman lobbying for funding to keep schools open, flying to and from Washington DC and Juneau, understands the importance of knowing who the senior senator on the appropriations committee is working with on legislation that could impact their communities. At the same time, they could be planning a traditional feast to entertain and feed hundreds of people while writing testimony about genetic studies of marine species and then discussing with states the management of those marine resources. Whatever is happening though, people want and need to be fully engaged in all pieces of a project. This engagement includes but is not limited to planning, implementation, and supervision of such projects. This will not look the same in each community, and it is up to those who are interested in pursuing the project to spend time learning about the community and having conversations about the goals of the project and what this could mean for the future of the region and of the resources. Obtaining a platform of understanding for all parties should be at the forefront of these conversations.

When we approach leaders in Arctic communities, acknowledgement that their time is valued and appreciated is necessary to properly engage with them. Every day, they are inundated with information; some of it useful and some of it not. Making sure prior to research and development that these activities will add value to the community can help to ensure that projects are headed in the right direction and involve the right people. Further, time and space are not defined in the same way as it is for Western societies, and value systems. The approaches to understanding the environment may not be familiar to the visitors seeking engagement. Being cognizant of this and the multiple roles people play in order to continue a traditional lifestyle while providing for the future of their communities is key to beginning the conversations that lead to fully engaging the people in the Aleutians and in the Arctic as a whole.

*Summary*

Some advice can be gleaned from these first person accounts. Meaningful engagement should begin at the onset of a project, allowing Indigenous Peoples the opportunity to have input and recognition prior to the start of the project. They should be contacted and included at every step of the project, ideally, at the very beginning of the planning process. The people seeking engagement should strive to understand the world view and the general customary practices of the people’s land they are trying to engage with. Finally, understanding that interactions throughout the Arctic will not be uniform across latitudes and each society and culture deserves time and attention that will reinforce good working relationships between the sectors highlighted in this document and the Indigenous communities affected by research and exploration. All who work or plan to work in the Arctic, should seek to invite Arctic communities to the table for all parts of a project, from the development of the project goals through to the end, with special attention to the time, effort, and resources needed to obtain a working rapport that works for all parties involved. It is hoped that these perspectives will encourage project leaders to initiate conversations with Indigenous Peoples.

**“Allaannginnami sila assallatseq”**

(The weather has twisted its mind. Let us "twist our minds" in order to understand the twisted mind of the weather. My hope is that we at last are reaching to the point, where we are thriving for the "twisting of our minds" into the direction for a sustained way of doing Arctic research, in regards of developing methodologies that fulfill the interests of all, be it the Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic and the Arctic scientific community.)

**Qujanaq!**

**5.5 Henry Huntington, USA**

**Meaningful Engagement from Outside the Arctic Indigenous Community**

Many people and organizations come to the Arctic, to provide services, to seek business opportunities, to develop policies, to conduct research, to explore, and more. Nearly all will interact in one way or another with Arctic communities and residents. This may be as simple as getting off an airplane in a remote community before continuing onwards, or it may be a long-term, multifaceted relationship affecting the community deeply. In all cases, basic politeness requires awareness of one’s influence and impact, and of local rules and expectations. In many cases, interactions with local institutions, leaders, and residents can be both necessary and beneficial for all concerned. This section looks at those interactions from the point of view of the visitor—the entrepreneur, the developer, the researcher, the adventurer—exploring what “meaningful engagement” can and should entail.

Unfortunately, attempts to engage communities or discuss what engagement means often lead to misunderstandings about the respective roles and rights of those involved, miscommunication about what is expected from each side, and frustration all around. This experience may cause some to conclude that community engagement is not worth the trouble or is best minimized if not actually avoided. These misgivings can be resolved with a better understanding of what is involved in community engagement, leading ideally to a shared vision for what is entailed and why. The following sections look at the reasons for seeking meaningful engagement, what meaningful engagement means, how meaningful engagement can be fostered, and finally some suggestions for action.

*Why seek meaningful engagement?*

The importance of meaningful engagement can be explained in three categories: respect, better information, and avoiding problems.

Nearly every travel guidebook contains a section on local customs and politeness. It is expected that visitors will make themselves familiar with at least the basic elements of local etiquette, to avoid giving offense and to show respect to their hosts. The same concept is true when engaging in activities that involve, in one way or another, one or more Arctic communities. This idea has been incorporated in various guidelines for ethical conduct, as well as international instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Those who are going to be affected by an action deserve and have the right to know what is planned and to have a say in whether and how that action happens. Few would dispute this in principle, but in practice, it can become complicated. Who needs to be engaged? At what point? Who has what authority with respect to any decisions? How does one know that “meaningful engagement” has been achieved?

Local residents are also likely to know their home region better than visitors. Engaging with communities can provide useful information to visitors, allowing them to avoid wasting time learning things that are already known or to operate more efficiently in the local area. There are many stories of operations gone wrong because of inattention to some detail, where a short conversation with a knowledgeable local resident might have avoided the problem entirely. Interactions with local residents may also help find ways to provide mutual benefit, for example by sharing logistics or by making connections between two efforts that were otherwise unaware of each other. If nothing else, a good interaction with local residents may help someone avoid becoming the next story about clueless visitors making elementary mistakes.

Meaningful engagement is not a one-time event, but the growth of a relationship. Few projects start smoothly and run their course with no snags or surprises. If the visitor-local relationship has a weak foundation, with limited communication and a lack of mutual understanding, it will not be surprising if the relationship cannot withstand a problem that arises partway through an activity. On the other hand, a strong relationship can establish mutual trust and communication, leading to a problem-solving approach when difficulties arise. Similarly, divergent expectations are likely to lead to feelings of betrayal and frustration, if the engagement has been superficial and has avoided digging into potential challenges. It is all too easy to interpret events to one’s liking. It is harder, but necessary, to make sure that the others who are involved understand things the same way.

*What does it mean to be meaningfully engaged?*

Meaningful engagement is hard to define with precision, as each instance will be different depending on the individuals involved and the activity being considered. It is tempting to say that one can recognize meaningful engagement when one sees it, but one side may believe they have achieved this standard at the same time that the other side thinks things are just beginning. Nonetheless, we can identify some characteristics of meaningful engagement that help show what should be expected and how one can recognize if one is on the right path.

Meaningful engagement is, at heart, a conversation. A conversation that can only include safe, easy topics does not suggest a robust relationship among equals, but instead an awkward interaction based on uncertainty, if not suspicion. A conversation that is open and honest, on the other hand, is a good sign that the relationship is based on mutual respect and a desire to understand each other’s point of view. Few people are likely to agree on everything, but it is important to acknowledge areas of disagreement and to decide if they are significant enough that they need to be resolved before further action is taken. Problems that cannot be resolved when the pressure is off are unlikely to reach a satisfactory outcome when everyone is under great stress, as may occur later in a project if difficult decisions are deferred. Establishing a way to communicate effectively is thus essential.

For any projects and activities lasting more than a brief period, meaningful engagement will include continuity. Even short-duration interactions can and should include a follow-up conversation, to share results or simply to say thank you. The relationships that are established at the beginning will continue, in one form or another, and are likely to evolve. It is difficult, if not pointless, to try to anticipate every possible scenario during the course of a project. Instead, changes and challenges must be dealt with as they arise. An on-going relationship is a good platform for resolving things. A relationship based only on the initial interactions and agreements is unlikely to have the depth and flexibility necessary to make adjustments easily. Thus, even if things are going smoothly, the opportunity to meet and discuss things is important to ensuring continuity and growth.

In any endeavor, it is important to know who is accountable for what. Meaningful engagement can only happen if accountability is shared. Does everyone deliver on promises? Does everyone complete work on time? Does everyone agree who is responsible for what? Does everyone agree on the consequences of failing to deliver as promised? If one side fails to do what the other has expected, it likely reveals either poor communication at the outset or a lack of commitment once things got underway. If there is not a sense of equality, in that both sides have responsibilities and are committed to meeting them, then it is difficult to see that meaningful engagement has been achieved. This is not to say that the responsibilities are identical, merely that both sides understand and agree to them, including the consequences of failure. Then everyone will know what they need to do to hold up their end of the arrangement, to make sure the plan that is agreed upon is followed.

Finally, quality and quantity should not be confused. Meaningful engagement is about quality—one “meaningful” interaction is likely to be worth far more than a dozen meaningless get-togethers. Most Arctic communities are small, and often there are a handful of individuals who bear most of the burden of engaging with visitors. Not surprisingly, these individuals often get tired of the demands placed on them, making it harder still to build a relationship and achieve meaningful engagement. At the same time, this is no excuse for failing to invest the necessary time and effort. Meaningful engagement needs to be planned carefully, so that it is indeed meaningful and does not simply become “multiple engagement,” something that is done just for the sake of appearances.

*How can meaningful engagement be fostered?*

As noted earlier, the basic rationale for and principles of meaningful engagement are unlikely to be controversial. The difficulty lies in putting them into practice. For the visitors, it can be difficult to understand how communities are organized, how they do business, and what they expect. This is not to place any blame on communities or their leaders and residents, but simply to acknowledge that a lot of learning is required, and that there are likely some steps that can help orient the visitors and create a more satisfactory process for everyone.

In any community or region, there are going to be multiple organizations with overlapping responsibilities and aims. Thus, “community engagement” should really be “community engagements.” It is not always clear which organizations play which roles in a given community, nor whether the various organizations at the community and regional levels work together effectively. It is thus important at the beginning to learn which organizations are active in the community or region, what each one is responsible for, and what each one expects. Here, communities themselves can provide a great service by providing clear information to visitors about what is expected. A one-size-fits-all approach is probably not very useful, given the wide range of projects, activities, and interactions that can be expected. The expectations for a multi-national corporation planning to operate in the area for decades should not be the same as for a researcher planning to take a few samples and continue onwards. Nonetheless, it should be possible to start with a basic information request from the community and work from there to determine what else will be needed.

In doing so, it is also important that community organizations are clear about their roles and responsibilities, and what the visitors are expecting from them. An organization that insists on being informed, but is unwilling or unable to respond in a timely manner or to attend scheduled meetings, is not fulfilling its part of meaningful engagement. While some allowance can be made for the way things are done in a community (e.g., meetings may be cancelled because key people are called away to other events), visitors should be able to expect timely responses and not have to make multiple trips to the community to hold a single meeting.

Responsiveness goes in both directions. Communities can and should expect the visitors to respond promptly and fully to requests for information, and that information should be provided in a form that is accessible to community leaders and residents. Thousand-page documents or detailed technical reports are unlikely to be effective ways of conveying information to non-specialists. Again, it can be a big help if community organizations can clearly state what they want and expect of the visitors, and even better if they can provide examples of things that have worked well in the past. No one is likely to get everything right the first try, and so it is important to build time into the process to make sure no one feels rushed or ill-informed. On the other hand, the process cannot be completely open-ended. Visitors usually need to make decisions, to live within their budgets, and to complete their work within a specified time. Understanding and accommodating local timelines is important, but a process that drags on with little way to measure progress is likely to be a waste of everyone’s time.

Good communication can help address many of these points. If someone does not know the answer, she or he should ask. If the community needs time to think or to develop the right way to respond, they should say so. In such situations, though, visitors should also be aware that in many cultures, it is rude to ask direct and confrontational questions, so indirect questions should be taken just as seriously as direct ones. If the visitor has a hard deadline or can only make a limited number of trips to the community, she or he should say so. If these limitations mean that one side or the other does not believe meaningful engagement has been achieved, they should say so, and then both sides can determine if there is a solution or if the project or activity should simply be canceled. A clear process can also help demonstrate to the next set of visitors what can be accomplished and how, so that meaningful engagement does not have to be invented anew each time.

*What do we do next?*

The concepts and practices of meaningful engagement are evolving. Communities, understandably, are expecting greater involvement even as they may struggle with the demands that such a role places on their time and capacity. Visitors who have sought to escape or minimize any kind of engagement are finding it harder to do so. Visitors who seek to do the right thing may still have trouble determining what that means and how it can be achieved within the constraints of budgets and timelines. Success is unlikely to be achieved by any one side working alone. Instead, it will take collaboration to try various approaches and to evaluate them together, according to criteria from both sides, and adjust for the next round. The development of meaningful engagement will be, like meaningful engagement itself, an ongoing conversation.

The first step, therefore, is to put our ideas into practice. Visitors can recognize their ethical and practical responsibilities. Local organizations can help spell out their roles and expectations. Then, everyone can share experiences, good and bad, so that all can learn. Learning, in turn, will only take place if we are willing to listen to one another and to adjust what we do and how we think about it. The cycle can repeat, with adjustments put into practice and evaluated, so that further improvements can be made. It is unlikely that a successful approach for now will remain the ideal way to do things forever. Evaluation and adjustment will continue to be appropriate as both the communities and the visitors grow and change.

In other words, meaningful engagement is not a formula or a recipe, but a process of interaction, a way of communication built on respect, openness, and accountability. It does not guarantee a particular outcome, but it should leave everyone with a clear understanding of what was decided and why, and of what will come next.

**6.0 Underpinning Analyses**

The analyses were done on an informational database compiled for the project. Although the MEMA database currently holds over 700 entries, it is by no means comprehensive. However, it is deemed representative of the existing approaches to engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The analyses occurred in two phases on two versions of the database. The first was done on the database when it contained 370 documents and the second phase was done on 240 additional entries.

**6.1 Phase I - October 2016**

The analyst reviewed 370 documents authored by governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, the Arctic Council, international organizations, industries, academia, and non-government organizations (NGOs) to determine the similarities and differences in approaches to engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities (Annex A[[24]](#footnote-25)).

The analysis used a qualitative grounded theory approach to code and categorize key words into concepts, elements and foundational components of meaningful engagement. The analysis focused primarily on engagement with Indigenous Peoples as most available information refers to Indigenous Peoples and their communities. The documents were sorted according to their applicability to either one of the following activities: marine management, scientific research, resource exploration and development, emergency preparedness/prevention/response, shipping and tourism or provided general commentary that applies across all activities. The reviewed documents included plans, guidelines, reports, papers, handouts, agreements, declarations, laws and policies. The reviewed documents were placed into a database, which provided the basis for developing the analysis.

These sources, stages of engagement, and sectors of activities were then cross-compared to show the practices used or recommended by each source, stage of engagement, and for each sector. The recommendations and guidance of the Arctic Council were compared to Governments, Industry, and Indigenous Peoples and local community’s practices, and to a lesser degree to NGO/Academic and International bodies of the United Nations.

This is by no means a complete review of all practices concerning engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The documents reviewed provide a snapshot of some efforts and practices. This analysis sheds light on approaches outlined by the Arctic Council as well as government, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and industry. Although “meaningful engagement” does not have a single definition, the approaches outlined by these sources have some shared or commonly referenced elements.

**6.2 Phase II - March 2018**

This analysis was on 240 additional (new) documents including 74 from Indigenous sources, especially from Russia, and 102 government documents, about half coming from international sources (Annex B[[25]](#footnote-26)). This analysis focused on Arctic Council, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, Industry and Government sources for a total 240 entries, but did not include advisory documents from NGO/Academics, of which 111 entries were excluded from the analysis. This analysis combined United Nations’ documents with national and regional government documents. The analysis did not breakdown these documents according to stages or sectors.

This analysis consisted of a scan of words done with a program that helped the researcher in coding keywords and major themes. The analysis contained three components. First, a word frequency query across the documents was conducted, and a list of the ten most frequent words within each actor category was created (see Annex B[[26]](#footnote-27) Table 3). Second, a search of the documents for incidences of the term “meaningful consultation” and related phrases was conducted. This allowed a determination of how often these particular terms were referenced and how they were defined, understood and used in the documents. Third, a thematic framework or codebook was developed by grouping the keywords from the Phase 1 analysis in to six broad themes (Annex B[[27]](#footnote-28), Table 2).

Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were employed to identify key components of meaningful engagement and commonalities and differences in approach to meaningful engagement. A thematic framework was developed with keywords that were categorized into six themes: Communication, Involvement, Development, Self-Government, Indigenous Knowledge, and Mechanisms Facilitating Engagement. For each theme and associated keywords, the percentage of sources and keyword frequency were analyzed and compared across the party categories. The qualitative part of the analyses used the results of the word frequency analysis and selected concepts or practices from the documents.

Although the themes and keywords did not directly correspond to the concepts, elements or foundational components used on the first analysis, the themes and related keywords were similar enough to make some correlations. The recommendations and guidance of the Arctic Council were compared to Governments, Industry, Indigenous Peoples and local communities practices to illustrate places where the Arctic Council could consider looking into adding some of the practices and guidance of these three sources.

**6.3 The Analysis Used**

While the methodology used in the Phase II analysis of the additional 240 documents is useful and informative, it was based on a different analytic method and a narrower scope than the methods used in the Phase I analysis of the 370 documents. This makes direct comparisons impossible between the two independent analyses. Therefore, this report used the Phase I analysis for the 370 documents and tried to make linkages between the two methods, taking into account the new data, where possible. Report authors also used the Phase I analysis to inventory and analyse inputs from all sources, including some NGO and academic sources, and to compare stages of engagement, and all sectors including general documents, marine management, scientific research, resource exploration and development, emergency prevention/preparedness/response, shipping, and tourism.

This analysis is provided to gain insight into ideas and concepts that outline engagement and provide a snapshot of current practices and existing recommendations by different sources and sectors. It does not represent an exhaustive review but can be considered in relation with the Phase II analysis and the outcomes of the workshop summary[[28]](#footnote-29) to provide a more comprehensive understanding of meaningful engagement. It is believed that this analysis of 370 documents presents a representative snapshot and that the analysis is a close approximation of the larger body of documents.

**7.0 Findings**

This section provides a general overview of the basic foundations of engagement identified in the in analysis of the literature in the database. A complete summary of the analysis is contained in Annex A[[29]](#footnote-30) to this report. Interested persons are urged to consult the report for more information on methodology, findings, and conclusions of the analysis.

In order to understand how meaningful engagement is described across the literature, a qualitative grounded theory approach was taken. A grounded theory approach allowed for concept connections to be made within the context of the data reviewed through an iterative process of analysis and coding words and phrases from the documents into concepts.

**7.1 Concepts, Elements and Foundational Components**

For each document in the database, a word search was conducted to identify whether or not it referred to any of the keywords. In addition, a qualitative search of concepts was completed to identify similar information to the keywords (Figure 1). These words can relate to concepts, elements, or foundational components of engagement. A list of major keywords was developed to highlight key elements and components that were used to describe meaningful engagement (Figure 2). The keyword analysis provides insight into terms and concepts that reflect engagement and that identify ideas that could be considered.



**Figure 1.** Frequency of keywords across all 370 documents reviewed.

Through further analysis of the documents, relationships between the concepts emerged giving rise to elements that encompass more than one concept (Figure 2). From analysis of these elements, certain key components were recognized as foundational for meaningful engagement (Figure 3).



**Figure 2.** Process of coding words and phrases, from words and phrases, to concepts, elements, and foundations.



**Figure 3.** An overview of the foundations influencing meaningful engagement. Each box is headed by foundational components and filled with elements of meaningful engagement. As denoted by arrows, communication is meant to be two-way between Indigenous Peoples and local communities and other actors.

**7.1.1 Foundational Components and Elements of Engagement**

The connections between components and elements were developed from the processes generating foundational components of meaningful engagement (Figure 3).

* Relationship-Building

# Relationships between Indigenous Peoples and local communities and other actors should include *collaboration* between actors*, participation* of all those who are being sought for engagement*, information sharing* that is balanced and reciprocal andactors are *involved* on an ongoing basis. In order to achieve these elements of a relationship, there should be equitable utilization of *Indigenous Knowledge* with Western knowledge.

* Qualities of Communication

Communication should be *culturally appropriate.* Consideration for language as well as other cultural differences can support inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge. It has been noted that the absence of cultural awareness can be one of the most significant factors affecting meaningful collaborations and public participation[[30]](#footnote-31).

Communication *transparency* through information sharing and ongoing involvement of all actors, will promote Indigenous Peoples and local communities informed decisions on whether or not to participate. *Respect* can be shown through collaboration, information sharing, and the equitable use of Indigenous Knowledge. *Trust* develops a relationship, requiring time and ongoing involvement among actors.

* Processes of Communication

The documents reviewed highlighted the following broad degrees of participation that can be used during engagement processes: *notification, informed, consultation* and *decision-making*.

* Available Support & Tools

Fostering relationships for the purposes of engagement require consideration of the *logistics* of engagement as well as the need for and available *resources*. Logistically, how and when engagement occurs, should reflect transparency, respect, and cultural appropriateness. In addition, whether communities have the available resources to engage and whether parties seeking to operate activities in the Arctic have the capacity to invest will influence the relationship and nature of engagement.

* Legal Obligations

Obligations for *government-to-government* engagement recognizes the right to self-government of Indigenous Peoples and may require more formal agreements. Legal obligations can trigger *consultation* processeswhere it has been identified that Indigenous rights are affected by government activities. This may influence a relationship as government can have a predetermined consultative process[[31]](#footnote-32). Legal obligations also place *accountability* on governments to engage by establishing a legislative process or threshold that triggers a government duty.

Where a right to *self-government* is recognized, Indigenous Peoples have the right to self-determination and the right to free, prior and informed consent, which includes the right to say “no”[[32]](#footnote-33)[[33]](#footnote-34).

As it is in the interest of all actors to develop effective processes and agreements that reflect shared interests, Indigenous Peoples have a reciprocal responsibility to participate in reasonable engagement processes[[34]](#footnote-35). To assist in developing relationships that result in meaningful engagement, Indigenous Peoples could outline potential adverse impacts on their rights and related interests, identify concerns, share relevant information and seek involvement in resolving issues in an attempt to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution[[35]](#footnote-36).

This conceptualization of meaningful engagement is not straightforward. What is considered ‘meaningful’ will be influenced by each of the elements outlined above, as well as the perspectives of parties attempting to engage. Ultimately, it is an Indigenous group’s perspective that can indicate to outside parties the engagement processes that are considered meaningful.

# 7.2 Approaches to Engagement by Different Actors

A review of current approaches and recommendations by the Arctic Council[[36]](#footnote-37), government, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, industry, the United Nations, non-government organizations, and academics, identifies how the various sources address engagement expressed as key words. Figure 4 provides a comparison of keywords across sources of documents, highlighting similarities and differences between sources.



Percent Keyword References by Sources of Literature
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**Figure 4**. Keyword comparison across sources. The sources, Arctic Council, Governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, Industry, Academic/NGOs, and UN Bodies, are color coded. The horizontal bars represent how often a keyword was mentioned, expressed as a percentage of all the references by the source.

**7.2.1 Stages of Engagement**

Reference to engagement across the stages of an activity or project were broken down by source group (see Table 1). This highlights where the discussion on engagement by source group is focused within the documents reviewed. This does not mean that engagement does not occur across other stages of an activity or project. This comparison can be used to show stages at which emphasis on engagement may be placed by certain actors.

The general stages that occur over the lifetime of a project or activity were identified. The documents were reviewed to identify the stages of a project or activity in which engagement is discussed. When engagement begins during the lifetime of an activity, plan, policy and/or research will depend on context. Regardless of the scenario, engaging as early as possible has been noted as preferable to allow for relationship-building, trust and respect to be developed.

In chronological order the stages identified are: pre-approval, planning, implementation, management, monitoring, and progress feedback. Generalized phases that can span across these stages include information gathering, throughout operations and dispute resolution. Not all activities or projects go through all stages identified.

**Table 1**. Stages of engagement breakdown by sources

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source**  **Stage** | **Arctic Council** | **Government** | **Indigenous People & Local Communities** | **Industry** | **Academic /NGO** | **United Nations Bodies** |
| Pre-approval | 0%  0 | 13.9%  45 | 2.7%  1 | 6.7%  2 | 5.8%  7 | 9%  2 |
| Planning | 25.3%  19 | 49.4%  160 | 18.9%  7 | 36.7%  11 | 20%  24 | 40.9%  9 |
| Implementation | 14.7%  11 | 7.7%  29 | 0%  0 | 3.3%  1 | 10%  12 | 9%  2 |
| Management | 6.7%  5 | 4.9%  16 | 24.3%  9 | 0%  0 | 7.5%  9 | 9%  2 |
| Monitoring | 24%  18 | 4.3%  14 | 2.7%  1 | 0%  0 | 16.7% 20 | 9%  2 |
| Progress feedback | 0%  0 | 1.5%  5 | 5.4%  2 | 3.3%  1 | 0%  0 | 9%  2 |
| Information gathering | 26.7%  20 | 8.6%  28 | 45.9%  17 | 13.3%  4 | 15.8%  19 | 13.6%  3 |
| Throughout operations | 2.7%  2 | 6.5%  21 | 0%  0 | 36.7%  11 | 5.8%  7 | 0%  0 |
| Dispute resolution | 0%  0 | 1.8%  6 | 0%  0 | 0%  0 | 0%  0 | 0%  0 |
| Total References | 75 | 324 | 37 | 30 | 120 | 22 |

A review of the source groups and a comparison identifies similar practices with the Arctic Council body of literature and where actors involved in on-the-ground engagement practices have developed different but effective practices.

**7.2.2 Sectors**

The documents were further categorized by sector of activity discussed in reference to engagement:

* General: Documents that discussed engagement without reference to a particular activity or practice. This includes laws, international conventions and principles, and Indigenous principles.
* Biodiversity & Ecosystem Management (Management): Activities in which government is seeking input on how to maintain species populations and environmental integrity. Within this includes management of fishing.
* Research: Processes, goals, timeframes, and techniques for collecting information.
* Resource Development: Natural resources such as oil and gas exploration and mining extraction.
* Prevention, Preparedness and Response (PPR): To natural incidents, oil spills and accidental releases of radionuclides that might threaten the living conditions for small communities in the Arctic.
* Shipping: Trans-shipping through the Arctic corridor, local shipping to and from Arctic ports. This can include support of resource development.
* Tourism: Tourist development and activities in the Arctic including cruise travel between ports and onshore activities.

The table below highlights the distribution of documents by source and sector of activity.

**Table 2.** Distribution of documents by source and sector of activity.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source**  **Sector**  **of Activity** | **Arctic Council** | **Governments** | **IPLC** | **Industry** | **Academic/NGO** | **UN Bodies** |
| **General** | 0%  0 | 35.4%  80 | 28.1%  9 | 0%  0 | 2.4%  1 | 66.7%  8 |
| **Management** | 13.5%  5 | 44.2%  100 | 25%  8 | 0%  0 | 24.4%  10 | 8.3%  1 |
| **Research** | 27%  10 | 3.5%  8 | 15.6%  5 | 4.5%  1 | 29.3%  12 | 8.3%  1 |
| **Resource Development** | 18.9%  7 | 12.4%  28 | 15.6%  5 | 54.5%  12 | 17.1%  7 | 8.3%  1 |
| **PPR** | 27%  10 | 3.5%  8 | 6.2%  2 | 0%  0 | 7.3%  3 | 8.3%  1 |
| **Response Shipping** | 10.8%  4 | 0.4%  1 | 9.4%  3 | 9.1%  2 | 12.2%  5 | 0%  0 |
| **Tourism** | 2.7%  1 | 0.4%  1 | 0%  0 | 31.8  7 | 7.3%  3 | 0%  0 |
| **Total** | 37 | 226 | 32 | 22 | 41 | 12 |

The overall key elements of engagement expressed across all documents are shown in Figure 1, Figure 5 provides a visual representation of the distribution across keywords by sectors and activities.

Figure 5 highlights community benefits, information sharing, participation,and Indigenous Knowledgewith high frequencies across all sectors and activities.

In this comparison, it is clearer where certain sectors or activities have a greater focus. For example, tourism activities see community benefits as an important element of engagement or information sharing and indigenous knowledge being of overarching importance for research activities.



Keywords

Percent Keyword References by Sector of Activity

**Figure 5**. Keyword comparison across sectors of activities. The sectors, General, Management, Research, Resource Development, Response, Shipping, and Tourism, are color coded. The horizontal bars represent how often a keyword was mentioned compared against all the references by the sector of activity.

Across all sectors of activities, planning was noted as being of primary importance (Figure 6), except for in research activities, where information gathering was seen as of greater importance, and for tourism throughout operations. Research activities focused on the inclusion of indigenous knowledge, which would be more beneficial in the collection of data. Documents on tourism activities focused on the benefits to communities through tourism. Engagement throughout operations focused on the ways in which Indigenous Peoples and local communities can contribute to and benefit from the industry.



Percent of Stages of Engagement References by Sector of Activity

**Figure 6**. Comparison of Stages of Engagement across sectors of activity for the Arctic Council. Sectors of Activity, General, Management, Research, Response, Resource Development, Shipping, and Tourism, are color coded. The horizontal bars represent how often a stage of engagement was mentioned, expressed as a percentage of mentions of all stages engagement by the sector of activity.

Stages of Engagement

**8.0 Arctic Council’s Approach to Engagement**

The Arctic Council is the leading intergovernmental forum promoting cooperation and coordination among the Arctic States, Indigenous Peoples and other Arctic inhabitants which address key issues including sustainable development, environmental protection, and human health.  The Council’s decision-making is based on transparency, access, and cooperation that enables collaboration and addresses meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities across all levels of the organization.

The Arctic Council has put forward guidance, recommendations, and Ministerial Declarations pertaining to the processes of meaningful engagement[[37]](#footnote-38). Figure 7 displays these, categorised under elements of engagement.

Elements of Engagement

Number of Recommendations

**Figure 7**. Elements of engagement described by the Arctic Council

The Arctic Council identifies the importance of collaborative and cooperative efforts in Arctic activities. The Arctic Council highlights the importance of participation in decision-making with various actors, where appropriate, and places emphasis on developing communication methods and efforts to ensure cross-cultural, full, and meaningful participation.

A review of all working groups shows that the most recommended elements are collaboration, Indigenous Knowledge, and participation. These are followed by local resources, consultation, information sharing, and culturally appropriate elements (Figure 8).

Percent of Elements and Foundational Component References by Working Group

**Figure 8.** Percentage of recommendations of each Arctic Council Working Group across foundational components and elements of meaningful engagement. Working Groups, SDWG, PAME, EPPR, CAFF, and AMAP, are color coded. The bars represent how often Elements and Foundational Components were mentioned, expressed as a percentage of mentions of all Elements and Components by Woking Group.

Elements and Foundational Components of Engagement

Least discussed in Arctic Council documents are the elements of involvement, transparency, respect, accountability, self-government, informing, trust, notification, and government-to-government. Two elements were missing from Arctic Council documents—logistics and legal consultations.

Within the documents reviewed across all working groups, the recommendations refer primarily to relationship building (Figure 9). Elements of collaboration, Indigenous Knowledge, participation and information sharing, make up the majority of the foundational component of relationship building (Figure 10).

**Figure 9.** Arctic Council recommendations across the components of meaningful engagement

Indigenous Knowledge and collaboration are the most recommended elements. For example, two PAME documents[[38]](#footnote-39)[[39]](#footnote-40) highlight that States should cooperate and collaborate with Indigenous Peoples and local communities, non-government organizations, and private actors to understand and integrate the needs and concerns of potentially affected communities. Many documents emphasize the need to utilize Indigenous Knowledge in research, planning, assessments and reports.

Indigenous Knowledge and collaboration are the most recommended elements. For example, two PAME documents[[40]](#footnote-41)[[41]](#footnote-42) highlight that States should cooperate and collaborate with Indigenous Peoples and local communities, non-government organizations, and private actors to understand and integrate the needs and concerns of potentially affected communities. Many documents emphasize the need to utilize Indigenous Knowledge in research, planning, assessments and reports.

**Figure 10.** Arctic Council recommendations referring to elements of relationship building.

These documents also frequently stress the need to identify models that will allow for the utilization of Indigenous Knowledge within the Arctic Council’s work[[42]](#footnote-43). Of the recommendations provided related to relationship building, the involvement of different actors was referenced the least often by the Arctic Council.

Generally, the Arctic Council notes that States should cooperate and collaborate with Indigenous Peoples and local communities, non-governmental organizations, and private parties to understand and integrate the needs and concerns of potentially affected communities[[43]](#footnote-44)[[44]](#footnote-45).

The Arctic Council emphasizes the need to foster relationships among governments, Indigenous Peoples and local communities and organizations, and other actors through consultation, partnerships, and effective communication. Information sharing through the inclusion of Indigenous and local knowledge is also emphasized in engagement. The Arctic Council has also provided recommendations that promote capacity building and benefit sharing to enable inclusion within projects and activities, allowing for long-term benefits, and the development of economic opportunities.

Incorporation of Indigenous and local knowledge in research, planning, assessments, and reports were often recommended, along with identifying models to enable inclusion. The Arctic Council recommends that Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge be incorporated from the outset of a project or activity and used together with scientific results and analysis. Community based monitoring is recommended as an effective way to incorporate Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge into a project/activity.

Consultation was recommended as a mechanism of engagement. Consultation is noted as a consensus-based process that can allow for greater inclusion in a project or activity (e.g. Indigenous Knowledge into Arctic Council work). Consultation is recommended early in the planning stage.

The Arctic Council notes that there is no standard approach to consultation but provides the following elements to promote effective consultation[[45]](#footnote-46):

* effective consultation is two-way,
* identifying and building relationships with potential consultees can take considerable time;
* consultation programs are integral to project planning and decisions making;
* there are limits to the consultation process; and
* consultation should be open and transparent

Legal consultation was not addressed by the Arctic Council.

All elements under the legal obligation foundational component are less commonly mentioned by the Arctic Council-accountability, consultation, self government, and government to government (Annex A[[46]](#footnote-47), Table 6).

The Meaningful Engagement workshop on September 17, 2016[[47]](#footnote-48) highlighted that engagement between Indigenous Peoples and other actors should be based on trust and respect, and is conducted in a manner that is transparent and culturally appropriate. ,

**9.0 Good Practices**

A review of the approaches to engagement outlined in the documents have highlighted good practices that governments, industry sectors, and other parties are currently using to engage with Indigenous people and local communities. These approaches have been used to determine the good practices outlined below. Box 1 provides a summary of the good practices for meaningful engagement that can be applied within any sector or activity to meet the context of the situation.

**Box 1**

Summary of Good Practices for Meaningful Engagement

* Identify the issues and factors requiring engagement and which issues/factors require engagement strategies to be established.
* Identify potentially affected participants and those with whom to engage.
* Consider legal obligations for how to engage, if applicable.
* Consider cultural differences, location of community, and resources available.

### Employ mechanisms for engagement by use of multiple strategies and early and proactive engagement at all levels.

### Develop an engagement plan or agreement, and report back to the community.

* Identify how best to communicate with Indigenous people and local communities.
* Identify the appropriate time to begin any engagement and the processes of engagement over the lifetime of an activity.
* Establish supportive measures includingrecord keeping, review of processes, and dispute resolution mechanisms, as appropriate..
* The relationship between actors and Indigenous peoples based on trust and respect, and conducted in a transparent and culturally appropriate manner.

plan

**9.1 Pre-Engagement**

An important part of plan development is pre-engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities who may be impacted by the activity.

**9.1.1. Beginning the Process**

Beginning engagement as early as possible is identified as valuable for establishing relationships, building trust, and for encouraging information sharing from the beginning. Early engagement will assist in identifying and addressing Indigenous concerns, avoiding or minimizing any adverse impacts on potential or established Indigenous or Treaty rights, and assessing and implementing mechanisms that seek to incorporate Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge.

A good practice throughout the life cycle of an activity, plan, or policy development is to ensure transparency and inclusiveness of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in the project development process. This may entail efforts to support the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

**9.1.2 Issues, Factors, Participants**

A good practice is to gain an understanding of the culture and way of life (ie. both qualitative and quantitative socio-economic data) of a community before engagement.

It is essential for the proponent to clearly identify activities, plans, and policies that may affect Indigenous Peoples and local communities. This includes the project scope, timing, and location of the proposed activity and how there may be an impact on Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

It is important to ensure that all relevant actors proposing an activity--government, industry, NGO or academic representatives--are included in the engagement process with Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

It is also good practice to understand who speaks for the community, which will be different depending on the context, and which could involve informal leaders, as well as official representatives[[48]](#footnote-49)[[49]](#footnote-50)[[50]](#footnote-51). It is important to pay particular attention and respect to the knowledge and perspectives of elders in Indigenous communities[[51]](#footnote-52)[[52]](#footnote-53).

**9.1.3. Legal and Established Practices**

It is important to identify whether there are legal requirements for engagement or any established approaches that are already in place. A good practice is to ask Indigenous Peoples and local communities whether communities have preferred or established practices of engagement that may provide an approach that is already accepted by Indigenous communities.

**9.1.4. Participation in Engagement**

Actors should consider potential influences or barriers to engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. These barriers could include: seasons, remoteness of region, community capacity, language barriers, and hunting or other priority activities that may be impacted by the proposed activity. These may change over the course of a project and therefore engagement should be ongoing.

Early notification provides Indigenous Peoples and communities with sufficient information in order for them to provide informed consent to participating in engagement concerning the issues being addressed.

Consultation is highlighted in the documents as a preferred mechanism for engagement, enabling actors to work directly with Indigenous Peoples and local communities. This can include interviews, workshops, and meetings in which group discussions can help potentially affected Indigenous Peoples and local communities understand what is being proposed or planned and assist in identifying and balancing competing claims, interests, and motivations.

**9.2 Communication**

Culturally appropriate engagement includes being sensitive and considerate of cultural and language differences among the actors involved in activities, in particular in the validation and use of information and knowledge[[53]](#footnote-54)[[54]](#footnote-55)[[55]](#footnote-56).

Regardless of the mechanisms used, being culturally aware includes understanding how communities may communicate differently. This can include recognizing language barriers by translating materials into the community’s language, using interpreters, and ensuring materials are written in plain, non-technical language.

To aid with communication difficulties, a local facilitator, advisor, or liaison can provide guidance and direction for getting to know communities and local organizations as well as identifying potential participants and preferred means of engagement.

Developing a intercultural communications or engagement plan between Indigenous Peoples and local communities and proponent actors can set out an agreed upon approach to engagement from the outset. A plan can outline how to coordinate with members of a community or representatives, the roles for all those involved, expected strategies for engagement, and adaptable measures to ensure flexibility of the process. In addition, a plan can assist in facilitating the creation of accessible materials or forums for information sharing.

Social media is a form of communication that can increasingly be used to generate awareness and interact with remote communities. More traditional communication methods is also encouraged such as radio/VHF and newspapers/community bulletins may still be used where social media or internet connection are unavailable (Box 2).

The provision of final results should also be included as a key aspect of a communication plan. It is also important to communicate interim and final results to communities in a means that they can find useful.

**Box 2 Forms of communication**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Written or web-based   * Community newspapers; * Handbooks; * Brochures; * Posters; * Websites; * Letters or emails * Publication of notices * Telephone calls * Radio or TV presence | Face-to-face   * Workshops * Visits to communities * Meetings * Presentations * Public events * Use of local advisors * Establish communication centres in communities |

Communication is meant to be ongoing and involve a two-way approach, which enables Indigenous Peoples and local communities to present their views, concerns, and questions. This opens up to a dialogue between Indigenous Peoples and local communities and other affected actors. It should be ongoing over the course of an activity, project, or plan, as it is a means of mutual information sharing between Indigenous Peoples and local communities and other parties.

**9.3 Stage of Engagement**

Beginning the process as early as feasible will often depend on whether there are pre-approval requirements to be satisfied. The analysis of the documents reviewed revealed that the planning stage was the most frequently noted stage of engagement across all sectors and activities and by all sources, as most do not require pre-approval (see Table 1). The stages at which engagement is utilized will depend on the activity, plan, or project.

A good practice is to be proactive with engagement rather than reactive. Meaningful engagement does not begin when a problem occurs, it is an ongoing process that builds a foundation on which problems can be solved or managed. One way to be proactive is to engage with stakeholders in their community and near the site where the activity will occur[[56]](#footnote-57)[[57]](#footnote-58). A key element to the pre-consultation phase is involving Indigenous communities in decisions about how engagement will occur and determining which issues will be on the agenda.

### Another good practice is to engage Indigenous Peoples and local communities in all components of an activity, from strategic planning processes that scope the project to operational decisions about how it is implemented.

### Developing a formal engagement or consultation plan can help manage engagement and ensure it is prioritized[[58]](#footnote-59)[[59]](#footnote-60). A plan creates clear and realistic expectations of the engagement process and the responsibilities of all actors. Establishing one concise plan is preferable to multiple, long and complicated documents. Engagement should be managed similar to any other business function to ensure it is prioritized.

There should be opportunities for follow up to address questions, concerns, and issues raised over the course of the engagement process. This will show Indigenous people and communities where their input is being included when they are not at the decision-making table and continues the dialogue established between all parties. In addition, at the end of a project, plan, or other activity, a final review to conclude the engagement process should be conducted.

### Reporting back to the community on the results of the engagement and how feedback was incorporated into a project or activity is another practice that is helpful in ensuring engagement is viewed as meaningful[[60]](#footnote-61)[[61]](#footnote-62). This will involve taking measures and providing resources to ensure information contained in a report is understood by the community. Meaningful information is accessible and directly addresses the concerns that were raised by the community.

**9.4 Supportive Measures**

The following measures are recognized in the literature as supportive towards achieving meaningful engagement.

9.4.1 Record Keeping

Consultation and engagement activities, meetings, discussions, issues, commitments, and outcomes should all be documented and recorded[[62]](#footnote-63). Methods of documentation and recordkeeping should be determined and agreed to by all stakeholders early in the process. Ensuring that a records management system is in place will enable access to information throughout engagement.

9.4.2 Review of Processes

Regular reviews of engagement processes in which feedback from Indigenous Peoples and communities is received can improve relationships and the overall process. This will allow for adjustments and accommodations as necessary. Some governments have identified that accountability measures, which review their procedures of engagement, are considered important for meaningful engagement.

9.5 Dispute resolution mechanism

Despite efforts for all parties to be in agreement on issues, there is often conflict. Although not a required component of engagement, including a conflict avoidance/resolution mechanism that is agreed to from the outset will outline steps to be taken in the event resolution is needed. In addition, agreements and plans of cooperation can assist in ensuring a focus is on balanced interests.

**10.0 Lessons Learned**

The MEMA workshop found that making mistakes trying to practice meaningful engagement should be considered a learning process. Some key lessons learned from this project can be summarized as follows:

General

* + - 1. There is no single approach to meaningful engagement, it is a contextual process.
      2. Consider outlining what is meant by a meaningful role for all parties.

Relationship Development

* + - 1. Understanding communities and the culture, heritage, and traditions of the people is necessary for engagement.
      2. Ongoing relationship building and engagement helps make the relationship meaningful.
      3. Collaboration and coordination among partners, including those that do not normally communicate directly with one another, is key to successful engagement.
      4. Develop capacity in communities through the provision of education, training, infrastructure, and funding
      5. Make an effort to incorporate and apply Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge through engagement approaches
      6. Develop a foundation of trust and provide clarity, certainty, and reliability through constructive dialogue and including time for events and activities not directly related to issues[[63]](#footnote-64).

Process

* + - 1. Planning for engagement while being flexible with the process can lead to more fruitful outcomes.
      2. Aim for an engagement process that balances interests and aims for positive outcomes for all partners.
      3. Aim for equal representation on advisory councils and decision-making boards.

**11.0 Conclusions**

This report is the result of analyses of existing requirements, policies, protocols, guidance, recommendations, policy statements, and declarations on engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in marine activities. While these are not exhaustive, they are representative of the common approaches to engagement used today in the Arctic states.

Although approaches to engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the Arctic will vary depending on the context and parties involved, building trust, a clear delineation of expectations, incorporating Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge, and ongoing communication between actors can lead to meaningful engagement. The underlying concepts and foundations for meaningful engagement will be the same across contexts, but the approaches taken will depend on the actors involved. Current approaches have identified meaningful practices to engagement and should be used to improve future efforts and establish ongoing relationships with Arctic Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Despite widespread agreement that engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities is a critical component of activities in Arctic marine areas, there are different approaches on how to make it meaningful. This report has explored what the concept of meaningful engagement means to the actors involved and what elements or components of engagement are viewed as important.

The Arctic Council has developed good guidance related to engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities. See Annex 3 to the Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in Marine Activities Part I Report for a complete list of all recommendations for engagement of Permanent Participants and Indigenous Peoples by the Arctic Council. But these are spread across many working groups, reports, sectors, and other documents and provide varied perspectives.

The Arctic Council could be a forum for discussions on good engagement practices. The Arctic Council also could be a champion of meaningful engagement practices and the use of Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge.

* + - 1. **0 Next Steps**

The review of documents from all sectors identifies certain practices or elements of meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities that the Arctic Council might consider for examination and possible addition to its body of guidance.

This final report and the supporting documents can be used by the Arctic Council for guidance and, if decided, in possible follow-up project(s) to update and expand existing guidance, identify areas where additional guidance may be needed, or as a value-added resource for other projects focused on engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

The Arctic Council could be a forum for discussions on good engagement practices. The Arctic Council working groups can consider developing templates that outline protocols for effective engagement and the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge and local knowledge in the work of the Council. These templates might also be useful for other actors who wish to pursue more meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The Arctic Council can consider synthesizing and outlining current practices of engagement as a way to encourage engagement practices around what has already been established, taking into account local conditions and cultural practices. The Arctic Council could consider defining broad elements of engagement as communities are developing their own protocols. From this, a “reference guide” on how to engage could be considered to assist meaningful engagement.
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