



**First Nations Environmental Assessment
Capacity Needs Assessment
and Strategic Plan Elements**

FINAL

**First Nations Environmental Assessment
Technical Working Group**

**First Nations Environmental Assessment
Capacity Needs Assessment
and Strategic Plan Elements**

Final

Prepared for

**First Nations Environmental Assessment
Technical Working Group (FNEATWG)**
c/o 7468 Mission Road
Cranbrook, BC V1C 7E5

Prepared by

Mary Ellen MacCallum, Carol Murray and Pascale Méra
ESSA Technologies Ltd.
1765 West 8th Avenue, Suite 300
Vancouver, BC V6J 5C6

and

Susan M. Carlick
FNEATWG

February 2, 2005

Citation: **MacCallum, M.E., C. Murray, P. Méra and S.M. Carlick.** 2005. First Nations Environmental Assessment Capacity Needs Assessment and Strategic Plan Elements. Final report prepared for First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group (FNEATWG) Cranbrook, BC. 56 pp.

© 2005 First Nation Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from First Nation Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group, Cranbrook, BC.

Summary

As part of its efforts to build capacity for EA among First Nations in British Columbia, the First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group (FNEATWG) contracted ESSA Technologies to conduct an EA Needs Assessment among BC's FNs and to identify strategic elements for EA capacity building. The work was done in collaboration with FNEATWG, with FNEATWG's Co-ordinator being closely involved in all steps except analysing the findings and writing the report.

The work was broken down into 4 steps:

1. Characterisation

The process began with a faxed invitation to all BC FNs and Tribal Councils to participate. The fax also included a survey, which 23 First Nations and one Tribal Council completed. This information was used to characterise the involvement of BC's FNs in EA.

2. Needs Assessment Interviews

Interviews then were conducted with all the FNs/ Tribal Councils that responded and were available to participate further: 15 First Nations and one Tribal Council. For simplicity the First Nations/Tribal Councils are referred to throughout the report as First Nations. 14 interviews were by telephone and two were in person.

The interview sample include First Nations from all regions of the province, from a spectrum of population sizes, and with experience in three aspects of EA:

- Proponents of on reserve projects;
- Interveners in provincial and/or federal EA processes; and
- Developers of self-directed EA.

The information gathered related to four areas:

- Characterisation of First Nations' involvement in Environmental Assessment;
- Experience and training of personnel working in EA;
- Community strengths that are relevant to EA; and
- Strategic approaches to capacity building.

The quality of information gathered was exceptional - participants were forthcoming and provided rich, insightful information- increasing our confidence in the recommendations to FNEATWG about capacity building priorities for FN in BC.

3. Analysis

The findings provide a snapshot of involvement in EA by BC's First Nations. Most medium¹ to very large First Nations are or have been involved in EA's for on-reserve projects. First Nations of any size are potentially involved as interveners, while the number involved in developing self-directed EA processes is confounded by involvement in negotiating treaties. Although most First Nations interviewed have staff working on environmental and resource management, few have staff working on EA related work, and very few staff have any EA training. However, several First Nations have adopted creative approaches to build capacity and/or compensate for limitations.

The capacity needs of individuals reflect this situation: with few staff to draw on and very little previous training in EA, people identified a wide range of EA capacity needs and training priorities. The community strength that was most often rated as high was a computerised office, followed by leadership.

4. Report and recommendations

The report provides a great deal of detail on the needs and priorities communicated by the FNs interviewed.

This information is then synthesised into six capacity building initiatives that warrant consideration by FNEATWG:

- continue to support the development of tools such as templates and guidance;
- enhance the website;
- mobilise FNEATWG members as resource people;
- provide short term training based on the FN EA Toolkit, with added sessions to meet a variety of needs;
- hold an annual FN EA Workshop; and
- consider how to encourage and support accredited training.

These six initiatives were chosen for the following reasons:

- they respond to the needs expressed by FNs;
- they have proven successful in other situations;
- they build on existing strengths of FNs;
- they respond to current realities while building for the future; and
- they are consistent with FNEATWG's mandate and strengths.

The EA capacity needs are too great to be met quickly or with a single initiative. There are no "quick fixes". However, FNEATWG is uniquely positioned to provide leadership and mobilise resources for action on several fronts, for a sustained effort. This approach of nurturing capacity through a variety of mechanisms will allow interested FNs to become involved in ways that suit their circumstances. The assumption is that as capacity grows among these "early adopters", more FNs will decide to take advantage of opportunities for EA capacity building.

¹ small First Nation : population <201
medium First Nation: 201 > population >500
large First Nation: 501 > population >1000
extra large First Nation: population >1000)

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	v
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Needs assessment methodology	3
2.0 Findings.....	8
2.1 Involvement in EA by BC’s First Nations	8
2.2 Needs assessment	9
2.3 Community strengths.....	19
2.4 Preferred strategic approaches	20
2.5 Participant comments	21
2.6 Summary of findings	22
3.0 Strategic Elements.....	23
3.1 Key issues and challenges for EA capacity building	23
3.2 Opportunities and drivers for EA capacity building	26
3.3 Initiatives	27
3.4 General requirements for functioning system.....	28
3.5 Strategies	29
3.6 Recommendations	30
Appendix 1: Criteria for Selecting First Nations for Interviews, and Assessing Coverage.....	32
Appendix 2: Interview Protocol.....	33
Appendix 3: Interview Schedule	36
Appendix 4: Questionnaire for Technical Staff.....	37
Appendix 5: Questionnaire for Leadership	43
Appendix 6: Questionnaire for Community Members	48
Appendix 7: Summary Tables of Needs Assessment Findings	53

List of Tables

Table 1.1.	List of First Nations interviewed, by population size.	5
Table 1.2.	Representation of First Nations interviewed in relation to all First Nations in British Columbia	6
Table 2.1.	Summary of involvement in EA by BC’s First Nations	8
Table 2.2.	Familiarity with, experience and training in conducting or reviewing EA/SA.....	12
Table 2.3.	Familiarity with, experience and training in intervening in EA.	12
Table 2.4.	Familiarity with, experience and training in developing and implementing EA procedures or regulations.	13
Table 2.5.	Priorities for training related to involvement in EA as a proponent.	15
Table 2.6.	Priorities for training related to involvement in EA as an intervener.	16
Table 2.7.	Summary of current support and capacity to be actively involved in EA – by population size.	18
Table 2.8.	Summary of responses regarding community strengths.	19
Table 2.9.	Summary of responses to preferred strategic approaches.....	21
Table 3.1.	Elements of an environmental management system to which capacity building initiatives would contribute.....	29
Table A.1.	Familiarity, experience with and training in conducting or reviewing EA/SA.....	53
Table A.2.	Familiarity, experience with and training in intervening in EA.	54
Table A.3.	Familiarity, experience with and training in developing and implementing EA procedures or regulations.	55
Table A.4.	Support and capacity to be actively involved in EA.....	56

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BC	British Columbia
BCEAAA	British Columbia Environmental Assessment Act
BEAHR	Building Environmental Aboriginal Human Resources
CEAA	Canadian Environmental Assessment Act
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DFO	Department of Fisheries and Oceans
EA	Environmental Assessment
EAO	Environmental Assessment Office (BC)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EM	Environmental Management
FN	First Nation
FNLMA	First Nations Land Management Agreement
FNEATWG	First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group
ITP	Individual Training Plan
INAC	Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
LMTTP	Land Managers Training Program
PIP	Public Involvement Plan
SA	Social Assessment
SCC	Supreme Court of Canada
TEK	Traditional Ecological Knowledge
TK	Traditional Knowledge
VEC	Valuable Ecosystem Components

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

The First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group (FNEATWG) is committed to helping First Nations increase their capacity to engage effectively in environmental assessment processes.

The FNEATWG undertook this needs assessment to hear directly from First Nations about their needs, to inform its planning and project implementation process, thereby ensuring that future capacity building initiatives do indeed address specific needs. The FNEATWG also wants to ensure it is developing and preparing training that suits the broad-based needs of First Nations throughout BC.

Some of the considerations in developing EA capacity among First Nations include the following:

EA priorities vary among First Nations

EA capacity building might address at least three different priorities:

1. Most First Nations have undertaken projects that trigger an EA under CEAA (and INAC policy), but not all are directly involved in those EAs. For many First Nations, more control over EAs for on reserve projects may be a priority.
2. Some are involved as interveners under the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Act (BCEAA) or the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA), or anticipate the potential for future projects to impact on their traditional territories. Their priority might be how to be more effective as an intervener. (With the term “intervener” we want to denote taking an active position about a project, rather than passively fulfilling a role that is required by law or policy. As used in this report the term is not limited to First Nations that have been granted official status as interveners.)
3. Some First Nations are involved in developing EA processes that enhance their capacity for self-governance, pursuant to self-government Agreements, Framework Agreements, or treaties. For them, developing self-directed EA processes may be a priority.

The above are situations in which enhanced EA capacity would be applied directly to EA processes. Enhanced capacity for EA also has the potential to be used indirectly, to advance other priorities of First Nations. While not conventionally seen as an objective of EA, intervening in EA processes is seen by some First Nations as a means of protecting their aboriginal rights and title. With a recent court cases before the Supreme Court of Canada (the appeals of the Taku River Tlingit, and of the Haida), consultation of First Nations by governments has come under close scrutiny.

Different EA priorities create different capacity needs

The capacities needed to become effectively involved will depend to some extent on EA priorities.

Some examples, (illustrative rather than comprehensive) include:

- Self sufficiency in conducting EAs for on reserve projects will require a high level of technical capacity among staff, as well as the capacity to get meaningful baseline information from the community.
- Effective involvement as an intervener in EAs requires leadership, a strategic vision, and a high level of community involvement.
- Developing and implementing self-directed EAs require a highly evolved organisation that is able to interpret and enforce technical requirements.
- Many First Nations currently use consultants to carry out EA work. Enhanced understanding of EA and how to manage their consultants is an important capacity building step for these First Nations. In addition, building opportunities for capacity building into contracts with consultants (as was the case with this project) is a very cost effective approach that would focus capacity on issues of greatest interest to an individual community.

Roles in EA differ for different segments of the community

These capacity needs may become even more apparent if one considers the role in EA of different segments of the community. In particular, leadership (Chief and Council), technical staff, and community at large all have different roles, and potentially different capacity needs. Full engagement will require the involvement of all.

Chief and Council must find ways to provide leadership that integrates environmental and social considerations with economic development.

Technical staff need both the technical capacity and also the ability to communicate technical issues effectively.

Community members need to be able to share their understanding of the environmental and social settings of projects, understand the implications of various potential impacts on the community, and to clear, constructive input at various steps of an EA process.

This project was originally designed to identify capacity needs of all three components. Based on initial feedback we determined that it was more effective to focus on the technical staff who facilitate a First Nations involvement. Once capacity building for this group has begun, and as more communities have had more experience with EA, efforts to enhanced the understanding of other players within the community will be more effective.

The context for capacity building in EA among BC's First Nations is challenging

Many First Nations in BC have limited capacity to meet the numerous demands on them: negotiating treaties, responding to referrals, and fulfilling existing obligations, to name just a few. Their "absorptive capacity" may be limited, with relatively few people with the necessary interest and educational background to take training or serve as resource people for the First Nation. While interest in protecting the environment is high for most First Nations, building capacity specific to EA may not be their highest priority.

FNEATWG hired ESSA Technologies, working with the FNEATWG co-ordinator, to conduct a needs assessment of First Nations in BC, and, based on these findings, identify pragmatic strategies for meeting the EA capacity needs of First Nations that have Aboriginal rights and title and treaty rights in BC.

1.2 Needs assessment methodology

Objectives

The objectives of the assessment were to answer three questions:

1. What is the current level of involvement in EA of First Nations in British Columbia?
2. What are the capacity needs of First Nations in British Columbia to more effectively engage in EA processes?
3. What capacity building approaches would best address those needs?

Environmental Assessment as subset of Environmental Management

Environmental Assessment is one of several technical functions covered by environmental management (EM), waste management and environmental monitoring being others. Because few First Nations have staff dedicated solely to EA, and because many of the skills and knowledge are transferable, some of the needs assessment focused more generally on EM and did not always distinguish between the two functions.

Collaborative approach

The Project team adopted an interactive and collaborative approach to conducting the needs assessment. Decisions in each step of the assessment were made in close collaboration and consultation with the FNEATWG Steering Committee and FNEATWG Co-ordinator. A unique feature of this Project was the participation of the FNEATWG Co-ordinator in implementing the needs assessment. She was involved in all stages of the Project, for the purposes of bringing her expertise and experience to the Project, and building her capacity to undertake needs assessments and be involved in FNEATWG strategic planning. ESSA team members provided guidance and supervision as required, with all steps conducted in a transparent manner, and in accordance with principles worked out and agreed to by all during the Project Initiation meeting.

To conduct the needs assessment, we undertook the following seven steps:

1. ***Characterised the nature and extent of involvement in EA among First Nations in BC and identified First Nations who were interested in participating in an interview.*** In addition to desk research, we distributed a brief questionnaire by fax to all First Nations and Tribal Councils in British Columbia to give them the opportunity to tell us about their involvement in EA, and indicate their interest in participating in an interview. Twenty-three (23) First Nations and one Tribal Council responded to the fax. (See Table 2.1 in Section 2 for a complete list of respondents.)

2. ***Established criteria (population size, geographic region, level of involvement in EA) for selecting the First Nations who we would ask to participate in an interview.*** The purpose of the criteria was to help ensure that we interviewed a representative sample of First Nations across the province, to the extent possible given the timeline of the project and the availability of First Nations to participate within that timeline. Appendix 1 lists the selection criteria.
3. ***Described potential strategic approaches to build capacity in EA.*** We identified and briefly described five potential approaches: EA training for all communities (i.e. an EA curriculum), an EA response team, an annual First Nations EA forum, pilot projects, and web-based resources.
4. ***Developed interview questionnaires for the needs assessment.*** The questions were designed to 1) identify and clearly understand the specific EA-related capacity and training needs of the interview participants and their community; 2) elicit feedback on the proposed strategic approaches for building this capacity; and 3) give participants the opportunity to discuss their own suggestions for capacity building. Three questionnaires were designed for different target groups: technical staff, Chiefs and Councillors, and community members. The questionnaires comprised the following four parts:
 - Part A: Characterising your First Nation's Involvement in EA
 - Part B: Needs Assessment. This included questions pertaining to the participants' familiarity with, experience and/or training in functions associated with EA; and a ranking of the First Nation's support and capacity to be actively involved in EA.
 - Part C: Community Strengths
 - Part D: Potential Approaches

Questionnaires combined both closed and open-ended questions in order to generate qualitative and quantitative information. The questionnaires are provided in Appendices 4, 5 and 6. The questions were tested in a trial interview with the FNEATWG Coordinator. While the Coordinator is a member and recent employee of the Taku River Tlingit First Nation (one of the First Nations in our sample), we did not include the test interview in our total number of interviews conducted or in the analysis presented in this report. (We interviewed someone else from that First Nation).

An interview protocol was developed to provide guidance to the interview team regarding what to do before, during and after each interview (see Appendix 2). The purpose of this protocol was to ensure completeness and consistency among the interview team.

5. ***Conducted interviews.*** Staff from 24 of the groups that responded to the fax agreed to participate in an interview. Fifteen of these groups were First Nations and one was a tribal council. We did not distinguish between the two in analysis and reporting; we treated all groups as if they were First Nations and refer to them all as First Nations throughout this report. We interviewed a total of 18 technical staff from the 16 First Nations (two of the interviews were with two staff members from each First Nation) (see Appendix 3 for the interview schedule and list of participants). We did not interview Chiefs/Councillors or community members, as originally planned, as none of the First Nations identified leaders or community members to be interviewed. This lead us to conclude that the reality for most First Nations is that engagement in EA processes is most likely to be initiated and facilitated by technical staff, with others becoming involved later. It became evident that the technical staff are able to provide insight into the overall capacity of his or her First Nation to engage in EA.

Interviews were conducted over a four-week period by a team of three interviewers: two from ESSA and the FNEATWG Coordinator. We had originally planned to conduct some interviews in-person, based on their geographic proximity to a member of the interview team and their level of comfort with the idea of an interview by telephone. However, we learned that the majority of

participants felt comfortable with a telephone interview, and when we also observed the quality of information generated in the first telephone interviews, we decided to minimise travel time and resources. Therefore fourteen interviews were conducted by telephone, and two were conducted in person. The Project Team, the FNEATWG Coordinator and FNEATWG Steering Committee all agreed that the information and level of detail obtained through telephone interviews met our expectations and would be sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

We developed a rationale for determining whether the 16 First Nations we interviewed was an adequate sample for the purposes of the needs assessment. The FNEATWG Steering Committee reviewed the protocol and all agreed that the sample was appropriate and would generate the information required. (This rationale is articulated in Appendix 1).

6. **Analysed results.** The information from the interviews was entered into a spreadsheet and analysed across communities in order to conduct a gap analysis (i.e. what is the difference between the skills and knowledge required to perform the relevant functions pertaining to EA involvement and the existing skills and knowledge?) and to learn which are the preferred approaches for building this capacity.

The analysis presented in Section 2 looks at the collective responses of all interview participants, as well as responses by size of community (population numbers). Table 1.1 shows the population of First Nations that participated in an interview (listed in ascending order of population).

Table 1.1. List of First Nations interviewed, by population size.

First Nations interviewed	Total population *	Population on reserve
High Bar	64	3
Burns Lake	92	35
West Moberly	176	62
T'sou-ke	206	131
Wetsuwet'en	206	86
Boston Bar	234	75
Tsawwassen	242	158
Shxwhá:y	281	57
Lheidli T'enneh	302	91
Tsay Keh Dene	336	4
Taku River Tlingit	366	87
Quatsino	386	187
Kwicksutaineuk -Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band	254 / 481	38 / 107
Ulkatcho	871	657
Ktunaxa Kinbasket Tribal Council**	1,170	623
Namgis	1,531	871

*Total population = population on and off reserve. On reserve = own band only.
Source: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. 2004. Registered Indian Population by Sex and Residence, 2003, QS-3620-030-EE-A1. September 2004.

Table 1.2 below shows the extent to which the First Nations interviewed are representative in terms of population numbers of First Nations in British Columbia. We divided the First Nations into four population size groups: 0–200; 201–500; 501–1000; and over 1000.

Small (0–200) and very large First Nations (over 1000) are represented in our sample in approximately similar proportions to their numbers in BC, in terms of both numbers of First Nations and their cumulative population. Small First Nations (0–200) account for 19% of First Nations of our

sample (i.e. First Nations interviewed) and 5% of the cumulative population of our sample, while across BC small First Nations account for 25% of First Nations communities and 5% of the cumulative population. Very large First Nations (>1000) account for 13% of First Nations in our sample and 40% of the cumulative population of our sample, while across BC very large First Nations account for 15% of First Nations and 46% of the cumulative population. Our sample over-represents First Nations with a population between 201 and 500. They account for 63% of the First Nations communities we interviewed, but are only 38% of First Nations province-wide; they include 41% of First Nations people represented in our sample, and only 21% of First Nations people province-wide. The sample under-represents those First Nations with a population of 501–1000.

The project’s emphasis on medium-sized First Nations is consistent with focusing on building capacity where there is the need, coupled with potential capacity to be developed.

Table 1.2. Representation of First Nations interviewed in relation to all First Nations in British Columbia

	Population size range				TOTAL
	0–200	201–500	501–1000	over 1000	
# of interviews of First Nations	3	10*	1	2	16
# of FN in BC	50	76	45	31	202**
#FN interviewed, by size range, as a percentage of total # of interviews	19%	63%	6%	13%	101***%
Total # of FNs interviewed as a % of FN in BC	25%	38%	22%	15%	100%
Total population of FN interviewed	332	2,813	871	2,701	6,717
Total population of FN in BC	6,042	24,921	32,259	53,788	117,010
Population of FN interviewed, by size range, as a % of total population of FN interviewed	5%	41%	13%	40%	99***%
Total population of FN interviewed as a percentage of population of FN in BC	5%	21%	28%	46%	100%

*One interview participant spoke on behalf of 2 First Nations, but did not distinguish between them in the comments provided. Both First Nations are in this population size range. Subsequent analysis treats the data as if they came from one First Nation in this size range.

**Total includes northern First Nations that are in British Columbia but are managed by the Yukon Region.

*** Rounding discrepancies.

The findings presented in Section 2 are discussed in terms of these population-based categories. The results of the analysis were then used to prepare Section 3 of this report: to recommend key elements of a strategic plan for starting to address the capacity needs, with a focus on training.

7. **Outlined key elements of a strategic plan for building capacity.** The elements of a strategic plan were arrived at through two main lines of analysis: comparison of findings with the conventional elements of strategic planning (issues, opportunities, initiatives, resources to be tapped); and an understanding of the requirements for an environmental management system.

Environmental management systems as conventionally seen as consisting of seven elements:

1. leadership;
2. legislation, policy and procedures;
3. initiatives (e.g. mapping, Traditional Use Studies, etc);

4. trained personnel;
5. information systems;
6. resources (budget etc.); and
7. monitoring and feedback to management.

Although the needs assessment focused primarily on one of these, trained personnel, it also provided some insights into the other elements, especially in questions relating to resources for EA, and a review of community strengths.

2.0 Findings

2.1 Involvement in EA by BC's First Nations

First Nation involvement in Environmental Assessment is summarised in Table 2.1. The table includes information from *both* First Nations that responded to a fax *and* those that responded with both a fax and an interview.

Fifteen of the 24 First Nations who replied to the fax questionnaire reported that they have staff who work in Environmental Management (EM) related positions. Nine First Nations reported having no staff for EM related functions.

On the issue of training for employees, seven First Nations do not have any trained staff. For those First Nations who reported having EM staff, their training was focused on Forestry and Mining, Oil and Gas, Resource Management, and some technical skills (negotiations, communication, H₂S, etc.), and almost no training in EA.

Eight First Nations reported that they are currently involved in EAs for on-reserve projects (CEAA screenings). Twelve currently are involved as interveners: 10 in CEAA processes, and 11 in BCEAA processes. Ten First Nations also reported that they have developed or are developing their own EA processes or guidelines or are in some way involved in developing procedures (e.g. developing land codes). Eight of those First Nations are involved in Treaty Negotiations and are negotiating their First Nation's involvement in EA decision making.

Table 2.1. Summary of involvement in EA by BC's First Nations. (Italics denote that the First Nation responded to the fax, but was not interviewed.)

First Nation	Pop. (approx.)	# of EM staff ¹	Past EM training ²	# of current CEAA screenings on reserve ³	# of current CEAA interveners ³	# of current BCEAA interveners ³	Self directed E4 ^A	Region ⁵
Boston Bar	234	1	Forestry	1	1	0	0	S Central
Burns Lake	92	1	Forestry	1	2	2	FNMLA/53/60	Central
<i>Fort Nelson First Nation *</i>	<i>372</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Negotiations/ technical; H₂S, OFA*, WHMIS*</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>North</i>
<i>Halfway River First Nation</i>	<i>215</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>Environmental monitoring</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>N Central</i>
High Bar	64	0	None	0	0	0	0	S Central
Ktunaxa Kinbasket Tribal Council	1,170	0	FNEATWG workshop	DK	DK	DK	0	Kootenays
<i>Kwadacha</i>	<i>428</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>N Central</i>
<i>Kwakiult Band</i>	<i>628</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>Vancouver Island</i>
Kwicksutaineuk - Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band	254 481	0	None	0	0	0	0	Coastal Island

First Nation	Pop. (approx.)	# of EM staff ¹	Past EM training ²	# of current CEAA screenings on reserve ³	# of current CEAA interveners ³	# of current BCEAA interveners ³	Self directed EA ⁴	Region ⁵
Lheidli T'enneh	302	8	Yes	0	1	1	FNLMA Land Code Treaty	Central
Namgis	1700	5	Resource mgmt, negotiations, communications, LMTP	0	1	1	Treaty	Coastal Island
<i>Prophet River Band</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>North</i>
Quatsino	386	4	Yes	3	1	2	0	Vancouver Island
<i>Saulteau</i>	<i>810</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Forest Resource Tech.</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>self-gov or Treaty</i>	<i>N Central</i>
Shxwhá:y	281	2	Yes	0	0	0	FNLMA Land Code	Lower mainland
T'Sou-ke	206	2	Fisheries	0	0	0	0	Vancouver Island
<i>Tahltan</i>	<i>1539</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>North</i>
Taku River Tlingit	366	4	Yes	2	2	2	0 Treaty	North
<i>Teslin Tlingit</i>	<i>538</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>RM, forestry, mining, LMTP, Env. Officer training</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>Self-gov or Treaty</i>	<i>North</i>
Tsawwassen	242	2	Negotiations/Technical and Land Stewardship/ Conservancy	0	2	2	FNLMA Treaty	Lower mainland
Tsay Keh Dene	336	4	Yes	0	1	1	Treaty	North
Ulkatcho	871	0	None	1	0	0	0	Central
West Moberly	176	3	Resource mgmt	1	0	2	0	Central
Wetsuwet'en	206	4	Forestry, other	3	3	2	Treaty	N Central

*OFA = Occupational First Aid; WHMIS = The Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System
DK = Do not know

¹ "EM Staff" include both part and full time, are likely to work on resource management and / or administration. Some First Nations mentioned that the number is difficult to pin down, as roles shift and change depending on current demands. None dedicated to EA.

² Training includes any technical training.

³ There is uncertainty about whether some of the projects in the table are in fact under a legislated process (CEAA or BCEAA) or are "referrals".

⁴ Some participants referred to land code and treaty processes when asked about "Self directed EA". Others that are registered in the treaty process responded "no" to the question of whether they are involved in developing self-directed EA procedures. Information summarised under this heading has a high level of inconsistency and uncertainty associated with it.

⁵ Region is arbitrary, and is given for convenience in locating First Nation within the province; it does not refer to a standard geographical unit.

2.2 Needs assessment

The needs assessment component of interviews with technical staff from sixteen First Nations was compiled and analysed. Summary tables of findings are presented in Appendix 7. This section discusses the interview findings. The Ktunaxa Kinbasket Tribal Council and the Burns Lake First Nation each put forward two technical staff for the interviews. For the purpose of this analysis, their responses are combined as one for each; the responses are not disaggregated by person.

Answers were sometimes specifically related to the EA process and sometimes applied more generally to environmental management (for example, questioning the suitability of site remediation processes was

provided as an example of intervening in EA processes). Participants were uncertain whether some specific projects were under a legislated process (CEAA or BCEAA) or as referrals. The analysis below is based on *all* the projects discussed (i.e. if participants said they had experience with a particular project, we included it, regardless of whether they were certain about its status). Therefore, the numbers below include experience and training in EM as well as EA.

Overall, 15 out of the 16 First Nations interviewed had some experience with EA either as proponents or interveners, while only half of the participants noted having experience in developing and implementing EA procedures or reviewing or implementing environmental protection measures. However, most people interviewed had no training in EA. Only two individuals had any relevant training, with one person having training in most topics.

The following sections discuss the findings in more detail. First Nations with populations of 0–200 will be referred to as ‘small’, those with 201–500 are ‘medium’, 501–1000 are ‘large’, and those over 1000 will be referred to as ‘very large’. Numbers in the tables are how many of the First Nations interviewed in each size category (n) are familiar with (F), have experience in (E) or training in (T) the subject under discussion.

2.2.1 Conduct or review EAs or SAs as a proponent

Eight First Nations (half of those interviewed) reported having familiarity with, experience or training in conducting or reviewing EAs or SAs for projects where they are the proponent (Table 2.2 below provides a summary of responses by population size). None of the small First Nations and the large First Nation we interviewed reported familiarity, experience or training in this area; while over half of the medium-sized First Nations and both of the very large First Nations do.

Amongst the eight First Nations with experience, most of them had experience with most of the tasks involved in conducting or reviewing EAs. The tasks with which more of them have experience are scoping EA/SA, reviewing the environmental setting, and hiring consultants. The tasks in which only few of the First Nations interviewed have experience are describing the social setting, assessing impacts on VECs, developing public involvement plans and follow up plans, and making decisions about balance of interests.

Only three First Nations reported having training, and it related to the following tasks: scoping, describing the social/ environmental settings; public involvement plans; assessing or reviewing social impacts, mitigation plans, environmental management plans/monitoring plans, making decisions about balance of interests, follow-up and hiring consultants. Almost all First Nations interviewed expect an increase in their involvement in conducting or reviewing EAs in the near future.

2.2.2 Participate in EAs or SAs as an intervener

In contrast to involvement as a proponent, where only half of the First Nations have experience, all First Nations we interviewed except for one (large) reported having familiarity with, experience or training in intervening in the EA process. This difference may relate directly to the size/capacity of the First Nation. One interpretation might be that small First Nations do not have the capacity to become involved in the EA process, and only do so when they feel the situation forces them to respond.

Table 2.3 below provides a summary of responses by population size. For most First Nations, their experience spans all tasks related to intervening in EA. The areas with which most of them have experience are: participating in consultation processes, identifying potential impacts on aboriginal rights

and title, clarifying ‘appropriate consultation’, conducting community consultation, and accessing legal and technical assistance. The areas in which fewest of them have experience are: preparing submissions, understanding the BCEA and CEAA process, negotiating and resolving disputes about development agreements.

While the majority of First Nations have had experience in participating in EA as an intervener, far fewer have had training. One of the small First Nations interviewed has had training, and this was only in one of the sub-tasks. Two out of the 10 medium-sized First Nations and one of the very large First Nations interviewed have had training in almost all of the tasks involved in intervening in the EA process. Two of the 10 medium-sized First Nations have had training in one sub-task. The large and very large First Nations have not had any training.

Almost all First Nations we interviewed expect their involvement in EA as an intervener to increase in the near future (including one First Nation which does not have any experience yet).

2.2.3 Develop and implement EA procedures or regulations

Half of the First Nations interviewed (six medium and two very large First Nations) reported having either developed and implemented EA procedures or regulations, or reviewed or implemented environmental protection measures (Table 2.4 summarises responses by population size).

However, there was uncertainty amongst participants as to whether they had in fact developed or implemented EA procedures. In addition, some said they are involved in developing EA because they are in treaty negotiations, while others remarked they are not involved in developing EA because they are negotiating a treaty. It was not always possible to determine whether the participants were responding to the questions in the context of developing EA procedures or in the context of their experience as proponent or intervener. For example, in some interviews there was some discussion about hiring and overseeing consultants, but it was not entirely clear whether this was directly for the purpose of developing EA procedures or regulations). Given the apparent inconsistencies and uncertainty associated with the information, and the finding that only half the First Nations had *any* involvement in self-directed EAs, less weight was given to building capacity for self-directed EAs in subsequent analyses.

Only seven First Nations of those interviewed (five medium, two very large, and none of the small or large) expect an increase in their involvement in developing and implementing EA procedures or regulations in the near future.

Table 2.4. Familiarity with, experience and training in developing and implementing EA procedures or regulations.

Size of FN Pop.	n	Develop and implement EA procedures or regulations; and review or implement environmental protection measures													
		Develop and implement EA procedures or regulations; and review or implement environmental protection measures	Develop procedures			Interpret /enforce /comply with environmental regulations			Read / summarise technical reports			Hire / oversee contractors			Expect greater involvement in future?
			F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	
0-200	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
201-500	10	6	2	1	0	6	4	2	5	4	1	6	6	1	5
501-1000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
over 1000	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2

n= number of FN interviewed F = Familiarity with E = Experience in T = Training in

2.2.4 Priorities for training

There was a general consensus that First Nations require more basic training to participate in EA more effectively. This section discusses the training priorities of First Nations that were interviewed. Tables 2.5 and 2.6 summarise these priorities as they relate to involvement in EA as a proponent and an intervener, respectively. No priorities that relate exclusively to self-directed EAs were identified in the interviews.

Training related to involvement in EA as a proponent

The small First Nations we interviewed identified the following as training priorities: describing the environmental setting, develop mitigation, environmental management, and monitoring plans, and hiring consultants. Three of the medium-sized First Nations indicated that training on ‘determining significance’ was a priority. Another high priority for this group was assessing impacts on VECs (including conducting fieldwork). One of the very large First Nations expressed a desire for training in describing the environmental and social setting (including conducting baseline studies and gathering social data). First Nations were also interested in training in report and technical writing, legal requirements, and general EA training (touching on all tasks).

Training related to involvement in EA as an intervener

Overall, regardless of the First Nation’s size and level of involvement in EA, there was a consensus that training in the BCEAA and CEAA processes would be very useful. This was the highest priority for the small, medium, and large First Nations. First Nations from these four population groups also prioritised the need for training in development agreements, and the very large First Nations also noted the importance of training in dispute resolution. Screenings, identification of impacts, community consultation, technical reviews, and technical field capacity were also areas where training was deemed a priority. Several First Nations indicated their intent to become less reliant on consultants and do more EA work themselves.

Table 2.5. Priorities for training related to involvement in EA as a proponent.

Pop.	n		Scoping EA/SA	Describe environmental setting	Describe social setting	Assess impacts on VECs	Identify stakeholders	Develop public involvement plan	Assess potential social impacts	Develop mitigation plans, EM plans, monitoring plans	Make recommendations about significance	Make decisions about balance of interest	Develop/ implement follow-up	Hire consultants
0-200	3			√*						√				√
201-500	10	Report writing EA overall Less reliance on consultants	√√	√		√√√ in the field (2)		√	√√	√√	√√√	√	√√	√
500-1000	1	legal requirements EA overall						√						
>1000	2	technical writing		√ baseline inventories	√ social data									√

*The number of check marks denote the number of First Nations that said training in this area would be valuable.

Table 2.6. Priorities for training related to involvement in EA as an intervener.

Pop.	n	General	Review screenings	Participate in Fed/Prov consultation	Identify impacts on Aboriginal rights/title	Identify workable accommodation	Clarify appropriate consultation	Consult with community	Access funding	Access legal / technical assistance	Review technical submissions / reports	Make submissions	Participate in monitoring / follow-up / PIP	Understand BC EA	Understand CEAA	Conduct Traditional Knowledge study	Incorporate TK into EA processes	Negotiate development agreement	Resolve disputes about development agreements	
0-200	3										Mitigation options ✓			✓✓✓	✓✓✓					
201-500	10	Less reliance on consultants EA overall	Get ready: basic mapping, consultation etc.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓		Technical ability in the field (2) Assess impacts		✓	✓✓✓✓✓	✓✓✓✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓		
501-1000	1													✓	✓			✓		
>1000	2	Less reliance on consultants; overall improvement												✓	✓			✓	✓	

*The number of check marks denote the number of First Nations that said training in this area would be valuable.

2.2.5 Existing support and capacity

Seven factors were assessed to determine the overall capacity of a First Nation to be effectively involved in EA. The factors, listed in Table 2.7, correspond to elements of a fully functional environmental management/assessment system.

Existing support and capacity to be actively involved in EA are summarised in Table 2.7. Access to computers, internet and software was rated high by the most First Nations, with nine out of 16 First Nations rating it as high (seven medium-sized and two very large First Nations). The aspect of current capacity and support that got the most 'low' ratings overall was the ability to mobilise an EA team and resources (two small, five medium, the large and one very large First nation).

The emphasis changes when analysed by size. Most of the small First Nations interviewed rated their capacity to communicate with the community and elders as high, and their access to computerised offices as medium. Seven out of the ten medium-sized First Nations gave a high rating to computers. Effective management regime, and communication with elders and the community also got high ratings (from 5, 4, and 4 medium-sized First Nations, respectively). The large First Nation felt that it had medium support and capacity in terms of access to computers and communication with the community and elders, but rated all other aspects as low. Both very large First Nations gave high ratings to access to computers and communication with elders. Other aspects tended to be medium to high.

Several small and medium First Nations ranked research, analysis skills, and communication skills amongst EA staff as 'not applicable' as they do not have EA staff.

Table 2.7. Summary of current support and capacity to be actively involved in EA – by population size.

Population	Rank	Access to computers, Internet, software	Effective management regime	Ability to mobilise EA team/resources	Research/analysis skills of EA staff	Communications skills among EA staff	Effective ways to communicate with community	Effective ways to communicate with elders
0-200	H		√		√	√	√√	√√
	M	√√√	√√	√		√**	√	√
	L			√√	√*			
	n/a***				√	√		
201-500	H/VH	√√√√√√	√√√√√	√√	√√	√√√	√√√√	√√√√
	M-H					√	√√	
	M	√	√√	√√√	√√√	√	√√	√√√√
	L-M	√	√			√		
	L	√	√√	√√√√√	√		√√	√√
	n/a***				√√√√	√√√√		
501-100	M	√					√	√
	L		√	√	√	√		
>1000	H	√√	√		√			√√
	M		√	√	√	√√	√√	
	L			√				

* The participant ranked his own skills as high, but thought that low was a better representation of the skills of other staff.

** The participant ranked his own skills as high, but thought that medium was a better representation of the skills of other staff.

***The First Nation has no EA staff

H = high
H-VH = high-very high
M = medium
M-H = medium-high
L = low
n/a = not applicable

2.3 Community strengths

Current community strengths are summarised in Table 2.8. Computerised offices were assigned more H ratings than any other characteristic, with ten First Nations rating it as high. The next characteristic to have the largest number of high ratings was leadership (rated high by six First Nations), followed by linkages with other communities (rated medium-high by four First Nations), community engagement, vitality of culture, and management skills (rated high by three First Nations). Technical skills tended to be rated medium to low.

Table 2.8. Summary of responses regarding community strengths.

First Nation	Characteristics							
	Leadership	Management	Technical	Computerised office	Communications	Culture	Engagement	Linkages
Boston Bar	H	M	M	M	M	M	L	some
Burns Lake		L	L	L	L	M	L	M-H
High Bar	M	M	M	H	M	M	M	M
Kwicksutaineuk - Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band	M	L-M	L	L	varies	H	L	M
Ktunaxa Kinbasket	NR	M	M	H	M	H	M	M
Lheidli T'enneh	H	M	M	H	M	L	H	M
Namgis	H	H	H	H	M	H	M	M
Quatsino	M	M	M	H	M	D/K	L	M
Shxwhá:y Village	M	M	M	H	M	M	M	M-H
Taku River Tlingit		M	L-M	L-M	M	L	H	M
Tsay Keh Dene	H	H	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Tsawwassen	H	H	M	H	H	L-M	M	M-H intermarriages
T'Sou-ke	M	L	L	H	M	M	L	L
Ulkatcho	M-L	M	L	L	M	M	L-M	L
Wet'suwet'en	M	L	H	H	L	M	L	M
West Moberly	H	M	M	H	M	L	H	H

H = High

M-H = Medium to high

M = Medium

L-M = Low to medium

L = Low

D/K = Do not know

NR = No response

Several of the First Nations we interviewed specified characteristics of their community that they felt were affected their capacity to be involved in EA (either in a positive or negative way). These include:

- First hand knowledge.
- Treaty Council, not a First Nation so the situation is a bit different.
- Community desire to improve their quality of life.
- Very determined; nothing goes on without them being involved.

- Progressive.
- Limited education and social fabric.
- Persistence to do the right thing.
- Persistence to try to do the right thing; appreciation for elders' knowledge (TEK); ability for strategic planning.
- Participation depends on whether the people feel they will be heard.
- TEK and genealogy are strong.
- Experience: internal struggles.
- Value harmony and cooperation.

2.4 Preferred strategic approaches

Interview participants showed relatively high levels of support for training (especially active training and/or field oriented training), an annual First Nations EA forum, and web-based resources: with 11, 9, and 10 of 16 First Nations respectively rating them “high”. Other scenarios generated a range of questions and comments. Table 2.9 summarises these findings.

Interesting alternative options also were suggested by First Nations:

- Two alternatives involved funding for First Nations to become more actively involved in EAs.
- Two related to building capacity that was transferable to other applications.
- Two related to mentoring: from INAC/consultants, and in the context of Individual Training Plans.
- One suggested having FNEATWG members share their experience with other First Nations.
- One was interested in EA for fish farms.
- One looked forward to hands on opportunities (such as the Toolkit workshop) that provided tools rather than “dumping of information” through lectures.
- One recommended local training, in the field, with visual tools.
- One reported doing capacity building in the context of territorial management: needs include getting baseline info, gap analysis, create maps, so they can be proactive rather than reactive.

Table 2.9. Summary of responses to preferred strategic approaches.

First Nation	Approach				
	EA training	EA response team	Annual FN EA forum	Pilot project	Web-based resources
Boston Bar	M	L	M	H	M
Burns Lake	H		H	?	
High Bar	H	H	H	H	H
Kwicksutaineuk - Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band	H	H	H	H	H
Ktunaxa Kinbasket	L	M	L	M	H
Lheidli T'enneh	H	-	H	not transferable	H
Namgis	H	L	M	M	H
Quatsino	H	L	M	M	H
Shxw̓há:y Village	H	L	H	L	H
Taku River Tlingit	H	?	H	?	M
Tsay Keh Dene	H	L	H	M	L
Tsawwassen	H	?	M	H	H
T'Sou-ke	M	H	H	L	H
Ulkatcho	H	M	H	H	H
Wet'suwet'en	M	M	L	M	H
West Moberly	H	H	M	H	H

H = High
M = Medium
L = Low

ITP = Individual Training plan
? = not clear from interview results

2.5 Participant comments

Almost every interview produced important insights relating to needs, community strengths, or options for capacity building, summarised below. The comments may contradict each other; this reflects not only different approaches and needs of different First Nations, but also the challenges a First Nation faces as it tries to meet its many different requirements with limited resources. For example, staff may need training, but they (or their managers) may not view training as the most effective way to use their time.

- Small numbers of staff / community population numbers limit capacity (i.e. people's time is already fully booked).
- Staff move around: even if someone receives training, he or she may not stay in the same position.
- Limited education and other factors such as fetal alcohol syndrome limit capacity.
- Lack of money restricts ability to travel to training.
- Focus on treaty making and other issues may take priority over EA.
- Treaty making may be the impetus for improving the land code and environmental protection
- Individual Training Plans (ITPs) are being used at the First Nation level.
- Plain language translations are useful for people who do not have technical background.
- EA is only a priority when there is something happening; other priorities are always there.

- Not really aware of whether projects on reserve have EAs or not.
- Capacity building is best if it is transferable, applicable to other topics, e.g. problem solving.
- Short courses do not really build technical capacity; people need more advanced degrees and certified programs to do that.
- Training is needed for more than technical staff: councillors and office staff too.
- Collaboration with accredited institutions is desirable.
- Training needs to be concrete and focused; preference for field oriented work.
- Involvement in EA needs to be strategic, it should not just focus on tangible things (like jobs), but should promote thinking about the big picture, the sustainability of development.
- Building technical capacity for land management will enable First Nations to be proactive in case of EA, not only re-active.
- Almost everyone needs more training in field of environmental management: most staff have no training for this type of work.
- “Hands on” training is more effective.
- Focused, non-academic training is more likely to maintain attention.
- First Nations have various initiatives that are building capacity: e.g. Resource management (Namgis), Aboriginal health (Boston Bar).
- Relationships with some consultants of EA (or environmental remediation) processes on reserve lands feel as if INAC is the client, not the First Nation.
- Involvement with larger (regional / tribal council) processes increases awareness that we need to do something; “but we don’t necessarily know what we need to do”.
- Not always sure what falls under EA and what is referral; do not necessarily distinguish between the two.
- EA for on-reserve project are sometimes approved through the Capital department without the EM staff even hearing about it.
- Not really aware of a lot of EAs, whether EAs were done or not.

2.6 Summary of findings

The BC First Nations interviewed represent those First Nations who were interested in EA capacity building and had time to respond to the fax and participate in an interview. The details of their experience and interests are highly variable, ranging from a First Nation with no staff and little experience, to others like Ktunaxa Kinbasket (a tribal council representing five First Nations) with nine part and full time staff working in environment.

In general there are few staff to deal with EA issues and even fewer with explicit training in EA. Nonetheless, most First Nations are involved both as proponents and as interveners: most are involved in development projects on reserve that trigger an EA under CEAA (INAC having responsibility as Responsible Authority for ensuring that the First Nation as proponent does an EA that meets INAC’s standards), and most have concerns about projects that may have an impact in their traditional territories. Fewer were involved in developing their own EA procedures or regulations. This may be because the interview sample is biased to reflect smaller First Nations, as we had fewer interviews with larger, relatively well-resourced First Nations. Most had illuminating comments relative to the particular circumstances of their First Nation, and most were enthusiastic about one or more possible opportunities to increase their capacity.

3.0 Strategic Elements

3.1 Key issues and challenges for EA capacity building

Population size

Small population size is one key limitation on capacity. The median population of First Nations in BC in 2003 was 368. In other words, half of First Nations in BC have fewer than 369 people. (The average population was 578: a small number of large First Nations account for the difference.)

The influence of population sizes on potential capacity are confounded by the question of whether people live on-reserve, or, in the case of First Nations that reside largely in a nearby off-reserve town, whether off-reserve Band members are actively involved in First Nations affairs. First Nation budgets are also related to numbers living on reserve, so a First Nation with few people living on reserve will also have less money to put towards EA-related initiatives.

Low educational level and other factors further reduce the capacity of staff, making capacity even smaller than numbers alone might suggest.

Despite these challenges (or perhaps in response to them) some First Nations have adopted approaches to capacity building that allow them to participate more actively than their population numbers might suggest was feasible. First Nations with relatively small numbers are having an impact on how resources are managed and how EA is conducted: Wet'suwet'en (which, with the Gitksan First Nation brought the Delgamuwk case to the SCC) has a population of 206; Taku River Tlingit First Nation has a population of 366.

Access

Access may also be a factor in influencing the effectiveness of capacity building. Evidence from this project is insufficient to know how it would exert that influence: some First Nations that seem relatively isolated are very active, while lack of access seems to be a barrier for others.

First Nations can be able to compensate in part for isolation through use of telecommunications. Many (10) of the First Nations interviewed reported that having a computerised office was a community strength.

Two approaches would reduce some of the constraints associated with isolation:

1. make full use of the internet, in conjunction with other approaches; and
2. cover all travel costs for participating in capacity building, while making sure the topics and subject matter are worth the time and effort required to participate.

First Nation Priorities

Priorities are mixed. Some circumstances such as involvement in treaty making focus the attention of some First Nations on environmental issues while serving as a distracter for some others. Internal political issues, treaty issues, and a past history of being ignored may reduce the priority given to dealing with

environmental issues. Alternatively, concern about resources and the impact of a project may focus attention (and resources) beyond what might be expected based on size of the First Nation. In addition, not all First Nations see capacity building as a priority. With many demands and limited resources, some First Nations focus on “getting the job done”, which may mean hiring consultants for any technical work. For others, there was a clear interest in reducing reliance on consultants, and being able to do more work for themselves.

It should be expected that First Nations will focus on EA capacity building when and if they are ready to do so (i.e. when it becomes a priority). Recent Supreme Court cases , and potential new initiatives by government in response to those rulings, may help make EA a priority for more First Nations.

Community strengths

While a few communities reported having all the ingredients for success, most see weaknesses in one or more areas: leadership, management skills, technical skills, communications, vitality of culture, community engagement, or linkages with other First Nations. Capacity building must take into account the need for balance, and recognise that ideally all of these are necessary to support an effective environmental protection system.

Perspectives on EA

Several First Nations described a negative experience with previous exposure to EA. Some also said that a group like FNEATWG with a First Nation’s perspective would be invaluable in providing a different kind of experience and new insights and tools. Participation in the First Nation EA Toolkit workshops was seen as a positive experience from which they could learn. Potential for new initiatives as a result of the SCC ruling may also create a constructive environment for EA capacity building.

Non capacity building issues

Several of the First Nations referred to issues that are not likely to be resolved by capacity building, and are beyond the scope of this assessment. These include:

- lack of reasonable consultation by government or proponents;
- EM processes (including EA processes) wherein First Nations feel proponents or government have not taken their concerns seriously;
- EM processes (including EA processes) wherein proponents or government may have contacted the wrong person within the First Nation, established inadequate timelines; etc.
- internal First Nation practices that hinder EM staff from protecting environmental or cultural resources.

While improved understanding of EA and better communications may reduce some of these frustrations, other measures, such as policy initiatives, are needed to resolve some of these issues.

Formats for training

Some apparent contradictions in the interview responses can be resolved if we distinguish between training (for awareness raising , and for developing skills and knowledge), and education.

Awareness raising:

Awareness raising is often the first step in capacity building. It can take many forms ranging from events (such as a meeting about a proposed project that might have an impact on one's traditional territory), to campaigns that raise awareness of an issue and inform people (e.g. posters and activities to raise awareness about nutrition). Some of the "training" that people referred to in interviews has the objective of raising awareness. Typically this takes the form of "introduction to" training, or workshops wherein people with relevant experience share that experience.

Training:

Conventional training focuses on developing skills and knowledge. Most introductory level skills training has a component of awareness raising, but goes beyond that to provide people with concrete new skills. Training usually consists of short courses and workshops.

Therefore, short courses might serve different purposes:

- to raise awareness, for example, of the ways different community members can contribute to an EA (leaders, technical staff, elders, concerned members);
- to create a common level of understanding and vocabulary for EA across the community (also awareness raising);
- to improve general understanding and vocabulary within technical staff (e.g. the difference between environmental assessment and environmental *site* assessment);
- to develop skills (e.g. how to access information in the EA Toolkit; how to use various templates, how to do a site assessment).

Technical training /education:

While education conventionally builds general academic abilities, it is increasingly seen as providing concrete technical skills and knowledge. Advanced technical training resulting in some kind of recognition might be considered as education. Short term training cannot replace the need for substantive technical training/education.

The interviews confirmed that few people working for First Nation communities have training in the technical skills related to EA; technical skills were reported to be "low" relative to other community strengths. Substantive progress regarding First Nation involvement in EA depends in part on increasing the numbers of trained technical people (ideally, aboriginals) working for First Nations. This will not be achieved overnight, but must be recognised by First Nations as a long term objective if First Nation communities are to become self sufficient in environmental areas. A few of the communities interviewed seem to be taking active steps in this direction.

Fortunately, technical training is becoming available through a number of aboriginal and/ or accredited institutions. Examples include:

- the curriculum that has been developed by BEAHR for northern (territorial) applications;
- the new offering recently announced by the Native Education Centre in Vancouver relating to environmental management;
- agreements entered into by the University of Northern BC and several colleges to facilitate aboriginal education in a number of fields.

Capacity building for First Nations needs both short term training and awareness raising to build a broad base of involvement in EA, *and* increased numbers of people with substantive technical training.

Content of training

It was apparent from interviews that small First Nations have less experience with EA as proponents than as interveners. This makes sense: they don't have the capacity to get involve in EA unless the proposed project threatens their community and they feel they have no choice. Their priorities for training include being better prepared to deal with projects in their traditional territory, especially learning more about BCEAA and CEAA processes, and reducing their dependency on consultants.

Several medium-sized First Nations (200 < population < 501) want to become more self sufficient as proponents, with some interest in training in the full spectrum of EA skills. Their priorities for training as interveners focus on better understanding of EA processes. In both cases they are especially interested in skills relating to field work.

Larger First Nations (population > 1000) are further advanced in building specific technical skills, as evidenced by existing initiatives such as creating databases of baseline data. Their priorities for training include report writing, and Development Agreements.

Some topics are of general interest regardless of the size of the community: most of the First Nations were unclear about EAs for on-reserve projects, and about what projects might fall under BCEAA or CEAA. Basic training in these processes is warranted.

Distinctions between EA and other environmental management/protection practices such as environmental site assessments, environmental audits or site remediation seem blurred. Any staff responsible for EA are likely to cover environmental protection in general, and need to be familiar with the range of topics. EA training might at least indicate how they differ in application. (In 2001–2003 LMTP training has covered this in a two-day course.) Other technical topics in which First Nations may be involved that are relevant to EA include waste management and environmental monitoring.

3.2 Opportunities and drivers for EA capacity building

Several First Nations expressed a high level of interest in FNEATWG and the possibility of EA capacity building. These First Nations seem like good candidates to become involved with FNEATWG initiatives. Some are already engaged in programs to build capacity (e.g. Namgis); others have staff that are committed to capacity building (e.g. West Moberly).

First Nations have become more involved in EAs over the past few years. The general level of awareness of and involvement in EA is likely to continue to increase:

- First Nations will become more involved in on-reserve development as communities grow.
- Resource development (e.g. mining) is likely to increase in BC: this is likely to increase involvement of First Nations either as joint venture partners or as interveners.
- Recent Supreme Court decisions will likely have an impact on consultation by governments with First Nations.

Traditional values, especially the concept of stewardship, has motivated and will continue to motivate First Nations to find ways to fulfil their sense of obligation to “the land”.

3.3 Initiatives

Based on our assessment of the interview findings, four initiatives warrant consideration. The rate at which they are implemented would depend on the resources available.

1. Tool development and dissemination

The existing First Nation EA Toolkit is an excellent starting point. Some of the people we interviewed were not familiar with the toolkit, which suggests that the toolkit should be disseminated (or advertised) more broadly. As specific tools and examples are developed, introductory workshops can include more of these as well.

As people become familiar with the tools already available, they will identify additional tools that would be useful (guidelines, protocols, examples, etc.). As tools are developed on a priority basis (e.g. new templates and guides) they can be disseminated first with a workshop that provides background and hands on experience, then made available through the website.

2. Website

The website can be expanded as a mechanism for communication, dissemination of information resources, and training. Each of these functions warrants close consideration. The following provides examples of some of the elements that might be added over the longer term:

- communications could include opportunities to share ideas and information among First Nations;
- a roster of technical resources might be compiled and listed;
- the field of on-line training is becoming well enough established to warrant consideration;
- as new tools are developed they should be designed for dissemination via the website.

3. Resource people

The existence in FNEATWG of a group of First Nations people with experience in EA is an invaluable resource for First Nations. They can facilitate capacity building by being available to share information, provide guidance, and indicate what other resources are available. Funding must be available to support them in doing this. A survey of FNEATWG members would identify whether they need any other resources, including specialised training, to be able to operate effectively as resource people.

4. Training

Short term

A list of training needs have been identified. A reasonable starting place is a workshop introducing the First Nation EA Toolkit, with one day to meet specific priority needs. For example, after one or two days introducing the Toolkit, one day could be spent focusing on one of the tools (such as those used in describing environmental settings), one of the EA processes (such as EA for on reserve projects), or another other topic. The workshop could evolve as new tools are added, and through more in-depth treatment of specific subjects.

Other courses might be developed if funds permit.

An annual workshop for exchanging experience and discussing issues is a useful way to involve leaders, while creating a forum for discussing aboriginal practice in EA.

Long term

FNEATWG can consider how best to support the development of more trained technical people within First Nations communities. Options include the following:

- monitor educational opportunities closely to ensure any FNEATWG initiatives do not overlap;
- review these opportunities and, if warranted, promote them by making people aware of them;
- approach institutions to explore ways of involving BC First Nations as pilot; or
- consider whether to approach institutions about co-development of courses for which accreditation might be available.

3.4 General requirements for functioning system

In developing strategies for capacity building, it is important to be aware of the elements of a functional system for environmental management. Increasing capacity should move the First Nations closer to such a system. Focusing on only one element, without considering strengths and weaknesses in other elements, is not likely to be successful in the long run.

It is convenient to think of an environmental management system as consisting of seven elements:

1. leadership;
2. legislation, policy and procedures;
3. initiatives (e.g. mapping, Traditional Use Studies, etc);
4. trained personnel;
5. information systems;
6. resources (budget etc.); and
7. monitoring and feedback to management.

Although this needs assessment has focused primarily on trained personnel, it has provided some insights into the other elements, especially in questions relating to resources for EA, and the review of community strengths.

The initiatives identified under Section 3.3 may contribute to more than one element. Table 3.1 summarises this.

Table 3.1. Elements of an environmental management system to which capacity building initiatives would contribute.

System	Capacity building initiatives					
	EA Tools	Website	EA Resource people	EA Training: FN EA Toolkit	Annual FN EA Workshop	Accredited courses
Leadership				A session for leaders could be prepared and based on Toolkit	An annual workshop could be used to identify key issues for leaders.	
Policy and procedures	Develop policies and procedures as tools	Use website to disseminate policy and procedures	Experienced people may help catalyse new developments	As procedures, templates etc are developed they can be added to Toolkit	Use workshop to disseminate procedures	
Initiatives	Initiatives may focus on tools e.g. protocol for consultation	Share information about initiative with other FNs	Experienced people may help catalyse new developments		Discuss and identify initiatives at workshop	
Trained personnel				Training based on Toolkit can be used to train personnel in various functions	Annual workshop can be used to train personnel in various functions	Support for accredited courses would enhance access of personnel
Information systems (IS)		Create links with sources of information and contacts about IS on website				
Resources		Disseminate resources through website; create links to resources available	Experienced people may help catalyse new developments			
Monitoring and feedback					Discuss successes and lessons learned	

3.5 Strategies

FNEATWG will need to be strategic in its approach to building capacity for EA: the need is too great, and resources too few to do everything.

Based on prior experience and the specific information collected, suggested elements of a successful capacity building plan include:

1. *Build on existing successes:*

Examples might be:

- using the First Nation EA Toolkit as a platform for tool development (i.e. developing the Toolkit additional tools that can be incorporated into the Toolkit) and training;
- using FNEATWG members as resource people;

- work with other community strengths (such as computerised offices and web based resources) to build strength in EA;
 - communities with more resources (or better leadership) may become leaders in developing EA expertise. One potential role for FNEATWG is to create links between these leaders and others with less capacity; to capture the lessons learned and share them with others .
2. *Respond to First Nation realities:*
- First Nations have developed their unique ways of dealing with their situation. If a local approach has potential to be effective, work with it. (If it is likely to be unsuccessful review Strategy # 1.)
 - First Nations with limited capacity may only be able to respond to urgent needs.
 - Success will look different in different communities: one size will not fit all.
3. *Build for the future:*
- Examples might be:
- work with other capacity building initiatives (BEAHR, LMTP, First Nation initiatives);
 - don't expect to achieve the objectives overnight;
 - don't ignore long term capacity (such as building technical capacity) while meeting urgent and short term needs.

The success of FNEATWG's efforts can be measured using some of the information provided in this report as baseline data. Indicators that can be obtained through a simple fax back survey are:

- # of First Nation volunteering to participate in a fax back survey;
- # of staff trained in EM;
- numbers with self-directed EAs.

3.6 Recommendations

The details of FNEATWG's capacity building strategy and plan will dictate what resources are required. The availability of suitable resources will affect implementation. We recognise that these are the forces that will shape FNEATWG's capacity building efforts.

Nonetheless, we respectfully urge FNEATWG to consider the following recommendations:

- Focus on needs of small and medium First Nations.
- Use larger First Nations as resource in ways that also serve their capacity building purposes.
- Focus on capacity building relating to First Nations as interveners and proponents; leave development of procedures for self-directed EAs up to the individual First Nations.
- Involve experienced FNEATWG members as resources for First Nations.
- Use the First Nation EA Toolkit as a starting point for training.
- Increase emphasis on BCEAA and CEAA processes, and on skills training .
- Consider adding field oriented exercises.
- Use the First Nation EA Toolkit as framework for developing more tools.

- Develop the website in tandem with new tools, lessons learned, and rosters of resource people and consultants.
- Continue using a variety of forums to introduce the Toolkit and raise awareness of FNEATWG and the available resources.
- Consider an annual workshop to discuss EA issues. Ideally it might be attached to other forums.
- Work with other institutions to promote longer term technical training.

Appendix 1: Criteria for Selecting First Nations for Interviews, and Assessing Coverage

Criteria for selecting First Nations to Interview

- Representation of the four different types of involvement in EA: proponent, intervener under CEAA, intervener under BCEAA, developing self-governance (i.e. FNLMA).
- Cross section of urban/remote; population size (0–200; 201–500; 501–1000; and over 1000); geographic regions (north, central, south).

The First Nations that responded to the fax were an excellent starting point for our interviews, as they represent a wide cross section of First Nations in BC, with a few exceptions noted below. There were a few gaps that we tried to fill to the extent possible in the time available. At first, we had a total of 15 First Nations to interview. We added one (Tsawwassen) to improve coverage.

Rationale for why 16 First Nations is an adequate sample

For the following reasons, we believe the 16 First Nations interviewed for this project are an adequate sample of First Nations across the province, for the purposes of the needs assessment:

Range of experience: The 16 First Nations have the range of experience or needs that we were looking for. Our data showed that the only gap regarding types of EA involvement is FNLMA. The First Nations represent a wide range of experience: some had no previous involvement, others had involvement only in their own projects, and others had experience as interveners in many BCEAA and CEAA projects. Among the latter, some projects are large (mines), while others are likely smaller resource management projects involving forestry and fisheries. We felt this was a reasonable cross section.

Coverage: The 16 First Nations we have selected provide reasonable geographic coverage. They represent peri-urban to remote First Nations and small, medium and large populations.

Interest in being involved: Ideally, one wants to design initiatives for those First Nations that are interested and most likely to be involved. For capacity building initiatives to be successful, it is usually best to start with those who are most interested and have sufficient motivation, time, etc. to engage. Others that have not stepped forward at the beginning can always become involved later, as they see various initiatives in action. Thus the ones that step forward are the ones that are most likely to provide information that will lead to successful initiatives.

Appendix 2: Interview Protocol

Setting up interviews

Sue:

- Contact First Nations by telephone:
 - provide brief explanation of the project, and how the information will be used by FNEATWG,
 - determine their availability,
 - set up an interview date/time, and
 - get their contact phone number.
- Send information to the interviewer, including:
 - name of interview participant,
 - the interview date and time,
 - their First Nation,
 - their contact number, and
 - any other relevant information (e.g. they only have an hour max for the interview).

Interviewers (Sue, Carol, Pascale):

- Call the person to be interviewed (as soon as possible after it is booked) to:
 - introduce yourself,
 - confirm their availability for the booked date/time,
 - explain you'd like to fax the questions ahead of time and ask for their fax number, and
 - give them your phone number so they can reach you if something suddenly comes up that makes them unavailable at the booked time.
- Fax them the "Questionnaire for interviewees".

After the interviews

Immediately after each interview, review the notes on the recording template: add information where necessary to flesh points, and ensure that the notes are discrete (i.e. do not include any disparaging comments.)

Once the notes in the template have been reviewed and you are satisfied that they convey the flavour and content of the interview, fax (if you used a paper copy) or email (if you used an electronic copy) the recording template to Susan for entry into the database.

Conducting interviews

Introductory comments (approx. 10 minutes):

Hello, my name is ____ and I am part of the team conducting interviews to assess EA capacity needs among First Nations in BC.

- *Thank you very much! Your help will be invaluable, and your time is greatly appreciated.*
- *I'd like to take a few minutes to review a bit of background information before we start.*
The First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group (FNEATWG) is conducting a needs assessment designed to identify capacity needs of First Nations in BC as you engage in environmental assessment processes. The information will be used to develop a strategic plan for future FNEATWG initiatives.

The purpose of the interviews is to identify capacity needs of First Nations and the personnel working for them, as you engage in or prepare to engage in environmental assessment processes in BC; and to identify First Nations' priorities for future capacity building initiatives. First-hand information from people such as yourself who are (or will be) involved in EAs is essential to this project... the insights that come from your experience are crucial to ensuring that future initiatives reflect real on-the-ground needs and priorities.

ESSA has been contracted to conduct the interviews and, based in part on the information gathered, write a strategy for FNEATWG for EA capacity building. The interview notes, the subsequent analysis, and the report will become the property of FNEATWG. While this report may be shared with others, it is not FNEATWG's intention to share the detailed interview notes.

If you have concerns at any point during the interview about sharing information that you consider to be confidential, please tell me and we can just skip the question – or answer it in a general manner that makes the point without conveying sensitive or confidential information.

Are you comfortable proceeding with the interview?

- *The interview should take approximately one hour (maybe more, depending on how much time you have and how much detail you would like to go into in your answers). Do you have a specific time constraint? [If they only have exactly one hour, keep a closer eye on time to ensure you cover all the questions.]*
- *The interview questions have been divided into four sections. Part A pertains to the level of involvement of your First Nation in EA, and we have already received some of this information via fax. Part B asks about your familiarity with, expertise in, or training in a number of specific aspects of EA. Part C asks about experience and strengths related to EA in your community. Part D provides an opportunity for you to respond to some preliminary ideas we have for capacity-building approaches, as well as provide your own ideas about what approaches you think might be most effective for your First Nation. (This is so that you can get some idea, based on any comments they might make at this point, regarding whether to focus more time on Part B or Part D.) Have you had a chance to look at these questions ahead of time and think a bit about the answers?*
- *I'm going to be writing your answers, so I'll let you know if I need to pause to finish scribbling.*
[OR:] I'm going to be typing your answers into my computer as we go, so please let me know if the sound is too distracting for you and I'll switch to writing by hand on a paper copy.
- *Do you have any questions or comments before we start?*

Note, to be aware of (but no need to explain before the interview): The Informed Consent section above does not address all the aspects of “anonymity”. We will write names on the interview notes and store them in the database, but not use them in the report. However we recognise that occasionally a fully attributed quote can provide useful clarity. If an interviewer hears something that we may want to quote in the report by name or by First Nation, we will ask “May I quote you on that”. This will be ad hoc (i.e. not explained in advance). If the participant agrees to be quoted, the interviewer will make a special note of that on the interview recording template. Without such a note, the comment may be included in the written report as an example but would not be attributed.

During the interview, record answers on the interview recording template. Don’t worry so much about getting the info in the right place; the most important thing is to get it, and you move info into the right places afterward.

Use the template as a tool to work through the questions in a systematic manner. If they don’t have anything to say for a given question, put a line through it or something so you know it has been addressed. That will make it easier to note gaps when reviewing your notes near the end (see below).

Note the start time and keep an eye on time throughout interview. The first few interviews may take longer; if we find they are taking too much of people’s time we may need discuss it among ourselves and adjust interviews accordingly. Alert the team if you think it is necessary to adjust the protocol.

In Part B, the first layer are the 4 main competencies in grey (Questions 1-4). Start there, and if they have no experience at that level then you can just skip over the more detailed rows under that question.

Use a mental “mantra” to help you keep on track, particularly if you have a “free-form” participant who’s input tends to wander no matter how you try to structure the flow. (E.g. “what can I learn from this interview about EA capacity needs, priorities, and approaches?”) Try not to get bogged down in examples — remember, we’re not trying to learn everything they know; but their level of experience and training, and their need. If they have a lot of experience, ask where would they start if they were doing it again. If they don’t have a lot of experience, ask where they would like to start, given everything on their plate.

If someone surprises us and their input doesn’t “fit”, use comment fields to capture their input. And it’s OK to say “do you mind if I take a moment and review my questions to see if there is anything I wanted to ask you that we haven’t already talked about?” You should do that near the end of the interview, in any case, to be sure you haven’t missed anything.

At the end of the interview, thank them very much for their time, and let them know the next steps:

- *We will be conducting interviews until mid-November. We will then compile and analyse what we learn and submit a draft report to FNEATWG by December that will include a summary of the interview results, and suggestions about how best to address capacity needs. FNEATWG will use this information to update its strategic plan and begin identifying projects and programs that will assist First Nations to strengthen their capacity to engage effectively in EA processes. FNEATWG will maintain contact with you by providing you updates as new initiatives are launched and opportunities are identified.*

Appendix 3: Interview Schedule

First Nation	Contact person and phone number	Interview date	Interviewer
Boston Bar	John Warren 604 867 8844	November 9, 2004	Sue
Burns Lake	Ryan Tibetts and Dan George 250 692 7717	October 25, 2004	Carol
High Bar	Melanie Painter 250 459 2117	November 10, 2004	Pascale
Ktunaxa Kinbasket TC	Ray Warden and Michael Keefer 250 417 4022	November 16, 2004	Carol
Lheidli T'enneh First Nation	Rick Krehbiel 250 962 5843	November 12, 2004	Pascale
Musgamawm Tsawataineuk Tribal Council (Kwicksutaineuk - Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band)	Connie Mclvor 250 974 5516	November 8, 2004	Pascale
Namgis First Nation	Doug Aberley 250 974 5556	November 22, 2004	Sue
Office of the Wet'suwet'en	Rick Budhwa 250 847 3630	November 9, 2004	Sue
Quatsino First Nation	David Schmidt 250 749 8147	November 12, 2004	Sue
Shxwhá:y Village (formerly Skway First Nation)	Jeff G. Mercer Band Manager 250 792 9316	November 16, 2004	Pascale
Taku River Tlingit First Nation	Michael Svoboda 250 651 7925	October 29, 2004	Carol
Tsawwassen	Andrew Bak 604 948 5224 / 604 943 2112	November 9, 2004	Pascale
Tsay Keh Dene	Karl Sturmanis 250 562 8882	November 19, 2004	Sue
T'Sou-ke First Nation	Kerrie MacLean 250 642 3957	November 2, 2004	Pascale
Ulkatcho First Nation	Lynda Price NRC Director 250 742 3439	November 18, 2004	Pascale
West Moberly First Nation	Hugh Taylor 250 788 3676	November 3, 2004	Pascale

Appendix 4: Questionnaire for Technical Staff

First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group First Nations Environmental Assessment Capacity Needs Assessment Project

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project! This document provides a brief description of the project and why we are doing these interviews, and introduces you to the questions that will be asked during the interview.

Purpose of the project: The First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group (FNEATWG) is conducting a needs assessment designed to identify capacity needs of First Nations in BC as they engage in environmental assessment (EA) processes. The information will be used to develop a strategic plan for future FNEATWG initiatives.

Purpose of the interviews: The purpose of the interviews is to identify capacity needs of First Nations and the personnel working for them, as they engage in or prepare to engage in environmental assessment processes in BC; and to identify First Nations' priorities for future capacity building initiatives. First-hand information from people who are (or will be) involved in EA is essential to this project... the insights that come from your experience are crucial to ensuring that future initiatives reflect real on-the-ground needs and priorities.

Where the information goes: ESSA has been contracted to conduct the interviews and, based in part on the information gathered, write a strategy for FNEATWG for EA capacity building. The interview notes, the subsequent analysis, and the report will become the property of FNEATWG. While this report may be shared with others, it is not FNEATWG's intention to share the detailed interview notes. (For more information about FNEATWG and who they are please contact the co-ordinator: Susan Carlick; scarlick@trfn.com, 867-633-3553.)

Informed consent: If you have concerns about sharing information that you consider to be confidential, please tell the interviewer that this is the case and *decline to answer the question – or answer it in a general manner that makes the point without conveying sensitive or confidential information*. We will ask you to confirm verbally that you are aware that the information you do provide may be used by FNEATWG.

Interview structure: The interview questions have been divided into four sections. Part A pertains to the level of involvement of your First Nation in EA (we have already received some of this information via fax). Part B asks about your familiarity with, expertise in, or training in a number of specific aspects of EA. Part C asks about experience and strengths related to EA in your community. Part D provides an opportunity for you to respond to some preliminary ideas we have for capacity building approaches, as well as provide your own ideas about what approaches you think might be most effective for your First Nation.

Part A - Characterising your First Nation's involvement in EA

1. Number of staff assigned to Environmental Management (EM) functions.
Part time _____
Full time _____
2. EA Training of EM staff.
None
Workshops:
Resource Management (specify sector – i.e. mining, forestry, etc.)
Communication/Professional Development
Negotiations or technical training
Lands Management Training Program
Other workshops (please specify)
Other types of training (please specify)
3. Projects initiated by First Nation requiring EA under Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) (e.g. capital projects and permits requiring EA)
Approximate number in past 5 years?
Number currently in process?
Number likely in next two years?
4. Have there been EAs conducted within CEAA legislation that may affect your First Nation's aboriginal rights, title or interests. (Please complete the appropriate lines.)
None
Approximate number in past 10 years?
Number currently in process?
Number likely in next two years?
Number of Joint reviews past, present, likely in future?
5. Projects under BC Environmental Assessment Act that may affect your First Nation's aboriginal rights, title or interests: (Please complete the appropriate lines.)
None
Approximate number in past 10 years?
Number currently in process?
Number likely in next two years?
Number of Joint reviews past, present, likely in future?
6. Has your First Nation developed its own EA policies or guidelines?
None
First Nations Lands Management Act
Section 53/60 of Indian Act
Self government or treaty related process

Part B- Needs Assessment

The list that follows indicates some of the functions associated with EAs, then provides some examples of what tasks this might involve. For each, you will be asked to indicate if you are familiar with the tasks, have experience and/or training, or expect it to be something you will need to deal with in the near future. Then you will be asked to identify whether you think it is a good focus for additional support.

Do you have familiarity with, or experience/training in, the following tasks?	
1	Conduct or review environmental assessments (EA) or social assessments (*SA) associated with a proposed project
1.1	Scope the assessment (EA or SA)
1.2	Describe (or review) environmental setting (EA)
1.3	Describe (or review) social setting (SA)
1.4	Assess (or review) potential impact on Valued Ecosystem Components (EA)
1.5	Identify / describe stakeholders and project-affected people (or review report)
1.6	Develop (or review) public involvement plan
1.7	Assess (or review) potential social impacts
1.8	Develop (or review) mitigation plan, environmental management plan monitoring plan
1.9	Make recommendations about significance of impacts (environmental and/or social)
1.10	Make decisions about balance of interests *
1.11	Develop or implement Follow up (might include environmental management plan, monitoring plan, site assessments and restoration plans, etc)
1.12	Hire consultants to assist with any of the above*
1.13	Do you expect your First Nation's involvement in any of the above to increase in the near future (i.e. 1 or 2 years)?
1.14	What are your priorities for your First Nation for capacity building in this area?
2	Participate in environmental assessments (EA) or social assessments (SA) associated with a proposed project
2.1	Review or comment on EA screenings
2.2	Participate in consultation processes with federal, provincial authorities or proponents
2.3	Identify potential impact on Aboriginal rights or title
2.4	Identify "workable accommodation" for any infringements
2.5	Clarify what "appropriate consultation" means for your First Nation
2.6	Conduct consultation within your community
2.7	Access sources of funding for participation and studies
2.8	Access legal and technical assistance
2.9	Review and comment on technical submissions and reports
2.10	Prepare and make submissions
2.11	Participate in monitoring or Follow up, or public involvement plan
2.12	Understand and be able to summarise BC EA process
2.13	Understand and be able to summarise CEAA process
2.14	Conduct Traditional Knowledge study

2.15	Incorporate findings from Traditional Knowledge study into EA processes
2.16	Negotiate a development agreement
2.17	Resolve disputes about development agreements
2.18	Do you expect your First Nation's involvement in any of the above to increase in the near future (i.e. 1 or 2 years)?
2.19	What are your priorities for your First Nation for capacity building in this area?
3	Develop and implement environmental assessment procedures or regulations; and review or implement environmental protection measures
3.1	Develop environmental assessment procedures, guidelines, or by laws.
3.2	Interpret/enforce/comply with environmental regulations, standards or other protection measures
3.3	Read or summarise technical reports relating to above
3.4	Hire and/or overseeing contractors to do any of the above
3.5	Do you expect your First Nation's involvement in any of the above to increase in the near future (i.e. 1 or 2 years)?
3.6	What are your priorities for your First Nation for capacity building in this area?
Please rate the following (high, medium, low):	
4	Support and capacity to be actively involved in EA
4.1	Access to computers, internet and ability to use internet and routine software
4.2	Effective management regime within office
4.3	Ability to mobilise EA team and resources
4.4	Research and analysis skills among EA staff
4.5	Communication skills among EA staff
4.6	Effective ways to communicate with community
4.7	Effective ways to communicate with elders and those using oral tradition
4.8	Do you anticipate changes in any of these areas in the near future? Which area(s)? Improvements? Deterioration?

Part C - Community Strengths

First Nations bring an array of experience and strengths to their involvement in EA. Please indicate your sense of the relative strength (High, Medium, Low, Don't know) of your First Nation in each of the following areas:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Leadership | 6 Vitality of culture |
| 2 Management skills | 7 Engagement of community |
| 3 Technical experience of staff | 7a Specific process in place? |
| 4 Computerised office | 8 Linkages with other communities |
| 5 Communications skills | 9 Other (please describe) |

If your community has had a notable EA process, please tell us about it. What worked? What didn't work?

Part D - Potential Approaches

A variety of different approaches might be used to build EA Capacity. The following scenarios are some examples. Please read through each, and consider the pros and cons of each in terms of its potential to build EA capacity for your First Nation. Your responses will be used to evaluate the potential effectiveness of each example, and could also be used to revise a scenario if it looks promising. For the final scenario you are asked to think about what other approaches, not described here, might be successful.

Scenario 1 EA training for all communities

FNEATWG might develop an **EA curriculum** of courses and resources for decision makers, technical staff, and communities. Courses would be short term (less than one week), would be advertised in advance, and be generally available to all interested First Nations. The approach would be to provide a wide range of courses to match the range of EA needs identified.

Scenario 2 EA Response Team

A team of **First Nations EA specialists** might be trained in key skills and knowledge, with the objective of assisting First Nation communities as the communities respond to EA issues. The team would consist of a limited number of First Nation personnel who already have some EA experience and/or training. They would be trained in an intensive multi-week program. The team would receive some support for travelling to and assisting First Nations; there might be some requirement for cost sharing by the First Nation. The approach would be to create a learning environment for a group of potential First Nation EA specialists.

Scenario 3 Annual First Nations EA Forum

An annual one or two day forum will be held for BC First Nations to discuss their EA issues and exchange information. Some general training might be included, extending the duration to approximately one week. The approach would be to promote and support networking and exchange of information, while providing some training.

Scenario 4 Pilot project

FNEATWG might provide a group of technical staff from several First Nations with resources, training and supervision as they work through an ongoing EA, or develop EA protocols for a First Nation. The approach would be to provide concrete learning opportunities in the context of hands-on experience. The participants then would be able to apply the skills that they had learned in their own communities.

Scenario 5 Web-based resources

FNEATWG's website will be enhanced to include training and other resources from many sources and links, with the objective of serving as an EA information clearing house for BC First Nations. The approach would be to make a wide range of resources available to as many communities as possible.

Scenario 6 Your ideas

What would be a successful capacity building scenario for your First Nation?

Appendix 5: Questionnaire for Leadership

First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group First Nations Environmental Assessment Capacity Needs Assessment Project

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project! This document provides a brief description of the project and why we are doing these interviews, and introduces you to the questions that will be asked during the interview.

Purpose of the project: The First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group (FNEATWG) is conducting a needs assessment designed to identify capacity needs of First Nations in BC as they engage in environmental assessment (EA) processes. The information will be used to develop a strategic plan for future FNEATWG initiatives.

Purpose of the interviews: The purpose of the interviews is to identify capacity needs of First Nations and the personnel working for them, as they engage in or prepare to engage in environmental assessment processes in BC; and to identify First Nations' priorities for future capacity building initiatives. First-hand information from people who are (or will be) involved in EA is essential to this project... the insights that come from your experience are crucial to ensuring that future initiatives reflect real on-the-ground needs and priorities.

Where the information goes: ESSA has been contracted to conduct the interviews and, based in part on the information gathered, write a strategy for FNEATWG for EA capacity building. The interview notes, the subsequent analysis, and the report will become the property of FNEATWG. While this report may be shared with others, it is not FNEATWG's intention to share the detailed interview notes. (For more information about FNEATWG and who they are please contact the co-ordinator: Susan Carlick; scarlick@trfn.com, 867-633-3553.)

Informed consent: If you have concerns about sharing information that you consider to be confidential, please tell the interviewer that this is the case and *decline to answer the question – or answer it in a general manner that makes the point without conveying sensitive or confidential information*. We will ask you to confirm verbally that you are aware that the information you do provide may be used by FNEATWG.

Interview structure: The interview questions have been divided into four sections. Part A pertains to the level of involvement of your First Nation in EA (we have already received some of this information via fax). Part B asks about your familiarity with, expertise in, or training in a number of specific aspects of EA. Part C asks about experience and strengths related to EA in your community. Part D provides an opportunity for you to respond to some preliminary ideas we have for capacity building approaches, as well as provide your own ideas about what approaches you think might be most effective for your First Nation.

**Part A - Characterising your First Nation's involvement in EA
(Information may already have been provided by technical staff)**

1. Number of staff assigned to Environmental Management (EM) functions.
Part time _____
Full time _____
2. EA Training of EM staff.
None
Workshops:
Resource Management (specify sector – i.e. mining, forestry, etc.)
Communication/Professional Development
Negotiations or technical training
Lands Management Training Program
Other workshops (please specify)
Other types of training (please specify)
3. Projects initiated by First Nation requiring EA under Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) (e.g. capital projects and permits requiring EA)
Approximate number in past 5 years?
Number currently in process?
Number likely in next two years?
4. Have there been EAs conducted within CEAA legislation that may affect your First Nation's aboriginal rights, title or interests. (Please complete the appropriate lines.)
None
Approximate number in past 10 years?
Number currently in process?
Number likely in next two years?
Number of Joint reviews past, present, likely in future?
5. Projects under BC Environmental Assessment Act that may affect your First Nation's aboriginal rights, title or interests: (Please complete the appropriate lines.)
None
Approximate number in past 10 years?
Number currently in process?
Number likely in next two years?
Number of Joint reviews past, present, likely in future?
6. Has your First Nation developed its own EA policies or guidelines?
None
First Nations Lands Management Act
Section 53/60 of Indian Act
Self government or treaty related process

Part B- Needs Assessment

The list that follows indicates some of the functions associated with EAs, then provides some examples of what tasks this might involve. For each, you will be asked to indicate if you are familiar with the tasks, have experience and/or training, or expect it to be something you will need to deal with in the near future. Then you will be asked to identify whether you think it is a good focus for additional support.

Do you have familiarity with, or experience/training in, the following tasks?	
1	Conduct or review environmental assessments (EA) or social assessments (*SA) associated with a proposed project
1.12	Hire consultants to assist with EA*
1.13	Do you expect your First Nation's involvement in conducting EAs to increase in the near future (i.e. 1 or 2 years)?
1.14	What are your priorities for your First Nation for capacity building in this area?
2	Participate in environmental assessments (EA) or social assessments (SA) associated with a proposed project
2.2	Participate in consultation processes with federal, provincial authorities or proponents
2.3	Identify potential impact on Aboriginal rights or title
2.4	Identify "workable accommodation" for any infringements
2.5	Clarify what "appropriate consultation" means for your First Nation
2.6	Conduct consultation within your community
2.7	Access sources of funding for participation and studies
2.8	Access legal and technical assistance
2.10	Prepare and make submissions
2.12	Understand and be able to summarise BC EA process
2.13	Understand and be able to summarise CEAA process
2.16	Negotiate a development agreement
2.17	Resolve disputes about development agreements
2.18	Do you expect your First Nation's involvement in any of the above to increase in the near future (i.e. 1 or 2 years)?
2.19	What are your priorities for your First Nation for capacity building in this area?
3	Develop and implement environmental assessment procedures or regulations; and review or implement environmental protection measures
3.4	Hire and/or overseeing contractors
3.5	Do you expect your First Nation's involvement in developing EA procedures to increase in the near future (i.e. 1 or 2 years)?
3.6	What are your priorities for your First Nation for capacity building in this area?
Please rate the following (high, medium, low):	
4	Support and capacity to be actively involved in EA
4.1	Access to computers, internet and ability to use internet and routine software
4.2	Effective management regime within office
4.3	Ability to mobilise EA team and resources

Do you have familiarity with, or experience/training in, the following tasks?	
4.4	Research and analysis skills among EA staff
4.5	Communication skills among EA staff
4.6	Effective ways to communicate with community
4.7	Effective ways to communicate with elders and those using oral tradition
4.8	Do you anticipate changes in any of these areas in the near future? Which area(s)? Improvements? Deterioration?

Part C - Community Strengths

First Nations bring an array of experience and strengths to their involvement in EA. Please indicate your sense of the relative strength (High, Medium, Low, Don't know) of your First Nation in each of the following areas:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Leadership | 6 Vitality of culture |
| 2 Management skills | 7 Engagement of community |
| 3 Technical experience of staff | 7a Specific process in place? |
| 4 Computerised office | 8 Linkages with other communities |
| 5 Communications skills | 9 Other (please describe) |

If your community has had a notable EA process, please tell us about it. What worked? What didn't work?

Part D - Potential Approaches

A variety of different approaches might be used to build EA Capacity. The following scenarios are some examples. Please read through each, and consider the pros and cons of each in terms of its potential to build EA capacity for your First Nation. Your responses will be used to evaluate the potential effectiveness of each example, and could also be used to revise a scenario if it looks promising. For the final scenario you are asked to think about what other approaches, not described here, might be successful.

Scenario 1 EA training for all communities

FNEATWG might develop an **EA curriculum** of courses and resources for decision makers, technical staff, and communities. Courses would be short term (less than one week), would be advertised in advance, and be generally available to all interested First Nations.

The approach would be to provide a wide range of courses to match the range of EA needs identified.

Scenario 2 EA Response Team

A team of **First Nations EA specialists** might be trained in key skills and knowledge, with the objective of assisting First Nation communities as the communities respond to EA issues. The team would consist of a limited number of First Nation personnel who already have some EA experience and/or training. They would be trained in an intensive multi-week program. The team would receive some support for travelling to and assisting First Nations; there might be some requirement for cost sharing by the First Nation. The approach would be to create a learning environment for a group of potential First Nation EA specialists.

Scenario 3 Annual First Nations EA Forum

An annual one or two day forum will be held for BC First Nations to discuss their EA issues and exchange information. Some general training might be included, extending the duration to approximately one week. The approach would be to promote and support networking and exchange of information, while providing some training.

Scenario 4 Pilot project

FNEATWG might provide a group of technical staff from several First Nations with resources, training and supervision as they work through an ongoing EA, or develop EA protocols for a First Nation. The approach would be to provide concrete learning opportunities in the context of hands-on experience. The participants then would be able to apply the skills that they had learned in their own communities.

Scenario 5 Web-based resources

FNEATWG's website will be enhanced to include training and other resources from many sources and links, with the objective of serving as an EA information clearing house for BC First Nations. The approach would be to make a wide range of resources available to as many communities as possible.

Scenario 6 Your ideas

What would be a successful capacity building scenario for your First Nation?

Appendix 6: Questionnaire for Community Members

First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group First Nations Environmental Assessment Capacity Needs Assessment Project

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project! This document provides a brief description of the project and why we are doing these interviews, and introduces you to the questions that will be asked during the interview.

Purpose of the project: The First Nations Environmental Assessment Technical Working Group (FNEATWG) is conducting a needs assessment designed to identify capacity needs of First Nations in BC as they engage in environmental assessment (EA) processes. The information will be used to develop a strategic plan for future FNEATWG initiatives.

Purpose of the interviews: The purpose of the interviews is to identify capacity needs of First Nations and the personnel working for them, as they engage in or prepare to engage in environmental assessment processes in BC; and to identify First Nations' priorities for future capacity building initiatives. First-hand information from people who are (or will be) involved in EA is essential to this project... the insights that come from your experience are crucial to ensuring that future initiatives reflect real on-the-ground needs and priorities.

Where the information goes: ESSA has been contracted to conduct the interviews and, based in part on the information gathered, write a strategy for FNEATWG for EA capacity building. The interview notes, the subsequent analysis, and the report will become the property of FNEATWG. While this report may be shared with others, it is not FNEATWG's intention to share the detailed interview notes. (For more information about FNEATWG and who they are please contact the co-ordinator: Susan Carlick; scarlick@trfn.com, 867-633-3553.)

Informed consent: If you have concerns about sharing information that you consider to be confidential, please tell the interviewer that this is the case and *decline to answer the question – or answer it in a general manner that makes the point without conveying sensitive or confidential information*. We will ask you to confirm verbally that you are aware that the information you do provide may be used by FNEATWG.

Interview structure: The interview questions have been divided into four sections. Part A pertains to the level of involvement of your First Nation in EA (we have already received some of this information via fax). Part B asks about your familiarity with, expertise in, or training in a number of specific aspects of EA. Part C asks about experience and strengths related to EA in your community. Part D provides an opportunity for you to respond to some preliminary ideas we have for capacity building approaches, as well as provide your own ideas about what approaches you think might be most effective for your First Nation.

Part A - Characterising your involvement in EA

What has your involvement in EA been?

Projects initiated by First Nation requiring EA under Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) (e.g. capital projects and permits requiring EA)?

EAs conducted within CEAA legislation that may affect your First Nation's aboriginal rights, title or interests?

Projects under BC Environmental Assessment Act that may affect your First Nation's aboriginal rights, title or interests?

Has your First Nation developed its own EA policies or guidelines?

None

First Nations Lands Management Act

Section 53/60 of Indian Act

Self government or treaty related process

Please describe the EA process and your community's involvement, and your role.

Part B- Needs Assessment

The list that follows indicates some of the functions associated with EAs, then provides some examples of what tasks this might involve. For each, you will be asked to indicate if you are familiar with the tasks, have experience and/or training, or expect it to be something you will need to deal with in the near future. Then you will be asked to identify whether you think it is a good focus for additional support. Please draw on your experience as a member of the community to comment on training needs *not only* for other community members, but also for the leadership and technical staff.

Do you have familiarity with, or experience/training in, the following tasks?	
2	Participate in environmental assessments (EA) or social assessments (SA) associated with a proposed project
2.2	Participate in consultation processes with federal, provincial authorities or proponents
2.3	Identify potential impact on Aboriginal rights or title
2.4	Identify "workable accommodation" for any infringements
2.5	Clarify what "appropriate consultation" means for your First Nation
2.6	Conduct consultation within your community
2.7	Access sources of funding for participation and studies
2.8	Access legal and technical assistance
2.10	Prepare and make submissions
2.12	Understand and be able to summarise BC EA process
2.13	Understand and be able to summarise CEAA process
2.16	Negotiate a development agreement
2.17	Resolve disputes about development agreements
2.18	Do you expect your First Nation's involvement in any of the above to increase in the near future (i.e. 1 or 2 years)?

2.19	What are your priorities for your First Nation for capacity building in this area?
Please rate the following (high, medium, low):	
4	Support and capacity to be actively involved in EA
4.1	Access to computers, internet and ability to use internet and routine software
4.2	Effective management regime within office
4.3	Ability to mobilise EA team and resources
4.4	Research and analysis skills among EA staff
4.5	Communication skills among EA staff
4.6	Effective ways to communicate with community
4.7	Effective ways to communicate with elders and those using oral tradition
4.8	Do you anticipate changes in any of these areas in the near future? Which area(s)? Improvements? Deterioration?

Part C - Community Strengths

First Nations bring an array of experience and strengths to their involvement in EA. Please indicate your sense of the relative strength (High, Medium, Low, Don't know) of your First Nation in each of the following areas:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Leadership | 6 Vitality of culture |
| 2 Management skills | 7 Engagement of community |
| 3 Technical experience of staff | 7a Specific process in place? |
| 4 Computerised office | 8 Linkages with other communities |
| 5 Communications skills | 9 Other (please describe) |

If your community has had a notable EA process, please tell us about it. What worked? What didn't work?

Part D - Potential Approaches

A variety of different approaches might be used to build EA Capacity. The following scenarios are some examples. Please read through each, and consider the pros and cons of each in terms of its potential to build EA capacity for your First Nation. Your responses will be used to evaluate the potential effectiveness of each example, and could also be used to revise a scenario if it looks promising. For the final scenario you are asked to think about what other approaches, not described here, might be successful.

Scenario 1 EA training for all communities

FNEATWG might develop an **EA curriculum** of courses and resources for decision makers, technical staff, and communities. Courses would be short term (less than one week), would be advertised in advance, and be generally available to all interested First Nations.

The approach would be to provide a wide range of courses to match the range of EA needs identified.

Scenario 2 EA Response Team

A team of **First Nations EA specialists** might be trained in key skills and knowledge, with the objective of assisting First Nation communities as the communities respond to EA issues. The team would consist of a limited number of First Nation personnel who already have some EA experience and/or training. They would be trained in an intensive multi-week program. The team would receive some support for travelling to and assisting First Nations; there might be some requirement for cost sharing by the First Nation. The approach would be to create a learning environment for a group of potential First Nation EA specialists.

Scenario 3 Annual First Nations EA Forum

An annual one or two day forum will be held for BC First Nations to discuss their EA issues and exchange information. Some general training might be included, extending the duration to approximately one week. The approach would be to promote and support networking and exchange of information, while providing some training.

Scenario 4 Pilot project

FNEATWG might provide a group of technical staff from several First Nations with resources, training and supervision as they work through an ongoing EA, or develop EA protocols for a First Nation. The approach would be to provide concrete learning opportunities in the context of hands-on experience. The participants then would be able to apply the skills that they had learned in their own communities.

Scenario 5 Web-based resources

FNEATWG's website will be enhanced to include training and other resources from many sources and links, with the objective of serving as an EA information clearing house for BC First Nations. The approach would be to make a wide range of resources available to as many communities as possible.

Scenario 6 Your ideas

What would be a successful capacity building scenario for your First Nation?

Appendix 7: Summary Tables of Needs Assessment Findings

Table A.1. Familiarity, experience with and training in conducting or reviewing EA/SA.

Pop. First Nation	PART B - Needs Assessment. Question 1: Conduct or review EA/SA																																						
	Conduct or review EA/SA (Y/N)	Scoping EA/SA			Describe environmental setting			Describe social setting			Assess Impacts on VECs			Identify Stakeholders			Develop public involvement plan			Assess potential social impacts			Develop mitigation plans, EM plans, monitoring plans			Make recommendations about significance			Make decisions about balance of interest			Develop/implement follow-up			Hire consultants			Expect greater involvement in future? (Y, N)	
		F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T					
64 High Bar First Nation	N																																						
92 Burns Lake Band	N																																						
176 West Moberly First Nation	N																																					Y	
206 T'sou-ke	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y			Y	Y		Y			Y			Y			Y	Y		Y	Y		Y			Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	
206 Wet'suwet'en	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y			Y			Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y			Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
234 Boston Bar First Nation	Y	Y																														Y	Y					Y	
242 Tsawwassen	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y*	
254 Kwicksutaineuk - Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band	N																																						
281 Shxwhá:y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y			Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	
302 Lheidli-T'enneh Band	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
336 Tsay Keh Dene	N																																						
366 Taku River Tlingit	N																																					Y	
386 Quatisino	N																																					Y	
871 Ulkatcho	N																																					Y	
1170 Ktunaxa Kinbasket	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							Y	Y	Y	Y						Y	Y	Y				Y							
1531 Namgis	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	
0-200	0																																					1	
201-500	6	6	4		5	5	1	5	3	1	4	3		5	4		5	3	1	5	4		5	4	1	5	4		5	3	1	5	3	1	6	6	2		8
501-1000	0																																					1	
over 1000	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1		1	1		1	1		2	2	1	2	1		1	1		2	2	1	1	1		2	1			1

* expects greater involvement (in 2-5 years)

F = Familiarity with E = Experience in T = Training in

Table A.2. Familiarity, experience with and training in intervening in EA.

Pop. First Nation		Part B, Question 2: Intervene in EA																		
		Participate in EA/SA (Y/N)	Review screenings	Participate in Fed/Prov consultation	Identify impacts on Aboriginal rights/title	Identify workable accommodation	Clarify appropriate consultation	Consult with community	Access funding	Access legal / technical assistance	Review technical submissions/reports	Make submissions	Participate in monitoring / follow-up / PIP	Understand BC EA	Understand CEAA	Conduct Traditional Knowledge study	Incorporate TK study into EA processes	Negotiate development agreement	Resolve disputes about development agreements	Expect greater involvement in future? (Y,N)
		F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T	F E T
64 High Bar	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					Y					N
92 Burns Lake	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y		Y Y	Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
176 West Moberly	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y	Y	Y Y	Y	Y Y	Y	Y	Y
206 T'sou-ke	Y			Y		Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y		Y			Y Y					
206 Wet'suwet'en	Y	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y		Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y	Y Y	Y	Y	Y
234 Boston Bar	Y	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y	Y Y	Y	Y	Y			Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
242 Tsawwassen	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y
254 Kwicksutain/Tsawataineu.	Y					Y	Y			Y			Y	Y	Y	Y				Y
281 Shxw'á:y	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y
302 Lheidli-T'enneh	Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y	Y	Y
336 Tsay Keh Dene	Y		Y Y	Y Y																Y
366 Taku River Tlingit	Y	Y Y		Y Y		Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y Y	Y		Y	Y Y	Y	Y Y				Y
386 Quat'sino	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y
871 Ulkatcho	N																			y
1170 Ktunaxa Kinbasket	Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y	Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y
1531 Namgis	Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y Y					Y Y	Y Y	Y Y	Y
0-200	3	2 2	2 2	3 2	3 2	3 2	3 2	3 2	3 2	3 2	1 1	2 2	2 1	2 1 1	3 2	2 1	2 1	2	2	
201-500	10	7 4 2	7 6 2	9 7 2	6 4 2	9 6 2	9 7 3	8 6 2	8 7 2	9 6 3	7 3 2	6 3 2	7 3 3	7 4 3	9 5 1	7 4 1	6 3 1	6 2 1	9	
501-1000	0																			1
over 1000	2	2 2 1	2 2 1	2 2 1	2 2 1	2 2	2 2 1	2 2 1	2 2 1	2 1 1	2 2 1	2 2 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	2 2 1	2 1 1	2 1 1	2	

PIP = public involvement plan F = Familiarity with E = Experience in T = Training in

Table A.3. Familiarity, experience with and training in developing and implementing EA procedures or regulations.

Pop. First Nation	Part B, Question 3: Develop and implement EA procedures or regulations; and review or implement environmental protection measures													
	Develop and implement EA procedures or regulations; and review or implement environmental protection measures (Y/N)	Develop procedures			Interpret/enforce/comply with environmental regulations			Read / summarise technical reports			Hire / oversee contractors			Expect greater involvement in future? (Y, N)
		F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	F	E	T	
64 High Bar First Nation	N													
92 Burns Lake Band	N													
176 West Moberly First Nation	N													
206 T'sou-ke	N													
206 Wet'suwet'en	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y
234 Boston Bar First Nation	N													
242 Tsawwassen	Y				Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y
254 Kwicksutaineuk - Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band	N													
281 Shxwhá:y	Y				Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		Y
302 Lheidli-T'enneh Band	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
336 Tsay Keh Dene	Y	Y			Y	Y								Y
366 Taku River Tlingit	N													
386 Quatisino	Y				Y			Y			Y	Y		
871 Ulkatcho	N													
1170 Ktunaxa Kinbasket	Y	y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1531 Namgis	Y								Y			Y		Y
0-200	0													0
201-500	6	2	1		6	5	2	5	4	1	5	5	1	5
501-1000	0													0
over 1000	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2

Table A.4. Support and capacity to be actively involved in EA.

Part B, Question 4: Support and capacity to be actively involved in EA									
Pop.	First Nation	Access to Computers, Internet, software	Effective management regime	Ability to mobilise EA team/resources	Research/ analysis skills of EA staff	Communications skills among EA staff	Effective ways to communicate with community	Effective ways to communicate with elders	Anticipate changes in these areas? (Y, N)
64	High Bar First Nation	M	M	L	N/A	N/A	H	H	N
92	Burns Lake Band	M	M	M	H	H	H	H	***
176	West Moberly First Nation	M	H	L	L-H**	M-H	M	M	*
206	T'sou-ke	H	H	L	N/A	N/A	H	H	D/K
206	Wet'suwet'en	H	L-M	M	H	M-H	M-H	H	N
234	Boston Bar First Nation	H	M	L	N/A	N/A	M-H	M	Y
242	Tsawwassen	H	H	M	M	H	L	L	Y 4.5, 4.6
254	Kwicksutaineuk - Ah-kwaw-ah-mish Tribes and Tsawataineuk Indian Band	H	H	L	N/A	N/A	M	M	+
281	Shxwhá:y	H	H	H	H	H	VH	VH	N
302	Lheidli-T'enneh Band	H	H	H	M	M	H	M	Y
336	Tsay Keh Dene	L	L	L	N/A	N/A	H	H	***
366	Taku River Tlingit	L-M	L	L	L	L-M	M	M	Y 4.2, 4.1
386	Quatisino	M	M	M	M	H	L	L	Y
871	Ulkatcho	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	+
1170	Ktunaxa Kinbasket	H	M	L	M	M	M	H	Y
1531	Namgis	H	H	M	H	M	M	H	Y

VH = very high

H = high

MH = medium high

M = medium

L-M = low/medium

L = low

+ = did not respond either way, but noted they hoped things would improve.

* Literacy is increasing/traditional language is decreasing – this might have an effect

**The participant ranked this as low to high because there is a big discrepancy between his own capacity and that of his staff.

*** Did not respond to the question.