



- **Do you have feedback on how these can be implemented by companies and how compliance can be verified by the CER (e.g., potential oversight activities, assessment criteria, performance measures.)?**

**Notes:**

- Proper record keeping within the communities
- Providing a space and capacity to first nations communities to conduct a Ceremony.
- Cultural Significance training; we don't review the training program that is being provided. Each nations cultural protocols and practices aren't the same. Respect each individual autonomous nation. E.g. An individual should not be providing cultural competency training within a community they are not part of. Every nation provide their own training and duly compensated for their knowledge.
- Compliance Verification training program: there needs to be some form of trust developed for the ones conducting verification activities. We need to know how other nations are looking at these projects as well.
- A mechanism for nations to know what other nations thoughts are on the project. (e.g opposed nations vs. non-opposed nations; and why they are opposed) knowing how other nations are impacted might affect our decision to support the project.
- There's not enough financing for Indigenous Peoples to do any type of proper response with these types of reviews. Consultation offices are often a one man show that oversee multiple files, multiple industries, and multiple reviews that are important to each indigenous community. We didn't give up land and resources and industry and government are constantly taking land and resources. It's a forced incompetence, we can't go into detail because there is not enough capacity within each community.
- We recommend an agreement with each autonomous First Nation community.
- Localized knowledge incorporation: Picking medicines, never pick from first batch you find, go to second or 3<sup>rd</sup> batch. If that's the last batch, leave it alone so it continues growing. Indigenous teachings are "Only take what's needed", were not the only ones taking from the land. Animals also need the same plants and medicines to sustain themselves. Would CER consider this form of action for not overburdening an area? (Taking too much from the land and not allowing for the recovery of resources)
- Chance finds protocol; Create a protocol for culturally significant items, artifacts, ceremonial landmarks, etc.

- How is it determined that sites are significant? Relying on archaeologists are not always beneficial to indigenous sites of significance. They almost disregard the indigenous background by having a Non-indigenous expert determine if the site is significant. It is disrespectful to indigenous subject matter experts if their opinion is over-ruled by their non-indigenous counterpart.
- Communications protocol for the chance finds; E.g Springbank Examples
- Environment Monitors are there to monitor the environment, should there be a cultural find don't expect the monitor to provide a ceremony. Reach out to each community to discuss further.

## **Sub-topic 2**

### **What is your feedback for CERs objective for improvement?**

- It's a good starting point for further discussion. This could also be
- Could withhold licenses for industry's that are not properly compensating communities. What is the amount they are actually making and a specific percentage they should be providing FN's people. We had our own trade systems and economy, it was based on economic profit. Trading furs and Oil, they cut us out entirely, they're benefitting and profiting. How can we ensure there are benefits being provided to FN's? are they providing a percentage of revenue, if they want to duplicate their work. CER can withhold licenses to industry if they are not providing adequate compensation to FN's people.
- Treaties – when treaties were signed there was an expected sharing of resources. It should be 50/50 split.
- Indigenous Communities themselves can provide the answers for the socio-economic compliance verification activity. Each community has different needs and will determine themselves if those needs have been met.
- The AB Government is reviewing coal policies; NRTA was transferred from Canadian to alberta government in 1930. Danielle Smith, not long ago was making request to make NRTA; Northern bands, seems that they are endorsing that Natural resources belong to the AB government. That nations are accepting that. We did not make alberta, it's a bigger issue than objectives. Ask Kennedy what his thoughts are on jurisdiction.
- Performance measures: economic footprint they leave. Think of it as a graph and the graph is measuring the footprint. Size of the project. Population of animals. Land, Air, Water, Species. Each could have their own measurement.

- Every situation needs to be treated differently and respectfully. There no one size fits all approach to any situation. Every nation treated with the utmost importance and respectfully.
- Potential duplication of providers and Services. CER/IAAC. When do they collaborate?
- New requirements: Give everyone a chance to review them and put them out to the public to conduct a review first. They should state why they are having new requirements.

### **Sub-topic 3**

- Companies should really consider each indigenous communities' perspective on each project they are working on.
- There are communities that are mainly impacted by having major projects cross through their territory. They should have priority as they are directly impacted and will also impact their future generations.
- Culturally significant sites if they can be identified, should be identified and included within a protection plan.
- Communication plan to be included within socio-economic protection plan.
- Indigenous Communities themselves can provide the answers for the socio-economic compliance verification activity. Each community has different needs and will determine themselves if those needs have been met.
- Metrics talking about nature; it's difficult to talk about those surveys. Our hunters will give us an idea through hearsay. As much as we would like to be in the know it's hard to get it down to a number. Statistics are difficult for nations to get. There are no baseline stats within Indigenous communities. We need to create a baseline. The healthy baseline was along time ago, were collecting industries dirty data.
- It's about the timing of everything. The Agreements we have been working on with Government, it takes a long time. There's no urgency in getting items wrapped up. On critical issues, response times from government is often slow and calculated. When they want numbers from us, its difficult to get the appropriate data. They are almost asking for the impossible.
- Don't know what GNP comes to Alberta. GNP is something that comes to AB. What percentage of that comes to Indian Groups. Where are we going to develop? All these questions are from the past. Don't see us doing much future development. Are we drilling more wells. These new objectives are something that doesn't relate to Maskwacis. Our develop is already completed.

- Objectives. We should be asking for Gross National Product. We should be involved in a closer range at these tables. We don't know is saying we never kept track and no statistics makes us vulnerable. Indigenous require funding to provide statistics. A lot of those were not addressed like sewer lines. Any new regulation being proposed is absent on grandfather clauses.