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Executive Summary

This research workshop was set up to help guide the work of the network, with the intentions of helping to establish research questions, and determining how to coordinate projects and ensure community benefits, without focusing on specific projects so much as on discussions targeting the overall directions of the research program.

On the first day, ReSDA Principal Investigator Chris Southcott provided an overview of the ReSDA program and the intentions of the workshop (as detailed above). Brenda Parlee then highlighted a schematic diagram with a skeleton timeline explaining that in years one and two of the research process, the main focus will be determining what has been done, examining historical and contemporary data on social and economic related areas, and conducting a gap analysis. Years three and four are planned as establishing more focused and “on-the-ground” research projects, and addressing problems and questions that ReSDA research partners and the community level may have with respect to resource development. The final years are to involve an analysis of the “big picture,” ensuring that the initial objectives do address community needs, and identify knowledge mobilization and action. Frances Abele and Dave Natcher provided supporting comments emphasizing the importance of understanding what has previously been studied, building and developing new ideas, as well as realizing that, as a Circumpolar program, ReSDA should include a range of issues that are changing the North.

Following the opening presentations, a panel made up of representatives from the northern ReSDA partners provided insights from their organizations and regions. Included in this panel were the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, Labrador Institute, Yukon Government, and Government of the NWT. An interesting point worth noting was that there is a great deal of research already done in the territorial North, but there is a need for research in the provincial North. Furthermore, a question that was raised was: What has been the response to the research that has been done in the North? It is crucial that it is understood why the research is being undertaken and who it will benefit.

Following the Northern Perspectives panel, the workshop was structured to allow for panels on: Meta Questions, International Perspectives, Methodological Issues, Issues and Approaches (Parts I & II), and Final Remarks and Next Steps. The final four of these panels occurred on the second day of the workshop.

The Meta Questions panel consisted of Lee Huskey, Ken Coates, Arn Keeling, Suzanne Mills, and Emilie Cameron. Main themes brought up throughout this panel were the importance of institutional and decision-making factors, and the social implications of resource development, such as community benefits, mobile and migrant workers, wage labour, and social organization.

The International Perspectives panel, made up of Florian Stammler, Gertrude Eilmsteiner-Saxinger, Stephanie Martin, Lassi Heininen and Chris Southcott, dealt with the role of institutions, the impact of commuter workers, differing definitions and levels of sustainability, and the importance of identifying indicators and actors, all in a global context.
The third panel, on Methodological Issues (composed of Michel Beaulieu, Andrey Petrov, Chris Furgal, Harvey Lemelin and Ron Harpelle) discussed the issues of knowledge mobilization and gathering, gaps in monitoring and communication, and how to better involve communities in the research.

The Issues & Approaches I panel (Martha Dowsley, Stephan Schott, Paul Berger, Deborah Simmons and Remy Rouillard) dealt with North-South relations, the integration of the traditional sharing economy with the market-based economy, the development of local labour, and education.

The final panel, Issues & Approaches II, made up of Thibault Martin, Natalia Loukacheva, Thierry Rodon, John Sandlos, Ken Caine and Chris Southcott (on behalf of researchers unable to attend), discussed the importance of defining what sustainability is for Aboriginal people, the legal connections with resource development, the need to expand networking between regions to improve capacity, and the importance of historical research.

In the final remarks of the workshop, it was stressed that it is necessary to connect skills, knowledge, interests and capacity with critical issues surrounding resource development.
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Introduction

Each year ReSDA will organize an annual research workshop based on a central theme. This first one was devoted to the discussion of a research plan for the next seven years. Discussions with community partners about research priorities began in 2010. This initial annual workshop in Yellowknife provided researchers with an opportunity to reflect on recommendations from communities and discuss how these suggestions should be translated into formal research questions.

This workshop report reflects the proceedings from the Yellowknife workshop as they occurred. The format of the workshop was a series of presentations of 10-15 minutes in length each, grouped around a central theme and followed by a discussion section, making up each of the panels. Roundtable introductions of workshop participants followed the opening introduction given by Chris Southcott, after which the panel presentations and discussions began.

Background

The Resources and Sustainable Development in the Arctic (ReSDA) network is a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) funded Major Collaborative Research Initiative. Bringing together a broad range of disciplines and organizations, ReSDA represents universities, colleges, communities, government, the private sector and non-profits in northern Canada and other circumpolar countries. ReSDA will examine ways of ensuring that a larger share of the benefits of resource developments stays in the region with fewer costs to communities. In partnership and with the substantial support of a wide range of northern actors, the Network will fund a series of research projects around the themes of sustainable regions, sustainable communities, sustainable cultures, and sustainable environments. These research projects will measure and analyze the impacts of resource development and find ways of assisting Arctic communities to deal with these impacts through a range of new and innovative development and policy tools.
1. Introduction of the ReSDA Project and Research Planning Approach

1.1. Chris Southcott  
*Lakehead University*  
*Principal Investigator and Theme 2 Coordinator*

**What is ReSDA?**

ReSDA is the largest social science research project ever proposed for the Circumpolar North. It currently involves 51 researchers at 29 universities in 9 countries. The main focus of ReSDA’s research will be on finding ways to ensure that a larger share of the benefits of resource development stays in the region with fewer costs to communities. How can communities in the North get more from natural resources than in the past? The Network will mobilize researchers around the questions of how to maximize benefits of resource development to northern regions and communities and minimize the social, economic, cultural, and environmental costs. The primary objective of the research will be to cultivate innovative approaches to determine the best ways of using natural resources to improve the well-being of northern communities while preserving the region’s unique ecosystem.

**Where does this proposal come from?**

This proposal came out of the Social Economy Research Network for Northern Canada (SERNNoCa) and its community partners, which began operations in 2006 and is still continuing. It is attempting to examine ways that community groups (such as non-profits, volunteer groups, cooperatives and others) can improve wellbeing in communities. As a part of SERNNoCa we have been going to different communities in the Canadian North and doing community research workshops. During these, we repeatedly asked what community representatives wanted social science research to focus on, and the theme of getting more out of resources often came up. They don’t want to repeat problems that happened in the past. They need to have a sustainable future. With the SERNNoCa program coming to an end the research team determined that the future research focus would relate to examining areas concerning the impacts of resource developments. There was also a similar Network of Centres of Excellence proposal developed in 2009 that was based around the same basic ideas as ReSDA, but wasn’t focused on working with communities. The SERNNoCa network wanted to see continued research and thought this could be achieved through this program. The program was also inspired by several international workshops organized by the University of the Arctic and UNESCO and the importance of resource developments in other countries.

There were several processes involved in the development of the project including a letter of intent proposal that was submitted just before Christmas of 2009 and accepted in February 2010. Then we had further discussions with Canadian northern partners, and a produced a final
full proposal in September 2010. This involved a process of review and interviews. A final acceptance notification was received in December 2010.

**Current Structure of ReSDA**

ReSDA is based on four themes: sustainable regions, sustainable communities, sustainable cultures, and sustainable environments. There are 3 types of questions for this research that include measuring the impacts, analyzing the impacts, and dealing with the impacts. This is shown in the schematic diagram in Figure 1.

![ReSDA research themes and questions](image)

The members of the ReSDA Steering Committee include the 4 theme coordinators, and partner institutions in each of the five northern regions to include the Yukon Research Institute, Aurora Research Institute, Nunavut Research Institute, Makivik Inc., the Labrador Institute; as well as also Arctic Co-operatives, and the addition of an international research representative. There is also a Management Committee, which is comprised of the four theme coordinators and the ReSDA coordinator, Valoree Walker.

There will be five coordination offices in the Canadian North, and we will also add something for the international perspective.
The purpose of this year’s workshop

The initial period of the project is to allow more discussion on what we should be doing. We have to take time to get to the important questions that we need to answer at the beginning so that this work is done in an efficient, coordinated way that will really benefit communities. We will not talk about specific projects at this stage, but will identify key research questions for the network. We want to develop a “state of the research knowledge /gap analysis” type document that would serve as the basis for determining our future research and for a more concrete “research plan”.

1.2. Brenda Parlee
University of Alberta
Theme 4 Coordinator

Brenda provided additional information about the research planning and the focus that is needed at this stage.

The ReSDA research themes of sustainable environments/communities/regions and cultures are very interrelated areas and depending on where people are in the Circumpolar North, this will mean different things. We are really talking about a very open book at this point in terms of themes. Some of the key sectors include mining, gas and hydroelectric developments and we are trying to focus on the impacts of these, but also in a broader sense of where these sectors fit into whatever sustainability framework each region, culture or community might have. In the research work with SERNNoCa, we found that different regions have different priorities and issues, but we also kept
finding cross-cutting themes and the same kinds of stories even within this large geographic area. In addition to the five Canadian northern regions, we are now adding a circumpolar piece within ReSDA as this will also address similar issues. The purpose of this workshop is to identify these cross-cutting themes and priorities as we have to identify larger meta-questions (not project specific questions). Some research partner representatives and research institutions from the communities are here as well and this will allow us to figure out a process to form research clusters to work together on particular projects in the future. We want to identify what we might work on for research areas as well as the process for research teams to work together.

Dave has developed a schematic diagram providing a skeleton of a timeline over the next 6 years. Brenda went through and described this diagram and the potential stages of ReSDA.

Years 1 and 2: We want to make the best use of funding and avoid duplicating work so that the research is useful to those dealing with resource development issues. This means that we need to figure out what we already know. Some examples of research that might happen in these first two years include historical overviews of key themes, trend analysis of historical and contemporary data on social and economic capital, meta-analyses of existing high-quality data, and the gap analysis.

Years 3 and 4: In these years, we will use what we learned in the first two years and do more on-the-ground research, and more specifically problem-solving projects. We need to work hard during this phase of the process in order to address the problems that our research partners and the communities have had with resource development. Examples of other kinds of questions to ask and areas to address include investigations of contemporary activities, programs and policies, and evaluations of environmental assessment processes.

Years 5 to 7: During this phase we will analyze the “big picture” and ensure that we have met our initial objectives, addressed community needs, and targeted knowledge dissemination in a more focused way. We will need to focus on mobilizing knowledge and research, and turning it into action.

Figure 3- Schematic diagram of proposed ReSDA program activities
1.3. Frances Abele  
*Carleton University*  
*Theme 1 Coordinator*

We have students here today that have been working on various projects over last few years relating to northern community development. Many of those coming to work in research in the North are stuck in the same old paradigms on northern economic development that were utilized during the Berger inquiry and describe the North as a frontier for development, and analyses are made in terms of dichotomies. What we are doing is quite grand, because we want to take the thinking about northern development to another level and find a new place for people to understand what is happening in the North.

We want to build on the best of the new work to develop new paradigms and ways of thinking, and then see if they work. This has to be Circumpolar and has to include a whole range of issues that are changing the circumstances in the North. We intend to take the understanding of northern social and economic development issues and take them to the next level, as part of this is looking at what has happened to the field. We are at a moment now where we don’t have to stay in this place of past research so we want to build on the best of the new work to develop new paradigms and ways of thinking and see if they work. It has to be Circumpolar and include all aspects that influence resource development.

1.4. David Natcher  
*University of Saskatchewan*  
*Theme 3 Coordinator*

There is nothing concrete about this plan as it will be developed. We are just coming out of the SERNNoCa research and it has been successful in a lot of ways, but one thing we learned is that we jumped into small case studies and these are helpful for organizations, but as researchers we are struggling to make links between these case studies to see how they fit into a bigger picture. With ReSDA, we are interested in taking stock of what’s been done so we don’t repeat work in northern development discourse.

1.5. Discussion

*Question:* Does everybody have same understanding of the level of integration between the research that’s going to be done on the Canadian North and the international components? There was a mention of an international coordinating office—how will this work?

- ReSDA is structured on the Canadian situation – integrating international projects is something to work on. We borrowed the paradigm from SERNNoCa, which is a Canadian project, but we do have a unique opportunity in that with the SSHRC Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI) program we can give funding to support international programs.
- How exactly we do this will be developed over time, but we hope that our international partners will talk about what they think we should be doing and what projects they can link into.
In the presentation, the “five regions” refers to Canadian regions (Yukon, Northwest Territories, Nunavut, Nunavik and Labrador) and the sixth region refers to the international region.

**Question:** What is the Circumpolar region? Will the subarctic be included?
- Outside of Nunavik and Nunatsiavut region, we are not technically supposed to include provincial North – but with that being said, we told SSHRC we would like to link with the provincial North.
- We have to develop a way that research in the provincial North in Canada can be included in ReSDA research, but currently don’t have funding to do so.

**Question:** Is there a mechanism for how the projects will be selected and funded?
- We are using the process from SERNNoCa so far. Under SERNNoCa we had calls for proposals, an application form, and a Committee that reviewed and decided on these.
- This time we want to be more proactive and rather than waiting for proposals to come in we want to mold the proposals between people and projects.
- We will come up with this process over next few weeks.
- We would like advice on this process though, so if anyone has had successes with this, we would appreciate input.

**Question:** If research clusters were developed, would these be able to develop work plans and budgets to reduce chances of fragmentation and an island approach to research proposals?
- In an ideal world we would have a sense of what these clusters would look like so that there are general groupings of people with similar interests.
- This would be an expansion of the governance model through decentralization.
- One problem is that we don’t have enough money to do this, but we are in good position to receive more money.
- Chris has been trying to get more money and it would be good to use the rest of the research money as seed money to get more money.
- Other partners have promised additional funding in their letters of support.
- Also trying to manage balance of projects and engagement in different regions – this means that there are multiple things going on in terms of how these clusters might be focused and multiple variables in figuring out how projects are put together.

**Question:** The four themes sound holistic, but when you mention sustainable – what do you mean by sustainable development?
- We were hoping that some people would talk about this to critically analyze notion of sustainable.
2. Northern Partners Panel

2.1. Jennifer Johnston  
*Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC)*

The Inuvialuit Final Agreement (IFA) was signed in 1984 and provided the Inuvialuit with 91,000 square kilometers of land. $45 million were to be paid over 13 years, with guaranteed hunting and trapping rights, participation in the management of wildlife, conservation and the environment through co-management boards, a $10 million Economic development Fund, and a $7.5 million Social Development Fund.

The IFA goals include preserving Inuvialuit cultural identity and values in a changing northern society; enabling Inuvialuit to be equal and meaningful participants in the northern and national economies and societies; and protecting and preserving the Arctic wildlife, environment and biological productivity.

The Inuvialuit Development Corporation (IDC) secures financial and long-term benefits for the Inuvialuit. It is 100% Aboriginal owned, with the sole shareholder being the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC), and is currently an owner, partner in joint ventures, and/or an investor in more than 20 companies.

*Figure 4 - IRC Corporate Structure*
Social science research is the most underfunded research in the Arctic, and the Inuvialuit still struggle with social, cultural and economic issues, such as food security, poverty, housing and employment. More often than not, researchers and research-users have fundamentally different world views, which can often reduce the benefits of research in a number of areas, for example: the production of research that is relevant and useful to communities; the reduction of research with an aim to create positive change; and lost opportunities for knowledge transfer.

As an additional comment, it is important to know the history of research in the region. Many people come up and do research that may not be mindful of the people who live there. Others may do research that is of interest, but do not come back to the community to present their findings. We are interested in partnering with researchers, to have them understand the day-to-day lives of the people who live there, so that both agendas are met.

In order to address the issues previously mentioned, Inuvialuit Institutions are currently developing a Research Agenda and Policy to coordinate and direct research in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region; encourage and prioritize research; and provide research results to Inuvialuit communities and institutions so that they can make informed planning, policy and program decisions. Many policies were developed a long time ago, are very colonial and do not work for people.

The Inuvialuit Indicators Project (www.inuvialuitindicators.com) has developed over the last 4 years and is based on data spanning 20 years. It set out to: measure the achievement of Inuvialuit Final Agreement goals; determine the social, cultural and economic impacts from resource development; and monitor Inuvialuit and government efforts to improve conditions.

The draft research agenda encompasses many things, such as:
- Social, cultural and economic impacts from resource development, based on Inuvialuit Indicators Data Base analysis, to more clearly identify impacts so that helpful measures can be more fully targeted and developed;
- Sustainable community-based economies. Many smaller communities are struggling because there is very little employment. It is necessary to know what the existing economic conditions of communities are (and defining what the benchmark of economic sustainability is), and how community entrepreneurs and businesses, as well as economic organizations, retain and sustain income and wealth;
- Impacts of government policies on sustainable development and culture;
- Specific health determinants to achieve sustainable communities. For example: what causes high rates of infant mortality and identify pre-post-natal care; develop methods to decrease harmful addictions and other mental health issues;
- Developing Inuvialuit Institutions as a governing and economic entity, by continuing to educate, train and build Inuvialuit capacity;
- Influencing policy and directions of the Governments of Canada and the Northwest Territories, through consistent and meaningful participation in decision-making based on well-developed positions supported by sound research; and
- Meaningful participation in regulatory agencies, industry and other stakeholder processes when making decisions that may impact the future development of the region, water use and environmental issues.
To emphasize, Inuvialuit Institutions are “open for business” with regards to research collaborations and partnerships. We encourage researchers to work with Inuvialuit communities in the development of their ideas and projects, and to seek involvement from the initial stages through to information and results sharing. This will ensure that both Inuvialuit and researcher goals can be achieved.

2.2. Jennifer Butler Wight  
*Labrador Institute*

Labrador Institute is part of Memorial University of Newfoundland, based in Labrador. Labrador Institute has offices in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, North West River and Labrador West. The Institute started off as Memorial Extension Services, which was very community-based; it has since changed to its present form, but still has a community-based component (though it is not the main focus).

Labrador Institute’s mission statement is to bring the needs and interests of Labradorians to the University, and to facilitate actions that will bring the capacities of the University to bear on the needs and interests of Labradorians. This mission is accomplished through four main strategies, known as “CORE”: C-collaboration; O-outreach; R-research; and E-education.

Collaborations include co-location agreements with College of the North Atlantic; development and delivery of collaborative programs (for example, the Integrated Nursing Access Program); a Research Centre in North West River; the Sivinivut Inuit Community Corporation; and a pilot Bachelor of Social Work Degree. Other collaborative efforts include ongoing involvement with the Aboriginal Initiatives Task Force, and the awarding of substantial grants to upgrade infrastructure and facilities in North West River, Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Nain. Labrador Institute also collaborates with SERNNoCa, as Dr. Ron Sparkes is a member of both the SERNNoCa and ReSDA steering committees, and Labrador Institute has been involved in student research and symposium coordination with SERNNoCa.

For outreach, Labrador Institute staff are very involved in the community through volunteer activities. For the research component, a number of studies, publications and reports have been produced. For education, a pilot Bachelor of Social Work degree has been implemented in collaboration with Memorial University of Newfoundland School of Social Work and the Nunatsiavut Government, and Labrador Institute has organized and delivered various spring and summer courses.

Plans for the future include a budget expansion, new faculty and staff, hiring of new research associates, new projects and collaboration with ReSDA.

More information/contact:  
http://www.mun.ca/labradorinstitute  
Email: labrador.institute@mun.ca  
Facebook: www.facebook.com/labainstitute  
Twitter: www.twitter.com/labainstitute
2.3. Mary Ellen Thomas
*Nunavut Research Institute*

The Nunavut Research Institute (NRI) suffers from bi-polar disorder in that we are in the natural sciences and offer the government scientific advice, but out of the 150 research projects we have every year only a third are in the social sciences. It seems wrong that the social sciences aren’t leading in the projects that we do because when you look at any of the statistics, we are the worst in just about everything that relates to social areas (such as income, health, education, and so on.) Nunavut is a very young government, however, and is going through growing pains. We are also on the edge of huge resource development. For example, there is a railway every two days on Baffin Island, with tanker ships traveling every two days to Europe, a diamond mine bigger than Diavik Mine, road development, gold development, uranium mining, and more. We are on the edge of many boom-bust cycles.

In the past, small communities have only reacted to big changes. It is a question of, will we do this again? ReSDA could be an opportunity not to wait for socio-economic research to be done by companies as part of their environmental process, but to help define what information communities need and be a part of that change in the process. If communities are not part of this process from the beginning, how do we know where we are now and how do we know (other than what the companies say), how we will be impacted in the future? ReSDA can be an opportunity to involve our communities. We do not know where we will be in seven years, but it opens the door for us to be a partner in this research and help define the process. We see ReSDA as a group involved in monitoring, measuring, and having information about resource development for northern communities.

2.4. Aynslie Ogden
*Science Advisor, Yukon Government*

A lot more departments within the Yukon Government (YG) would be interested in partnering with ReSDA. As the Science Advisor, I am able to facilitate these types of connections. The end of International Polar Year (IPY) gave the Yukon Government an opportunity to analyze what their interests are in this sector, what kind of policies need to be in place, and what kind of science needs to be in place to support this policy-making. With this process, of trying to get a sense of where we’re at in the Yukon, we came up with a report. From this report we got an endorsement to proceed with establishing an inter-departmental science group, which may be a good group for ReSDA researchers to liaise with in the future.

The inter-departmental science group has been tasked with devising a science strategy for the Yukon to align what our priorities are. They have also been tasked with developing a research agenda, working on a database to provide researchers with an idea of what our capacity is, creating a research activity database, and developing a research licensing process. We are proud of role that the Yukon Research Centre (YRC) has played in bringing ReSDA to the territory. The YRC has made significant progress since it opened its doors two years ago and is now a hub for research in the region. It is now SSHRC and NSERC eligible. It is encouraging to see the breadth of partnerships that are here today, because if we don’t develop international partnerships, we
will be left behind. It is also exciting that social science research is attracting more funding in the North, because the social science has an important role to play in addressing global issues.

There is currently in a mining exploration boom in the Yukon – the biggest ever in the territory. There are many social and economic changes, such as increasing population and labour force, and new issues like housing and energy. Some of the themes that ReSDA is working on are very important for the Yukon, for example sustainable development and mining. We have been working on influencing the Canadian High Arctic Research Stations (CHARS) to reflect the priorities of the YG. We have seen with federal programs that we don’t always have the opportunity to provide input in the early stages. We are trying to put an effort to do this in the CHARS program because it will be one of the primary federal funding vehicles in the future.

The YG has a list of research interests that is 20 pages long, has come from YG departments and corporations, and details the kind of research we’re interested in supporting. This support would range from potential financial contribution to in-kind support. However, there are a few steps that this list needs to go through before it is shared with researchers. It is encouraging that the concept of knowledge-to-action is being considered now, and not six years from now. For example, at IPY this wasn’t being considered and it’s obvious that it is an afterthought.

2.5. Andrew Applejohn  
*Science Advisor, Government of Northwest Territories*

There is a long history of government funding aimed strictly towards bio-physical impacts and assessing industrial development only in terms of air quality, water quality, and so on. While this is important, it is about time that someone looks at structural issues behind the impacts on people who live in the territory. Northern jurisdictions share advantages and disadvantages when it comes to the economic development associated with the resource extraction industries, as well as the issues related to the science in that area.

The Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) is still relatively young (circa 1974) and many of our institutions are still evolving. This is a dynamic political landscape where we’re still changing as a result of settling land claims, engaging with federal government on discussion of devolution, and wrestling with the boom and bust cycle of development. Most community representations (i.e. flags) involve aspects of the environment as well as implements of resource extraction – communities here are intimately involved with and have developed alongside resource industry. The importance of the work this group is taking on can’t be stressed enough in that we need to start re-focusing efforts on people and communities. We need to keep asking questions of “why” – i.e. why are we engaged in a review of a regulatory process? The answer is usually to benefit the people that live here.

They have gone through structural reorganization at GNWT to clarify various departments’ roles in the support of sciences. They formed an inter-departmental working group and research agenda – this group is a good platform for people to bring reports, concepts, etc. to and the science advisor can help arrange that process. We are eager to follow up on themes and concepts that have been laid out at this meeting; although it is a difficult time to discuss financial resources, there are some possibilities that we can discuss in longer term. GNWT isn’t without resources of its own and we have an ongoing interest in maximizing the benefits to our communities through ongoing
partnerships, then using this to help develop the backbones of public policy that will lead to reasonable solutions to ongoing resource development across the regions of the NWT.

2.6. Discussion

*Question:* What happened in Nunavut? During the land claims negotiation there was so much optimism because the agreement was better than anything that had happened in Alaska, but things aren’t turning out very well. Is there a lesson to learn?

- This is a challenging question to answer, which speaks to the heart of what’s happening in Nunavut.
  - How land claims progress is an interesting question, related to how land claims are working to restructure economies and affect the way that resource extraction is done.
  - How it affects mixed economy is also important.
- All of these things that are happening sometimes happen outside of the real lives of people living in the communities – with environmental processes, community consultations, etc., sometimes these processes aren’t happening in context of daily lives.
  - There is a disconnect from those political things going on and the lives people are living in their communities, so it becomes a question of theory or of researchers writing reports and not about hearing from those who are truly living the experiences.

*Question:* Is anything already going on related to offshore drilling of oil that involves social sciences?

- Beaufort Regional Environmental Assessment, which involves social and cultural working groups.
- Joint Secretariat involved in similar working groups.
- In contrast to Nunavut, there is a very different philosophy regarding offshore oil on the Greenland side – a comparison in two world views and philosophies would be an interesting research project.
  - In Nunavut, there is participation in national and local economies, participation in the work economy, but on the other you have a priority for protecting the environment, wildlife, resource harvesting, etc. – this is a dichotomy that exists within land claims organizations themselves.
  - Not sure what Greenland’s view is.

*Question:* No one has mentioned protected areas and tourism – how will it be incorporated into the project?

- This could be another good study.
- Is a complicated issue, and in the context of the Northwest Territories resource development and tourism are inter-related.
- Ex. Transportation infrastructure that brought everyone here works to benefit the tourism industry, but it was built by resource industry – they should work together.

*Question:* Is it correct to say that the common denominator to a lot of what has been said pertains to the idea that the first year of ReSDA should develop some sort of monitoring and measuring system that different regions could use? If so, do you have some ideas of what expectations you
have for this system? For the international component, what would be most valuable and relevant to Canadian stakeholders from an international perspective?

- Measuring and monitoring is an area that the Yukon Government is interested in, ranging from standardizing protocols for collecting baseline information to health.
  - Health is another area related to resource development that is of interest – number of challenges due to small populations because there ends up being an amalgamation of information across the territories, but territories are so different that there is no value in this amalgamation of statistics.
  - The territories are very different, but there is value in measuring and monitoring these things across the territories.
  - Need to be thinking of what are the most important things to measure, how we measure them, who is measuring them.
  - A lot of value that this network can add to this discussion, especially in environmental assessment and cumulative impact assessment.

- GNWT recently ended cumulative impact monitoring—there has been a large volume of monitoring (socially, economically, environmentally), but programs come and go based on government priority.
  - It was pointed out that there’s a gap in interpretation of results of monitoring programs, so standardizing results is difficult – the interpretation of results is one way to bring common perspectives to non-standardized protocols.
  - However, these rarely get back to the community, so they don’t see the results in a comprehensive perspective.
  - If this is a priority in the ReSDA working group, there would be a receptive audience in the NWT at least, if not in all the regions.
  - Publishing in academic journals is one thing, but people that are living here and experiencing it may need a different vehicle for communicating interpreted monitoring results.

**Question:** On a per capita basis, there is more research being done in the territorial North than in any other part of the country. If you want to find an under-researched part of the country, just go to the provincial North. The issue isn’t the number of scholars coming up here. There is an implicit criticism in our coming here of those who have been doing research here for a while. I am interested in your comments on the work that has been done and whether anyone up here is paying attention to it. This is an interesting challenge to make it clear why we are here.

- By law, the Aurora College (in NWT) is responsible for producing a state of research report every five years— for this we went out to speak to people and community organizations and found that their needs were opposite to the perspective of the scientific “experts.”
  - If you take the bias out and speak to people about their personal wants and needs in terms of science, it is the same here as anywhere, or very close at least.
  - Maybe it’s the responsibility of communities, local governments, Aboriginal governments and territorial governments to start a survey at a national level.
  - This doesn’t mean that old research isn’t invaluable, because they provide the basis for the next generation of science to go on.
  - A lot of money has been spent in the North already, but it costs a lot to operate here.
  - The question is why are we doing this? For whose benefit?

- Two real questions we need to ask – what science are we doing, and science for what?
Until we start addressing those questions, we will have an endless parade of people who want to do research on permafrost, glaciers, etc.

Comment: From an international perspective, I want to support the idea of joining forces on interpreting social impacts of resource development rather than coming up with another set of more sophisticated standards – it would be a great outcome of this project if we could translate these ideas into action.

3. Meta Questions Panel

3.1. Lee Huskey
University of Alaska Anchorage

When I first started working in Alaska, my research area was to try to figure out in a formal way what made rural Alaskan communities tick (economist perspective). At the time I used models and techniques from Missouri. We had to use the models and techniques that I was taught in school, which explain the economy as money coming into and leaving the community. It didn’t take long to realize that these models didn’t really work for rural communities and that they didn’t describe their economies – rural communities in Alaska are built on jobs, money from all levels of government, and the traditional economy. To figure out what makes an economy like this tick is a lot more complicated than the simpler models I started with.

In the process of figuring out what was going on in these economies, we still have questions that we haven’t figured out (in Alaska at least). ReSDA provides an opportunity to do comparative work and to learn from this cross-country comparison, because the North isn’t all the same. In Alaska we’re set up for an economic crisis – this has to do with flow of funds, a good share of which comes from some level of government (federal or state). Both levels of government are now facing the question of how to spend less money. Rural communities don’t have the same level of political power that other communities have. One question we have is what happens when these transfers that support these communities shrink?

In my research two things have come up that ReSDA could look at:

1. These rural northern communities are places of persistent poverty, in terms of money income; and
2. Question of migration – flows of people into, out of, and around the North. In certain places in the North there is urbanization of large towns. A question to pursue is the description, comparison and explanation of the flow of migration in the north. Why are some places getting more migration than others?

Since the 1970s there has been significant change in resource ownership – not only are we getting resource development, but the “owners” are changing, for example as in the Finmark project in Norway, where local residents are getting some control of resources they own. This has been going on for a long time in places with a wide variety of resource regimes. It suggests that there is an opportunity to study “rules of the game” – how the laws, customs and traditions that govern resource development change across time, how they’re different across places and how these
differences affect costs and benefits of development of resources across the North. In Alaska we have seen the development of new resource ownership – from land claims to community development quota programs to local governments in N.W. Arctic and North Slope. What are the consequences for research development of these different institutional structures? For example, it's not just about how does resource development affect global communities and different institutional frameworks, but vice versa as well. In Alaska we have found that ownership of resources doesn't necessarily solve the problems of conflicting resource use between corporations and communities.

One reason to study institutions is to look for better ways of solving problems in other countries. A broad study of institutions and their effect on resource development will allow ReSDA to do the things it wants to do. It is not to solve the problems of resource development, but to set up rules for institutions that limit problems.

Three important themes for further research:
- What continues to make the rural communities tick?
- Movement of people and migration.
- Study of institutions and their consequences.

3.2. Ken Coates  
*University of Waterloo*

In Northern research we think we know a lot, but never acknowledge how little we know. I will talk a bit about what I think the gaps are for research. From the northern partner’s panel, what was heard and what you were really telling us was that people matter more than academic agendas. These are real needs. Northern scholarship has always been more engaged and more interdisciplinary than most places so we are not starting this from nothing. This project is a real test of whether scholars can get it right, because behind it is the promise that we would, as scholars, make a difference. It is a lot of money that is being put towards this work. It is important to recognize that governments don’t trust us very much and the public trusts us even less so we have to realize that if people are excited about what we’re doing, it’s because they don’t like what else is out there. One of the things we should study is ourselves – how are we doing this, and whether we’re actually doing something different or if we’re dressing up what we’ve always done and calling it something else. We need to study what we are doing so we know if we can provide a model for elsewhere.

There are several relevant northern issues and areas of research interest. We need to know more about the impact of land claims settlements; some have been around since the 1980s, and it is important to figure out what worked and what didn’t. There are also some serious issues to look at – issues that undermine the core of societies. One area is fetal alcohol syndrome; the social services and health care costs of fetal alcohol syndrome in the North are unsustainable.

Another question to ask is, does research work? It would be helpful to identify 10 or 15 things that have worked. We need to find “good news” stories and projects that have actually worked, such as Julie Cruikshanks’s work on Aboriginal language in culture in the Yukon, which has had a noticeable transformative impact across the Yukon. We need to find the projects that have made a difference and talk about them, with a common vocabulary around good research that is clear and blunt about community aspirations.
An issue is that many academics don’t want Aboriginal people to change, but we need to know what people want; for example, are there intergenerational differences in community aspirations? What do young people want out of the North, and is this different from their grandparents? Do northern institutions have different aspirations than the communities? These are questions that we need to study.

We know very little about resource companies – personnel, background, commitment to the North, priorities and so on. Some of these companies have had more commitment to the North than any of us. We need to know more about engineers that are good northern residents, good environmentalists, etc. We also need to know more about North-South relations and connections, for example the transiency of the workforce. In Canada it is an interesting issue that has developed: the new Canadians who have migrated here have little or no connection to the Canadian North – what does this do when the country changes as a whole?

Other considerations include the needs and sustainability of infrastructure; northern successful entrepreneurship; and the impact of winter on northern communities. Additionally, it is important to note that, when we talk about the North, we’re generally talking about Aboriginal people. Research on non-Aboriginal northerners is very thin, but we need to know more about this as the social climate is changing, and more than half of the population is now coming back. Another, final, issue that needs to be addressed is the cost of legal processes and land claims negotiations – are they worth it?

Evidently, the scale of research needs in the social sciences is massive. Social science research matters and can change the way that society operates. Most importantly, we have the opportunity to prove that what we say about the research is actually true, that what we do matters and that we can change the way societies operate. We have the chance to do this through ReSDA.

3.3. Arn Keeling  
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY

I am going to zero in on a particular area of research which is my own research on mining and related areas. I have been involved in looking at abandoned mines in northern Canada, studying the impact of mineral development on communities in Northern territories. Work has focused on the history of mining and in part driven because of boom and bust cycles, but also because of students’ questions looking into the past of mining, its contemporary elements and the aftermath of mining. For example we have been looking at “zombie mines” – seemingly past episodes of resource development that come alive or whose implications live on long after the developments of the mine have finished. We have been looking at case studies in the Yukon and Nunavut, as well as the provincial North in some cases. Some of the big questions are coming into focus around the interaction of mining and extractive industries and questions of sustainability. We are increasingly interested in focusing on long-term sustainability of mining and extractive industries. Can we speak meaningfully about sustainability and extractive industries at all?

Mineral development poses problems for conceptualizing sustainable resource economies and these can be divided into questions about time and space. The timeframe of mineral resources themselves
is formed over geological time. We know they are finite resources, non-renewable on any meaningful human time scale. They can be redeveloped as a result of technological or economic drivers, yet economic cycles associated with mining occur in decades, maybe a fifty year life span for mining. This means very intense bouts of resource extractive activity are acting upon a finite resource that quickly disappears. There has been a lot of social scientific research about these boom and bust cycles and community collapse, but mining projects have afterlives that stretch out this time scale, which then stretches out our ability to speak in human terms about human societies and the notion of sustainability. The Giant Mine scenario is a now a perpetual care scenario.

Time is one problematic dimension for sustainability; the other is space. In many cases mining has intensely localized impacts, but mining’s geography is non-local whether it is the distribution of toxic bio-products from mining, international economic crises, physical commodities themselves and the way they travel far from the site of exploitation, and the migration of people north and south (fly-in and fly-out operations). These are all radius issues of how to measure spatial scale of sustainability – do you measure on the scale of what one mine is doing in one district or in terms of the wider dispersed geographies of flows of people and commodities? There is a fundamental question about the meaning of sustainability and the meaningfulness of talking in terms of sustainable development. The ultimate implications of the issues of sustainability are raising these questions for communities of the North that are planning to stay (multigenerational occupancy). What are the implications of developing infrastructure, developing economic strategies and developing governance institutions around models that aren’t going to be here in 25 years? We can learn from the past. How can we use historical studies to understand these dynamics? This is an opportunity for ReSDA to learn from other times and other places, connecting stories that communities are hungry to share. Learn from experiences of mining in communities to connect and share from others and understand the long term implications.

3.4. Suzanne Mills  
McMaster University

My comments come from my perspective in the School of Labour. I am currently looking at how industry changes are affecting workers, with an interest in wage employment. When proposing resource development projects, wage employment is often seen as one of the most important benefits for northern communities. It is important to ask what the structural parameters are of resource industries and how they constrain the transfer of benefits in communities. There are a number of factors affecting employment that are outside the parameters of labour agreements, for example, who will be employed, and actual experience of workers. A number are outside the parameters of impact benefit agreements.

We’re mainly speaking of how large-scale changes in the mining industry are affecting workers. Mining is an increasingly concentrated industry, with more and more global companies. There is increased use of subcontracting firms, more flexible production technologies, and increasing capital intensity (fewer jobs, more highly skilled employees). There is more employment related to construction. This means a large number of mobile employees with little opportunity for training for trades. Mobility can be positive and negative – a matter of increased power or disempowerment. There are increasing flows of migrant workers in the North. Increased mobility is also a way for employers to control work forces because it is harder to organize collectively and communicate.
Some of the ways that these industries can also influence the flow of benefits to communities include:

- Specific skill requirements can make it difficult to use local hires;
- Outsourcing can facilitate hiring of southern workers; and
- Mobility can increase workers’ ability to have a say, but can also undermine workforce democracy.

It would be interesting to look at how other institutions are able to influence quality of employment or are able to intervene in these processes – institutions such as the state, legal institutions, educational institutions, and training. On a smaller scale, what are the limitations of resource employment in general? How does social organization work in these sectors, for example, gendering of resource employment, lifestyles, work processes, and equality of work and how it affects peoples’ identities.

3.5. Emilie Cameron  
Carleton University

I come to these questions through my own work and interests in the colonization and decolonization of self-determination movements in Nunavut (Kitikmeot region) and in how the South relates to the North. In terms of the areas of focus for ReSDA, I want to focus on the need for critical examination of decision making around extractive industries, and this includes looking at institutional and formal levels of decision making processes. I would like to see a critical research review of environmental impact assessments and how that plays out in the North. Existing work in other areas have shown how some knowledge has failed to appear in processes.

Current research has focused on the critical examination of the resource extraction industry on a project-by-project basis, where the assumption is that mining will be approved and we should mitigate negative side effects and maximize benefits – this framework should be challenged.

Most people you talk to in communities are ambivalent about mines because they want jobs and the benefits that come from mining, but still have concerns about the mines; however, these torn feelings don’t register at hearings. There needs to be a more sensitive process for accounting concerns and questioning the ways that structure makes certain things possible and others not. Work needs to be done on cultures of confrontation – environmental impact assessments are often built on cultures of confrontation and that doesn’t always work.

There is a lack of resources to counter the submissions of corporations in their environmental impact statements. ReSDA could get involved in making information and research available, accessible and oriented towards environmental impact statements, could even speak at environmental impact hearings – government representatives often aren’t allowed to speak at these hearings because of their positions, so concerns don’t get registered. If researchers have the support of community members, they can articulate things that others can’t.

We need more work on understanding land claims and their relationship with extraction industries. I would like to see a critical examination of the transfer of decision-making to the local level. There
seems to be an assumption that local control will result in better outcomes. We need a real examination of how much pressure there is at the local level to make decisions on issues that have much wider implications and input from other places.

Work is needed on contextualizing how decisions are made in mining, especially around jobs – contextualize around issues of poverty, colonization, and shifts from land based work to wage labour. We need to try more sensitively to understand why jobs come to mean what they do, and how they can come to be the trade-off that they’re made to be in decision making around mines.

Sustainability should also include option of declining and stopping resource development under certain conditions. It is very difficult to stop a mine in Canada and we should talk more about this – under what conditions and in what ways communities could say no to certain mines.

Questions and issues around mining:
- Conditions of work in mines;
- Effect of fly-in/fly-out work on communities and families;
- Long-term viability of extractive industries;
- Lack of training and education;
- Effects on traditional and social economy;
- Gender as an understudied aspect of extraction broadly – not just that mining work tends to be done by men, but how this influences the gender dynamics in communities;
  - Need for development of a middle class and how this can relate to extractive industries;
- Overall point is that alongside practical community based research there should be critical broad-thinking research;
- Highlight broader structural, social, political, economic, and historical forces that are shaping what is going on today and in the past;
- Critique can be very valuable alongside policy work; and
- Articulating community needs and the way that they don’t register as such.

It is encouraging that we are raising questions about research, what it does, what it could do, and how we could do it differently. It is not necessarily the case that because research is based in communities, it benefits communities. We need to make research accessible and useful to people to help support the intervening process. We need to “think big” about research – not only about communities in the North, but also about changing how people in the South think about the North as a frontier for resource development, sovereignty and militarization.

3.6. Discussion

*Comment*: There are a number of new immigrants in the North (i.e. Yellowknife) and many of them going to food banks. The makeup of the North is changing just like the rest of Canada and we need to think about that.
- The power base in the country has shifted dramatically – new immigrant communities in the South often determine voter outcomes, but we (in the North) aren’t connected to those communities at all - we should figure out how to reach out to them.
Comment: One thing I have noticed here is that there is a desire for more baseline historical work and backward linkages.

- Very few courses on the Canadian North’s history.
- Need to re-examine work done in the 1970s.
- Only one history of Circumpolar North course that links these different ideas across the Northern countries.
- Not just about the North, but about the South understanding it – it’s encouraging that there’s interest in connecting to the South.
- Gaps in knowledge are getting bigger and bigger.

Comment: It would be interesting from a historical point of view to look at the political transformations that have happened in the North (i.e. Nunavut’s creation).

- We are at a point in time where we have the opportunity to collect an oral history about this transformation from people who have been negotiating these agreements, negotiating devolution, working on self-government, etc.
- It would be a tragedy to lose these stories – no northern institutions are currently working on collecting them.
- This is one of the greatest political stories in Canadian history and people in the North should be proud of it – researchers should work on this together.

Comment: There is a conflicted and contradictory view of development processes. Communities are talking about potentially redeveloping mines with the idea that the area is already messed up, why not mess it up some more? There is logic to this question. ReSDA is almost taking an advocacy role (“making resource development work for northern communities”). We have to ask, how do we insert ourselves? Many communities don’t know what they want. By participating in these debates we could be repeating the colonialism of having “experts” tell people what to do. I think people are aware of the potential pitfalls here, but we should have a discussion about it.

- People (in the South) don’t know anything about these issues – would be good to find out what the conflicted message is.
- On a fundamental level – what kind of North do the communities want?
  - But then what? We find out more about that, and then what?
  - On any decision, people come with a variety of desires.

Comment: There is a lot of pressure at the community level to articulate something that I don’t know that I can articulate in the community that I live in. That is my concern with always going down to the community level. There is a yearning to reflect on what that change has meant and come to terms with it, reflecting broadly on how fast that change has occurred, what it meant, what the future might be for making decisions not based on community interests.

- Need to think about the pace at which decisions are made.
- I.e. differences between Canada/Australia and the United States.

Comment: The question of the role that researchers should play on an advocacy level is an interesting one. It is an important question of methodology. Thinking about engaging on a policy level on these issues might be part of an answer. If we thought of ourselves as people who understand these issues and are able to communicate them in a public policy way to people who are
making decisions, that may be a useful role. That can be a difficult thing for researchers to do because it’s not always built into the research agenda.

Comment: When dealing with meta-questions, governments have been mentioned, but what about other actors in resource based industries? There are other actors outside these regions. Governments have a role less and less. We should concentrate on who are the actors, and then after that ask how they are inter-related and what their interests are.

- This is a way to think about the rules of the game – these non-residential actors have to have a role in making decisions.
- Need to know more about mining companies – their structure, mining capital (how is it organized, where does it go, where does it come from), what is informing their strategies in dealing with communities, and what is going on inside these companies.
  - There are people on the ground negotiating their place with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities, transient and non-transient workers, etc.
  - We are so focused on local communities, but this is part of the global political economy and we don’t research that.
- Because of the politics of research in the North, northern communities may be getting different treatment from mining companies than communities in Peru where Aboriginal rights aren’t on the political landscape.
- The international aspect is important - we talk the talk, but there hasn’t been any deep full-scale analysis at a historical level, and it is mainly a state-centered discussion.
  - Part of the reason for that is a methodological problem – many companies don’t have historical records, so you have to trace what they have done through their correspondence with the government, and that inevitably brings the focus to the state.
  - Similar problems with the smaller, decentralized neo-liberalized companies that appear then disappear.

Question: Because there is a question of seed money, should we take money from mining companies if they offer it to this project?

- There are ways this can work out – they can provide good data.
- Forming research partnerships with mining companies would be an interesting activity.
- The monetary dimension of that might introduce other complications (ethically, financially and practically), so we have to think about that step, but why not be engaging with them?
- If the goal is to make resource development work for communities we need to talk to the people doing the resource development – they are the ones that need to be the audience for the research at some level.
- Universities are already taking money from mining companies.

Comment: There is a question of unintended consequences of resource development – I think the answer is to put other actors, such as communities, in the driver’s seat so these consequences don’t fall on them. They don’t have to be responsible for the rest of the world, but they can put their needs first.

Comment: We have just come off of a research project looking at the social economy, where there was a real emphasis on what the economy looks like outside the space of commodification in the
North. There are ongoing discussions about whether there is any vitality to the “mixed economy”, which includes non-commodified activities on the land. I’m interested in the themes around labour issues – there is a strong interest by industry in the forging of a labour force, in particular an Aboriginal labour force in the North. It will be interesting to think about the decisions that are being made and what trade-offs they are making when thinking about becoming a labour force. At the same time, thinking more deliberately about what it means to maintain certain traditional preferences, which are to some extent commodified, but for the most part stay outside the economy.

- One effect of local workers seems to be that some of these people actually make the step from the villages to the resource work to urban areas because they make money and move to the city to spend it – the development of a residential workforce may not be residential for long, though there is no reason to say that’s a bad thing.

Comment: It’s not just mining that we are dealing with here, but shipping, oil and gas, etc. – these sectors are different, not all the same. There is a perception of Arctic exceptionalism when it comes to the sheer materiality of the Arctic. There are Arctic themed topics within engineering and that sort of thing. Socially the Arctic isn’t a region, but it is treated as one. In talking to business scholars, there is knowledge about how these companies work. They have existing partners in the European oil industry and know a lot about the internal processes by applying social science methodologies. It would be interesting to talk to some of these people. Another group of actors that are heavily interested in how resource development either works or doesn’t work is the NGO sector. There are interesting examples of what happens when the NGOs come in, in terms of either securing benefits for the community or screwing things up because they don’t have local knowledge. NGOs are also global actors (i.e. WWF, Greenpeace), but it depends on how interested they are in benefiting from our work. Industry may be more interested in working with us than the NGOs, but that may change. In terms of this ethical problem of taking money from industry, one thing to consider is what people in the communities think of this. Many take company money to develop family lives; therefore it might make sense to partner with companies in terms of capacity building.

- I think one ought to be cautious about taking money from mining companies – it may be a cause to lose credibility because we have to disclose our source of funding. I personally feel it is not in the interest of critical objective research. Maybe skill development is outside of this, but I don’t think it’s a good idea.

Comment: I was interested to hear about entrepreneurship and an Aboriginal labour force. Often when people talk about an Aboriginal labour force they mean low skill jobs. But what we’re starting to see now is Aboriginal organizations that are actually resource developers themselves. This is a new twist to look at – to see Aboriginal peoples not just as workers at the lower end of the labour force but as employers and developers themselves.

4. International Perspectives Panel

4.1. Florian Stammler

*University of Lapland*

In the regions where we work (Canadian North and Eurasian North) we assume that there are several theoretical ideas that are clear and agreed upon, such as “sustainability” and “community,”
but in reality, understandings of these concepts are quite diverse. It would be interesting to see whether we can bridge these gaps regionally and come up with terms that we can all work with, as well as a theory of resource development in the North that bridges the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

My own experience is in Russia and the Finnish North. I am interested in the influence of resource development on the people living there, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous. On one hand, some subsistence livelihoods are still well intact, for example the vital nomadic way of herding reindeer that is sustainable for people living next to huge oil and gas developments. On the other hand, in these same areas we have huge cities with large populations that are all multi-national with huge cultural and religious diversity, united by working for a particular end, which is developing Arctic resources. This links to the idea of movement, because these people have a long and specific history of movement, but you can also add the notion of attachment and settlement, because people are starting to get attached to places. This is something we can also study.

In the Eurasian North are major resources such as oil, gas, coal, iron ore, diamonds and nickel, as well as major population and urban centres. These extractive industries (EI) are fueling our planet, but the main question is how to make EI less harmful and more beneficial for the people. Current research is scattered in different regions and stuck in categories (such as Indigenous people, commuter workers, and geopolitics). It can make a significant contribution if we overcome these traditional boundaries.

The Extractive Industries Working Group was established at International Arctic Social Sciences Association (IASSA) 2008 in Nuuk, with its charter and ethics approved by the IASSA Council in 2009. The Extractive Industries Working Group is an interest group of social scientists in the North doing extractive industries research. The incentive to develop the group was the fact that a lot is known about what is happening to the environment, but not about what is happening socially. The ethics of research, also, is dealt with extensively. See http://www.arcticcentre.org/eiwg for more information.

Since the 2008 International Congress of Arctic Social Sciences (ICASS), the Extractive Industries Working Group has engaged in several side meetings with industry and NGOs, has lobbied for social
science input into oil and gas companies’ activities in the Arctic, and is currently creating and using an email list to network and share information. A website directory was started, and the group has channelled requests for social science expertise, yet there is still a need for greater internet presence, more social media and blogs, and increased information transfer. To sign up to the email list, send an email message to fms36@cam.ac.uk, subject EIWG.

A multi-institutional PhD program in Pan-Arctic Extractive Industries has been created, under the umbrella of the University of the Arctic, and in collaboration with a number of universities and institutions (Arctic Centre, Rovaniemi, Finland; Bodo Graduate School of Business, University of Nordland, Norway; Memorial University, Newfoundland, Canada; University of Greenland; Thule Institute, Oulu, Finland; European University, St. Petersburg, Russia; Northeastern Federal State University, Yakutsk; and MGIMO, Moscow, Russia). For funding, those who could be involved include ReSDA, participating universities, industry, NGOs, UArctic and funding bodies such as Norforsk.

The main goal of the program is to produce PhD’s to further the understanding of specific questions determined by the interests of the students involved. Examples of these interests include: EI impacts on the ground and impact assessment in any field from religion, anthropology and literature to business, economics and politics; EI and geopolitics; EI and international relations; EI development principles, standards, customary law, and economic/social/environmental bottom lines and guidelines; EI development principles and interests in different states and regions; sustainable and responsible investments; and EI practice from the circumpolar to the local level.

The collaborating universities within the program jointly train the students, both broadly in the EI field and specifically in the disciplines relevant for their fields. The students are required to attend course at different participating institutions, and will meet annually for grad school seminars, where assignments include mandatory participation in several meaningful conferences. Dissertations will be defended and degrees awarded by participant institutions, but these degrees will include a certificate in Arctic Extractive Industries awarded by the University of the Arctic.

We are looking forward to working with ReSDA on these topics; one question to put forward for future discussion is, to what extent do we have the possibility from the international group to bring the people from the communities we work with, into this network? Communities have expressed interest in learning about other regions; we could think about how to apply for more funding in order to facilitate this.

4.2. Gertrude Eilmsteiner-Saxinger

*University of Vienna*

My current work is focused on commute workers in Siberia – I go with the workers to fly-in/fly-out camps, and visit oil fields to look at housing conditions. I realized through this research that the perspective of the workers is not really addressed in discussions about impacts or community assessment procedures. Why are commute workers not really studied? We need to know something about these workers; a common sense assumption is that long-distance commute workers are loose from all social values. It is important to get an idea of their diverse life realities and values, because it is important that in the relationship between the workers and the communities they’re working in, both parties can interact with each other. It is important to give workers opportunities for cultural activities and personal space, and to get away from the idea that this group is homogenous and
usually uneducated. People are interested in the nature that surrounds them and would like to respectfully interact with the environment, including the communities – this would be interesting to look at.

I would like to learn more about the social impact assessment procedures so that we could think about how to integrate workers. Northern Russia is a rich region (economically), where it is important to have the fly-over effect from the North to the Southern regions. I assume that in other regions (such as Canada), this effect from resource development is problematic. However, we have to consider that the only revenue this region gets, aside from the federal distribution system, is from resource development. When we talk about benefits from the North, is this revenue not a benefit too? What do we mean by benefits? What do we mean by community?

I hope to work with a team to find cross-cutting issues. I am interested in using cartographic elements for communicating and visualizing data as an analytical tool in the next steps. Also, I wonder how we could address the production of maps and the visualization of social dialect and how this has political impacts; the theoretical aspects of the power of maps. It would be worthwhile to use this tool in the context of resource development.

4.3. Stephanie Martin
Institute of Social and Economic Research
University of Alaska Anchorage

The closest link between the work I do in Alaska and ReSDA is the idea that institutions matter and that history matters. When I think about institutions, I think about both the “surface” and the “subsurface”. Surface institutions are things that are created by governments and local people, such as land claims; they are things that are written down. Underlying this is some sort of community cohesiveness with cultural institutions that allows communities to engage in the process.

Institutions that communities have are a function of both of these. For example, North Slope communities are spurred by the development of the oil industry; North Slope communities established the North Slope Burrows, settled their land claims, and then taxed oil companies. They then used this money for employment and other benefits (such as subsistence hunting leave, high wages). They didn’t pay out dividends but did what people wanted. They think it is successful because they have oil there, but I think it is because of the underlying institutions. The people are able to take resources as they come in and make them work for them.

Other work I have done in Alaskan communities shows that the ability of a community to have its act together is largely because of its history. You cannot enact a policy that will do well everywhere. In my work I have found that in particular, whaling communities do well. There is also a relationship between alcohol control laws and suicides/homicides; on the surface it looks like having alcohol control reduces suicides, but it is more about the ability of the community to implement and enforce the rules that reduces homicides and suicides. It would be good to see what the lessons are from this Alaskan case that can be transmitted across the Arctic. It would be good to get local people talking about what works and why.
My background is in political science and my work has concentrated on international relations and world politics. I am not really examining individuals and communities. More of us are saying that individuals are the most important category of actors (though there are still are those thinking that states are the most important actors). We have to reason and take into account that we have different theories. We could have three different levels:

- Changes in individual politics and individual relations. This is the level of structures.
- If there are changes, then each change has its trajectory, including indicators. Why are these changes happening, why did these changes start, when did they start, what do they mean, and what is the future based on these indicators? It is difficult to find out when change starts, but it is more important to know what the indicators are.
- Actors and their interests: individuals are there.

We have recently tried to concentrate on two recent changes in the Arctic:

1. **End of the Cold War period.** It was a simple geo-political change, but in the Arctic this change started earlier because of other indicators.
   - It is important to understand what the indicators are, what their interrelations are and who the actors are.
   - Interrelations are there, and it is our duty to find out what role they play.
2. **Multifunctional:** environmental and geo-political, but also cultural, social and economic. Again, it is important to find what the indicators are, because the causes may be very complex. For example, climate change may explain some changes, but it is not the only indicator. It is probably one of the most important indicators, but there are other factors that you have to determine as well as their interrelations and who the actors are.

When you focus on a region, therefore, how much are you really taking into consideration the bigger picture? The interrelations are there, though they may not be obvious. There has been a small pool of PhD students who would like to know more about geopolitics security, particularly dealing with the Arctic; they think that it is important to know about the bigger picture. We should be more actively working to build that bigger picture, taking into consideration what the Arctic region is all about. There is plenty of time to consider it as a distinct region, but now there is also time to think of the Arctic as part of the globe. Considering different levels and taking into consideration all possible interrelations are ways to fill in the bigger picture. What do we know already? We know that various Arctic states have policy strategies. We have not really studied regional development – what does it mean for countries? Here you have 2 different scales for consideration, at the micro-level (community) and the macro-level (globe). Having different scales would be one way to build the bigger picture.

Innovation in political and legal arrangements (i.e. devolution in regions) has been recognized as an important part of the region. The next step could be looking at what it means. How can we use this in order to show that the position of the Arctic has been strengthened in geo-politics? This is something that might be valuable in other parts of the world. As a political scientist I am thinking about what role the Arctic can play in geo-politics. We are talking here about resources and material value, but many of these roles that are the most interesting are immaterial innovation. We have a
very peaceful situation compared to other parts of the world. Let’s put ourselves onto the world map in a positive way. While globalization is bringing some problems, it is also bringing a chance to improve.

4.5. Chris Southcott

*Lakehead University*

There are some international researchers who are not able to be here, so we will talk briefly on this as they have already started thinking about projects they would like to do as a part of ReSDA.

1. Nils Aarsaether, *University of Tromso, Norway.*
   - When we look at resources in the North, there are many types: mining, oil and gas, fishing, reindeer herding, and so on. It would be interesting to look at the level of sustainability of different types of communities; for example, what is the difference between a community based on fishing and its ability to be resilient or sustainable, compared to one that is based on mining or oil and gas? We often take resource dependence to be a homogenous entity, but there are many types of communities here (i.e. dependent on mining, oil and gas, fishing, reindeer herding, etc.). I would like to compare these types across the Circumpolar region, and I have a team looking at these types of questions.

2. Alad Institute at Sami University College with World Congress of Reindeer Herders (Norway/Russia).
   - Interested in social impact assessment processes: how these processes vary, how they are perceived by the communities and how they are used by communities.
   - In Norway, the state gets most of the benefits from oil and gas. All of the money stays there for the Norwegian people.
   - Interested in knowing why other regions don’t do this when developing resources.

4.6. Discussion

*Question:* In very short terms, what benefits can we as international researchers deliver to ReSDA and what can ReSDA deliver to us? What are the main directions you see that going in? What would others like to know from international experience? What would be valuable for Canadian northern regions to know?

- One thing that could broaden the horizon and provide insight is the Eurasian experience of co-existence of different resources in one place (i.e. Norway, Sweden).
- Could also bring in experience with impact assessment and monitoring – i.e. full project lifecycle monitoring that is being done very differently in different cases.
- The Eurasian view of community sustainability that also includes the urban Arctic.
  - The Arctic is already quite urbanized in Russia – increasing processes of urban agglomeration and multi-national/religious/cultural coexistence.
- From the Nordic model:
  - On one hand we can learn about how people-to-people cooperation can become real integration.
  - This integration was reached by discussion, simply by coming together and finding out what the common interests are – cooperation by small steps, with real results.
  - On the other hand, there are lessons to learn from this model in that what you have is valuable, and you might lose it – i.e. the loss of the Nordic welfare state
- In the Arctic, this may also happen.

- ReSDA can include follow-ups over the next seven years – if ReSDA can create some kind of mobile structure for discussion and dialogue, it would be a real achievement, because one of the biggest problems of our modern society is fragmentation.

**Question:** Where is the flow of the benefits (i.e. in the labour force)? Who steers the process (i.e. do they have the training, locals’ access to job, who are the locals)? What institutions make the flow of benefits possible? Who provides infrastructure to bring people from areas that are disconnected? Who carries the social/economic burden of the impact of mining on the labour force? Who has access to jobs? Under what conditions do they recruit? Where do they recruit? How does the erosion of the state impact Indigenous peoples? These are things we could compare.

**Comment:** Comparative, interdisciplinary research experience would have been good to have, if we had thought about it at the beginning and had people talk about it at the beginning. In my experience, it is hard to do. We have seven years of talking amongst each other, collaborations may just “pop out” as we share and learn. Gift of ReSDA is the time we have to work on this.

**Comment:** Seven years is not a long time when we are half a year into the first year already – by the time new projects get up and running you are already at year two of the program. For example, ArcticNet is in year eight, and the first seven years went by so quickly that a lot of the things we are dealing with now we are wishing that we would have thought more critically about the structures that need to be put in place to create the kind of integration that we hoped would exist by the time seven years came around. There are things that can be done to create an environment that’s conducive to interdisciplinary and new relationships, but it doesn’t happen organically – there are other ways we can do that, such as incentives with regards to encouraging people to come together to create new projects or in some cases dictating some interdisciplinary action. I wouldn’t leave it up to chance.

**Question:** In the Russian experience, what is the proportion of indigenous workers in mining process and how do they deal with training and skill development?

- Indigenous share in terms of entire population is minimal. In the labour force they are only a very small portion. The big difference with the Canadian project is that Aboriginal ownership is minimal – very small labour force as well. Hard to recruit locally. Projects were developed labour-intensively.

- We have multi-ethnic and multi-national workers – people came from all over the Soviet Union. There, integration of Indigenous labour force is unfortunately not at a high level. There could have several reasons for this; and they did not really have an established discourse.

- Never seen as an active labour force.

- Have to ask if there is even a desire among indigenous people to work for the industry or is there a desire to use benefits from industry for their own needs? There are assumptions within industry that they should have quotas and hire local people for projects without asking if this is the work that the people would like to do. Different options that people have opted for.

- New model is community development quota – can pick how you want to interact with ground fish allocation – can change so you have scholarship money, or can work on boat etc. Can change rules and have choices.
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5. Methodological Issues Panel

5.1. Michel Beaulieu  
*Lakehead University*

We want to focus on how the North has been perceived and shaped – the history of sustainable development in the North in terms of scholarship and literature. Sustainable development hasn’t been defined in this material. ReSDA provides an opportunity to move the discussion away from what SSHRC calls “knowledge transfer” and towards knowledge gathering. We’re preoccupied with how we’re going to connect with individuals to the point where we haven’t looked at knowledge gathering.

Things have been put in different models from allied disciplines, but no concerted effort has been made to look at things differently. ReSDA is an opportunity to examine historical approaches of how we conceive of the past. Its duration allows for a period of testing of any methodological approaches that we use, such as re-examining action-based research from communities and the relationship between the historical researcher and the archives and the sources. There has been a lot of discussion and theory about this, but there is a disconnect, especially in the North (provincial and territorial). A lot of words have been said, but not a lot put into practice.

In terms of history, there is a need for the type of research being done in this project to re-conceive history as a social science. There has been a lot of neglecting of baselines; there has been a focus on minute details, but the big picture hasn’t been examined. Despite language of transnationalism, multinationalism and globalization, there hasn’t been a concentrated effort to engage with scholarship in a circumpolar sense. The silo creation of history has occurred. In Canada we have lost a multi-lingual and multi-national approach.

There is an opportunity to train social science historians. There is an important place for history, in an applied sense, in this type of research and other types of research. A lot of questions and terms get thrown around where the definition is slippery, i.e. community, sustainability, resilience, etc. These are important concepts that need a strong historical basis and strong historical discussion, meaning a combination of traditional knowledge and archival knowledge. There needs to be a wider scale examination to understand what these words mean, as well as understanding the language that exists with individuals. This is where the international comes into play, for example Finnish scholars have been looking at the notion of resiliency, but much of this is unknown in Canada, partly due to language, but also due to conceal. One thing that historians can bring to this project is trying to reverse engineer some of these concepts and terms, throwing out the playbook that exists. We use these terms, but don’t think about where they come from. This is an opportunity to look at that. There are increasing gaps occurring, but no answer because the existing literature hasn’t dealt with it.
5.2. Andrey Petrov  
*University of Northern Iowa*

My background is in economic geography and spatial analysis. My expertise and research focus on: regional development in the Canadian and Russian North, including processes, factors, strategies, regimes, economic models, polarization, inequalities and so on; human development and well-being in the Arctic, specifically with indicators and monitoring systems; ‘alternative economies,’ for example the knowledge-based economy and human/creative capital in the Arctic; and spatially explicit economic and demo-economic modeling, labour migration and demography. The themes I will talk about today are: (1) human development/well-being monitoring and baselines indicators; (2) resource development, ‘other economies’ and human capital; and (3) institutional frameworks and analysis of development regimes.

The first theme deals with resource use as a sociocultural and economic activity and the impacts of use. This is the human side of resource development, and where the indicators about socioeconomic impacts of resource development activity are important. There is a gap in monitoring human conditions and change, which is a big challenge, and we don’t necessarily know where to start. We need to look at resource development in relation to human development with the development of principles and baseline indicators: relationships, contradictions, implications and management.

The Arctic Social Indicators (ASI) project measures human development in the Arctic in terms that are important for Arctic residents. It was developed with the International Polar Year Project, the Arctic Council, and the Arctic Human Development Report. ReSDA could adopt the general framework of ASI, but develop local studies while still preserving this general framework to keep comparability across the North. As ReSDA is a more nuanced project, it is hoped that the ASI experience will be useful.

**ASI Indicators Matrix: NWT & Canadian Territories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>INFANT MORTALITY (number of deaths of infants under one year of age in 1000 live births)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material well-being</td>
<td>PER CAPITA HOUSEHOLD INCOME (annual income per householder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>STUDENTS IN POST-SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural vitality</td>
<td>LANGUAGE RHYTHM (index of the number of respondents who report an ability to speak a language and an amount of language use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with nature</td>
<td>CONSUMPTION OF TRADITIONAL FOODS (number of respondents that had at least once a week in the last 12 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate control</td>
<td>PC OF LOCAL/ABORIG. IN-ENTREPRISES (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 - Arctic Social Indicators Matrix
Priorities for ReSDA with respect to this first theme include: a socio-economic impacts assessment systems review or reanalysis in the international context, in order to see common gaps and to learn what indicators other jurisdictions are using to study the impacts of resource development; developing a ReSDA data infrastructure; detecting circumpolar and regional/local indicators; and analyzing institutional frameworks.

The second theme, of resource development and ‘other economies,’ asks the question, what is the impact of resource development on endogenous economies and local capacities? It is not necessarily understood how and even if resource development could be geared towards non-resource-based economies. Do sustainable economies equal alternative economies, and how do we bridge the gap? Other key issues include the connection of human capital, human development and resource development.

The third theme is the analysis of institutional frameworks and development regimes. The final years of ReSDA could prepare for a project extension, and could develop institutions. Important things to look at would be the different components of development regimes (such as policies that lead to a certain outcome), and at which development regimes led to positive outcomes. One last question to ask is whether there is a neo-staple development regime developing in the Arctic.
5.3. Chris Furgal  
*Trent University*

The points I will make are related to experiences with other network projects – they have been more multidisciplinary, but are still applicable. This is about why methods matter and why we need to think about them in a proactive way.

Methods have already started as an outcome of SERNNoCa. Who comes to this meeting, what questions get asked, processes for identifying priorities, what kinds of projects we prioritize - there’s a method behind this and there are implications for outcomes and work that is done. Are we basing priorities on knowledge gaps and a review of the existing literature? We need to think outside the existing literature to identify problems. Are we simply looking for cutting-edge theoretical challenges? I would argue there are some fundamental community needs that could be served by research – not a question of either academic excellence or community relevance, but of blending the two. Are we looking at issues of public policy interest? If so, how do we define what a public policy is? For example, the experience of ArcticNet with integrated regional impact studies, which has the goal of serving/influencing policy, but waited until year four to engage decision-makers. Contexts of regional governments change, though, and without maintaining that connection and continuing dialogues with decision-makers it is hard to track needs of decision makers and what those needs may be in the future. There is a need to think about some form of mechanism for continuing partner engagement for the relevance of the research that is being done, so that it doesn’t just happen at the end of the project.

Methods of individual projects have consequences, both positive and negative. The notion of benefit to a community in the context of some regions is becoming more and more research savvy and developing a knowledge-based economy (i.e. the Yukon). Communities want to benefit from research more – not just the kind of research done, but also the way it is done. This means starting to enact policy and review with regards to the kind of research we promote – it brings up issues of knowledge translation and uptake as a form of research, not just as something we do at the end of project. This also means benefits that we don’t think of (adding to community economy, informal/formal training in this area). The notion of developing a knowledge economy has implications in the kind of work that communities would like to see more of, about the “how” of research. These are things we need to think about, because these things take time.

The notion of having a large network and maximizing benefits for communities is encouraging us to think about having dispersed and varied interactions with communities through different disciplines and projects. How do you make a big network seem small? There are two visibility issues here: coordination and methods. With coordination, for example the selection of study sites, we need to take advantage of opportunities as a network to think of standardized projects through a series of case studies in different regions. We need to think about integration from the beginning and how this will be planned for and conducted, so that we are able to learn a lot from comparable studies in the Arctic.

Methods are associated with network interactions that have implications on the outcome of our projects. We must be engaging with intent to do research in a different way, not simply applying for a two or three year grant and doing work on our own. Seven years is actually a short time when we
think of forging relations, doing research in a new way, and starting to work on the notion of interdisciplinarity. Sometimes this does happen organically, but sometimes it takes incentives to create cross-cutting projects. It is important to think about intentional incentives to encourage new types of research so that we are not bringing and leaving with our own single expertise, but rather we’re engaging in an intellectual project that we need to think about. We’re also engaging in a social project, occurring in a social context that we need to be aware of – we should think about studying the study. How do we learn about, facilitate or foster interdisciplinary projects in an Arctic context that engages and benefits community and decision-maker needs, and how do we manage that through a seven year project?

Methods matter before, during, and after our research activities and exercises because they are already having implications in how we choose projects and how we’re going about doing them.

5.4. Harvey Lemelin  
Lakehead University

There are three types of research: transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary. Transdisciplinary involves fusion and collaboration between, across and beyond disciplines; interdisciplinary means the mixing or interaction of disciplines; and multidisciplinary is a non-integrative method (see Figures 9 and 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transdisciplinary | Fostering the cross-fertilization of ideas and knowledge  
Achieving innovation  
Producing synergies, generative inquiry  
Deconstruction through coherence  
Achieving praxis – knowledge, theory, application |
| Interdisciplinary | The bridging together of disciplines or professions which retain their own concepts and methods that are applied to mutually agreed subject(s).  
Seeking integration |
| Multidisciplinary   | Research in which researchers remain within their disciplines and contributes using disciplinary concepts and methods.  
Essentially non-integrative – with each disciplinary approach remaining separate. |

Brown, Deane, Harris & Russell, 2010

*Figure 9 - Research Approaches 1*
Communities don’t get a lot out of multidisciplinary projects, so I think we can all agree that this is not what we want to do, but we have yet to see a project that can accomplish transdisciplinary approaches. With the people in this network, though, we can achieve this. We all have research interests, but we should also be evaluating if we’re seeking to accomplish this, and if not, why are we doing it? How do we achieve this? How do we, as researchers, try to achieve these goals?

We should not be doing research ON communities, and we are moving towards doing research WITH communities, but we need to strive beyond this, to doing research FOR communities. I would like to see community members as co-authors and co-presenters; we should strive for this and, in my opinion, this could be an indicator at the end, i.e. how many researchers are in the community; how many are allowed back in the community after the project is done.

The Evolution of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community role minimal</th>
<th>That Seventies Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-researchers</td>
<td>Community-Based Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-authors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-researchers</td>
<td>PAR Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-authors</td>
<td>BY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 - Research Approaches 2

Figure 11 - The Evolution of Research
The ownership of research interests is important as well. The resiliency of First Nations communities is amazing. This needs to be admired and recognized, so that we are not just talking about dysfunction. We need to focus on what is good and what we can give back to the community, and vice versa. If the research is open, fair and transparent, we can conduct research with and for communities. It would also be a great indicator if, at the end, we could get a northerner doing research by the community.

5.5. Ron Harpelle
Lakehead University

My background is as a historian, with an original research focus on the banana industry in South America. The main reason I am here is to talk about knowledge mobilization. I recently finished a documentary series focused on research for development. We have to think as researchers about producing teaching tools. If we want researchers from the North, we have to provide them with the tools to communicate with their communities. For example, we could say something like “Occupy this” (reference to map of North). When we talk about the North we have two things: inequities (which is what the Occupy movement is all about) and a vision of ReSDA as activists overcoming some of the great challenges experienced by people of the North; and the fact that the government also wants this occupied, but by corporations to develop the North.

Another consideration is that the 99% of people live in the South. Big decision-makers don’t live near the Arctic Circle and we have to be conscious of the fact that decisions are made elsewhere. Our opportunity is to empower people so they can participate in persuading decision-makers on issues that affect their lives.

There are several different things we can do with respect to knowledge translation. Documentary films and new media projects are a successful tool for reaching out to people, and we can make documentaries and videos that will speak to the people who most need the information. The idea here is to do what we can to assist people in realizing the kinds of projects that they want to realize. The Internet, as well, is an important source of information today; seven out of ten Canadians now get information from the internet. If we want to stay ahead of the curve, we have to be thinking about the kinds of information people will be accessing through the media and how we can reach the broadest possible audience.

The main problem is that the training of academics is not tailored with the aim of publishing for the widest possible audience. We have to be able to translate and mobilize information for those who can actually use it. In the social sciences, one of the main problems is that the work is difficult to simplify. You have to understand what users think of academics; you have to meet users halfway, see what their needs are, figure out how to connect with them and give them information they can use. We are going to have to answer questions of knowledge mobilization. We can enhance the possibility of receiving funding by broadening our ways of reaching out to communities.

It is important for people to relate to each other, see common problems and create linkages – we have a role to play in establishing those linkages, and the internet is a perfect tool for that. We need to use media as a pedagogical tool – we have to think about how policy makers, individuals and other actors will access information and how to make one product that will reach out to all these
groups in some way. We need to think about who the audience is and how we can reach them, talk
to them and see how they use technology, and adapt what we have to something they will actually
use.

5.6. Discussion

Comment: It is worthwhile exploring the possibility of inspired amateurism. We are in the age of
YouTube, and this can be a useful tool in communities and classroom because of the charm of
amateurism. These kinds of videos could be done easily and inexpensively, and we should explore
those possibilities.

- Idea is to create a platform to get out to communities.
- Have to put together a formula to overcome gaps in amateurism (i.e. not having a
  microphone) – we hope to put something together in a package so that anyone can go into
  the field and come out with something that looks better.
- We can’t gloss over the ethics - any time something is on the web we have to be clear to the
  community that information can’t be twisted - this is one outcome that should be
  developed.

Comment: I have mixed feelings about promoting participatory action research as “the method of
choice” for this research. When it works well it works very well, but when it doesn’t work well it is
just as extractive as other forms of research. Sometimes people have a lack of time to do it well and
I want us to have a bigger conversation about what we want in terms of how people relate to
communities, what people want to see for building capacity, etc.

- There are lots of disciplines, which is why we are talking about clusters, so there is not one
  method that everyone will use.
- Is not a one-size fits all for all projects - need to be thoughtful about this being a potentially
  valuable approach in some cases so that the community can actually participate.

Comment: Have to think about ways to communicate with communities and I like the idea of video
messaging. But we also need to be aware of the need for a peer review process.

- Creating videos is not to the exclusion of academic material.
- There is a way to move towards some sort of review process with videos (i.e. rate my video).
- ReSDA is putting together five packages of sound equipment, cameras etc. that we will be
giving to grad students and communities to use for their projects.
  o Point about amateurism is the basis of this.
  o We are using CFI money for this.

Comment: The peer review process is broken. It is narrow and isolated. In some cases work is
reviewed by people who have no experience in the area. There is a disconnect between what you’re
doing in a community and what the discipline thinks you should be talking about. There’s an
opportunity to push the bubble on this, particularly in our own areas.

Comment: The internet never forgets and we should think about anonymous stuff. Have to think
about who is using or misusing the data. It is also important to think about different modes of
representation (i.e. not just text). Could we have anthropologists visualize data? For example, we
could use cartography as a tool so that people can continually be contributing. It would be useful to
assess where we are training people, who is successful. It is also a political tool and a dynamic tool that can be visualized, rather than reading 200 pages of text.

*Comment:* Incentives were mentioned, but I’m not sure this is the right word. In some universities people have pushed for trying to have their “products of research” recognized. I would prefer going this route rather than incentives.

- Idea of incentives is to withhold money and put out a call to researchers for a particularly integrative research project that encourages two or three different disciplinary researchers to come together rather than expecting it will happen on its own.

*Comment:* It is good that in the beginning of ReSDA we discuss methodological challenges, such as interdisciplinarity. We need to educate PhD students. Another challenge is how we define or redefine “sustainability”. It is difficult to implement sustainability in the structure that we are currently operating in. We might be able to define it, but in this structure it will be difficult to implement. This is a new methodological challenge.

*Questions to think about:*

- What are one or two fundamental questions you think ReSDA should address?
- What is the best process to do that?
- What kind of outcome or indicator of success will you be looking for?

### 6. Issues and Approaches I Panel

#### 6.1. Martha Dowsley

*Lakehead University*

My research background focuses on the mixed economy and wildlife management. A current project is looking at Inuit women on Baffin Island. We have found that they don’t go on the land that much, despite their interest in doing so. It is not the barrier of financial challenges that is stopping them. The women are not more likely to go on the land if they had more money. My gap analysis questions relate to gender and community wellbeing.

How do we develop local labor? Some of these issues have been mentioned here. For example, in extractive industries local men are increasingly working construction, because the higher jobs require too much education and training. We need to find out how to get Inuit men working in extractive industries and in jobs that are not construction so that they can gain skills that they can carry over for the bust cycle and build more sustainable communities. By leveraging extractive industry profits to do this sort of thing, we will see important positive social outcomes (i.e. increased income, family stability) and decreases in some of the horrible statistics we see, especially out of Nunavut (i.e. substance abuse, family violence, suicide).

How do resource extraction industries affect communities and how can we minimize the negative effects? We need more research on positive impacts (i.e. spinoff industries) and how to make them last through the bust cycle. We know that families suffer when a member has to leave for work in a mining camp and that communities hosting these camps suffer as well – there are gender issues in both cases, with women suffering more than men. We need to look at these problems and solutions in an Arctic context, using historical and current case studies, as well as around the world. For
example, subsistence leave in Alaska: are other communities outside of Alaska going to benefit from that?

Other problems that we don’t question in our society include issues such as prostitution – is it seen as a social problem or a health risk? There is room for anthropology to question the assumptions around extractive industry sites.

How can we leverage northern cultures themselves to ameliorate some of the problems with the resource extraction industry and thereby promote long-term development? What cultural mechanisms do communities already have to cope with missing male family members? How can we strengthen these things today? Looking at a gendered approach can help both men and women, as well as deal with some of the disparities between genders in the Arctic.

6.2. Stephan Schott
Carleton University

My personal research interests include: possibilities for a more effective integration of the traditional sharing economy with the modern market-based economy; renewable resource management (fisheries, beluga, caribou); community and social well-being and its relationship to resource development and new economic opportunities; and energy efficiency and energy security in Northern communities.

We require a mapping of sharing networks and a better understanding of the dynamics and contribution of the subsistence economy. We need to undertake a valuation of country meat and its distribution, through surveys with hunters and travel cost studies, as well as a social network analysis. We have a labour market model that describes the allocation of hours between the sharing economy and the market-based economy: the Effort Allocation Model. This model could be used to predict wage rate developments, possible paths in the provision of country meat and resource exploitation rates. How do policy instruments affect all of the above variables? Could management be made more effective by explicitly incorporating interactions between both economic sectors? The model could also be used for the evaluation of wildlife management plans, and to consider the effects of sharing rules on resource exploitation rates.

An examination of the macro picture of economic development and social well-being, and of the proposed Arctic Social Indicators (ASI) project, is important. Arctic regions in Canada typically have a much larger proportion of Indigenous people than other Arctic nations, and different measures of community and social well-being might, therefore, be relevant in the Canadian Arctic. This might be a good linkage with the International context; I could contribute to this group because they are being taken quite seriously. The community and social well-being aspect will require further investigation. What constitutes community and social well-being? What are meaningful and feasible indicators? What is the interpretation of changes and, ultimately, what are the development objectives?

A final component to consider is related to energy efficiency and security: developing community energy plans across the Arctic, with respect to heating, electricity, transportation, waste removal and mining, and especially with respect to reducing the dependency on diesel fuel. What are the
baselines and alternatives? Some alternatives to consider include wind potential, run-of-the-river hydro, distributed co-generation, and waste removal and biomass.

6.3. Paul Berger  
*Lakehead University*

My current research work is on Inuit teacher recruitment, with the overall goal of increasing the number of Inuit teachers as a way to circumvent resistance to the current system. Access to education and training will be important if the goals of ReSDA are to be met. There have been some good things happening in Nunavut schools, but overall it’s a disaster. This is not to say that the students are a disaster. There are 60-65% of Inuit students who do not make it through the high school system we have imposed on them, which makes some people wonder whether they would be better off without schools at all.

A major issue is that students have no Inuit role models as teachers. Their teachers don’t know anything about their first language, culture, values, learning styles or aspirations. People, also, don’t think about the curriculum resources that are needed (such as Inuit guidance counselors or a university prep stream) or the fact that schools can force people off the land and force them to assimilate in order to succeed. Additionally, the lack of an Inuit presence in decision-making for Inuit education has resonated throughout history.

I’m not sure what the education piece might be within ReSDA; perhaps it could be something to do with video job shadowing so that students can have role models to raise their passion to finish school. I am suspicious, however, of current plans to get any Inuit through school as they exist. In the future, we will look back at current schools in the same way as we do residential schools. For resource development to work for northern communities, communities need to have a lot of control. This includes the ability to decide against a project. Having control in an education context is not something that Inuit have had a lot of. It may be easier to think of real alternatives to school for some people. The question of whether anything can be seen as sustainable in resource extraction was brought up; if resource extraction could drive improvement in schooling, guided by Inuit wishes, then the positive impact that would have might have sustainable outcomes through the generations.

6.4. Deborah Simmons  
*University of Manitoba*

My research background is in the implementation of policy frameworks of land claims in the Sahtu region of the Northwest Territories. I am preoccupied with Indigenous perspectives in land use planning, addressing the after-life of mines, and issues around sustenance and maintenance of harvesting practices and how that relates to caribou stewardship. I am interested in finding the limits of Aboriginal knowledge in participation and policy processes, where it is being limited by certain kinds of scientific inquiry, and how this informs decision-making processes.

The themes for ReSDA will be important to explain the drivers of change and continuity that are at play in the North. I support the idea of learning more about the impact of land claims. There are positive aspects in terms of increases in governance and the ability for Aboriginal people to participate. There are also the less visible aspects, including: commoditization of land and labour; corporatization of communities; speed-up in resource development; potential shifts in the driver of
Aboriginal economies from the mixture of harvesting/sharing and wage to a more capitalist logic, whereby there is a strong impulse towards the forging of a labour force; and developing joint ventures and a quantitative approach to making decisions. How have these processes led to fragmentation of social and ecological relationships, partly accelerated by climate change and other changes? What I’m hearing from some of the Indigenous intellectuals is that there’s a new kind of strategic and critical thinking that is required.

The SERNNoCa project with Sarah Gordon looked at the shift from the unconscious habitus in traditional economy and culture to a more conscious perspective of heritage as a project. It is a question of whether and how the concept of ‘homeland’ applies in this context of change. Is it part of an overly simplistic pair of frontier and homeland? Is it something that can be used to think about edges of capital and how people are both seeking to benefit from resource development and finding ways to maintain non-commodified ways of being? There are a lot of sub-questions within this.

There are interesting spatial and temporal aspects that require the co-production of knowledge. We need Indigenous intellectuals in the room and working with us at different scales, not just our own local situations. We need to look at how the identification of patterns can be used for theory at a local level and develop concepts of strategy and then, more concretely, policy development. For example, the abandoned mines project allows for a local understanding of the history of mines, but by bringing people from different communities together there is an analysis in the present and planning for future reclamation processes. This would be another interface between homeland and the forces of globalization, which expose the tensions that people are dealing with.

6.5. Remy Rouillard
McGill University

We want to discuss how decision-making in the South affects the North. Can we think about how what happens in the North also affects the South with increasing regularity? How is it going to affect our institutions? Is sustainable development in the Arctic having sustainable impacts elsewhere?

There are events taking place in the process of impact assessment that the public isn’t aware of, which contributes to a lack of transparency on the part of the state. There is also a culture of secrecy in the resource extraction industry. An example of this is Plan Nord, a project announced in 2008 without being planned (and made public in 2011). Shell Gas came into Quebec without consulting environmental assessment agencies, which led to a lack of trust regarding the state institutions that will be involved. The project involves all territories north of the 49th parallel and $80 billion was invested in projects related to the North. An important question to ask is, how can we start planning projects that involve Indigenous communities when people in the South feel that they aren’t listened to by the governments?

Often these projects are developed in the name of the nation or the general population, but if the native communities are not going to benefit, does the southern Canadian population have the impression that they will benefit? Is it a perception that they will benefit or will they actually benefit?

A lack of transparency and a culture of secrecy open the way for lots of rumors because people have to make sense of what is happening and there are a lot of unclear issues that have to be solved.
6.6. Discussion

Question: I was hearing two ways into some of the challenges that resource development poses in Arctic communities. On one hand we’re exploring questions of indicators, on the ground experiences of wellbeing and developing critical ideas about this; we’re measuring, analyzing, detecting and then trying to feed this into policy. On the other hand, I’m also hearing an interest in larger structural factors, such as globalization, capitalism, and geographies. How can we bring these analyses together more effectively? How can we unite the work on an intimate level with an analysis of the globalized political economy of resource development? What work can ReSDA do to re-theorize these things and bring them together more effectively? This is a big challenge for ReSDA.

- One way is to make people aware of what is going on, for example, the idea of creating videos so that people in a community can see that their research is going somewhere, so that they have an idea where it is being sent, but also so the people who are receiving this information can see where it comes from.
- We’re bringing experiences here from different regions in the circumpolar world, and some companies probably operate in these different regions too. Communities can report on their experiences with a certain company and we can coordinate and share with other communities before they get into impact agreements, etc.
- People on the community level want to use different methods – they want to be able to count things and understand what the numbers look like, but also want to produce knowledge in their own way. The resources that are on offer in this room could be plentifully used – bringing them together is at level of analysis. There is a gap when community researchers and intellectuals don’t have the opportunity to be a part of the analysis process, so they are receiving the results from the outside and aren’t able to assess the data in terms of their own qualitative understanding.
- Don’t necessarily see the dichotomy between the intimate and the large scale.

Comment: When talking about Plan Nord, 50% of protected areas are an issue. We are trying to placate environmental groups and mining companies at the cost of First Nations because there was no consultation. Also, the failed marine protected areas strategy that was due this year established 25% protected marine areas. All of these things seem to be coming up again and again. The protected areas are mainly there to placate different groups but aren’t bringing in the tourists that proponents say they will. We need to talk about this. This is a resource that isn’t creating income and capacity in these regions.

- Tourist industry is something they want to develop.
- There is intrinsic value to protected areas - value in not commodifying areas.

Comment: One of the big challenges is, how do we coordinate different methods, different levels and different pursuits of knowledge that we will have in ReSDA? It is great that we focus on bringing benefits to the communities, but one advantage we have with so many researchers and community members from different parts of the Arctic is that we can also come up with general insights for the advancement of knowledge in science. We can make ground-breaking contributions on a general level that may at some point be useful for informing community agendas as well, but this link is not necessarily straight forward. This is crucial when we think about methods and the selection of case sites. Will it be possible to link micro and macro level?
We had the idea of creating institutions, councils, etc. to do this, but maybe we should think about what would be a good mechanism within ReSDA to facilitate this coordination and exchange that encourages us to think bigger?

7. Issues and Approaches II Panel

7.1. Thibault Martin  
*Université de Québec en Outaouais*

How are we going to behave in this network? Are we going to try to fit our research into this network or should we bring this network into our research? Should we invent something new? Can we do better? One thing I noticed is that we haven’t spoken that much about the environment. If we are working with sustainable development, nature is important. The question of environment is important because this is where Western epistemology and Aboriginal epistemology meet – sometimes they merge and collaborate and other times they compete. Can we ask questions such as, what is the relevance of our concepts and how can we translate them into Aboriginal conceptions of the world?

We should discuss what sustainable development is for Aboriginal people. First Nations of Quebec and Labrador have established an institute for sustainable development. They defined sustainable development and came to the conclusion that there is no single definition; instead it is a matter of community definition. This is different from our own concept, which is a universal concept.

Peace is a nation-state issue. At a community level it’s about security. Is there security in the Arctic and are we concerned about that?

What is research? What is the epistemology of research? Everyone has their own views, but should we research the ethic of research? What is the epistemology of research of the Aboriginal people we are going to work with? How can we really integrate in our writing the epistemology of Aboriginal co-construction of knowledge? How are we going to work to answer these questions?

7.2. Natalia Loukacheva  
*University of Toronto*

I am curious to see some more linkages with legal aspects: connections to regulations, legislation practices, and Indigenous knowledge. I am interested in looking at existing legal arrangements and seeing what can be done differently to ensure sustainable development for northern communities. There are many legislative measures, but there are issues in implementation and understanding, and putting these into practice. What can be done, not just with decision-makers, but also with legislator? Researchers must always work within the legal framework. This framework is, in other words, how social change can influence the sphere in which we have to work.

Many projects could be developed. For example, what do Indigenous people know about Arctic Ocean management when it comes to offshore oil? What can be done to use customary practices to ensure Indigenous communities benefit from resource development? This research could facilitate dialogue between different groups and have policy implications for those involved in these issues. It is important to bring together legal people, academic practitioners, communities, and industries...
because there is a gap between scientists’ knowledge, community needs, Indigenous peoples’
values, and so on. Each individual has his or her own methodologies and approaches, but we could
have one direction to help us all understand things better, including Indigenous communities.

7.3. Thierry Rodon
*Université Laval*

The North has changed and we need to rethink it. We need to be heard by decision makers, both in
the North and the South. We need to expand our view of who the decision-makers are, and ReSDA
should work with northern decision-makers and help them as much as we can. There is a need here
and we are ready.

In the US a project was done on the economic development of American Indians asking why some
reserves are working and some are not. They found that resources don’t matter, that is, some
reserves without resources do better than those with resources.

What do matter for being able to benefit from development are: sovereignty and the capacity to
control the decisions; institutions and governance and the development of an environment to create
wealth around you; culture; and leadership.

Mines are not sustainable. They also do not have sovereignty because they are controlled by the
market, which makes them difficult to handle, even for the government. They don’t create many
jobs anymore, because so many are fly-in and fly-out operations. Environmental impact assessment
is a tool to work with, but it’s difficult to challenge. Impact and Benefit Agreements are also
negotiated, but these are private agreements and you don’t see them happen very often. One of the
best ways to make mines sustainable is to make them work with education.

We need to work on networking between regions to improve capacity. One way to give back to
northern communities is to make sure we strengthen northern governments to give them tools to
be able to stop development. There is a gap in research on impacts of mining on northern
communities; we should work to produce knowledge here that would be useful for decision-makers,
northerners and researchers.

7.4. John Sandlos
*Memorial University*

My experience is with the abandoned mines project. We found that communities are enthusiastic
about their own histories and historical encounters with development, partly because a mine
coming in was their primary encounter with colonialism and at that point everything changed in the
community, both for the better and the worse. People need to reconcile this history in order to
reconcile with contemporary development. This gets at the importance of historical research to this
project, because it has fed into policy.

There are many things I would like to see addressed in this project. First, there is potential for a
historical theme group, but it would be essential to have non-historical people working on this,
especially for an outreach component. History is one area where communities can do their own
research, going beyond involving them to letting them do their own projects. Looking at Circumpolar
synthesis of historical impacts of mega-development in the North could have applied dimensions as well. Additionally, commodity chain analysis could be useful. We could track how commodities leave the North, how value gets added to it, and how people can relate to these figures. More research is needed on Impact and Benefit Agreement (IBAs) and labour migration, and how they shape extractive economies in the North. Tracking attitudes towards historical developments and contemporary developments and the interplay between those two dimensions would be useful. It is multilayered and difficult to uncover, but runs to core of what ReSDA is trying to do.

More work is needed on education and training, and not just as an outcome. There is a question dating back to the 1960s and 1970s of how education feeds into training so people can take advantage of the jobs offered by resource development. Tracking these debates over time would be valuable. Military development is also important in Arctic history, but often gets ignored by historians. This may not be something we want to ignore. We have talked about impact of development, but there are a lot of developments that never happened. What about impact of exploration? There are a lot of unwritten stories of how these preliminary developments have impacted communities. Also, attention to the urban North could be valuable. For example, Yellowknife acts as a staging ground for diamond mines, with people in the North being pulled into resource development and its labour force. Finally, tourism has unique application in the North. It is the biggest industry in the world and relies on industrial activity to maintain it. It is promoted as the post-industrial catch-all solution to the collapse of mining. How tourism is being used in Arctic areas could be an interesting question to address.

There are also several potential pitfalls, especially with respect to methods. We have to be careful about giving advice concerning whether to participate in resource development or not. There is a danger for repeating colonialism. We can provide knowledge and help generate knowledge. It is good that we are engaging in applied research, but it is important not to engage in utopian catch-all solutions. The danger of the “big picture” is to miss the uniqueness of each community. Communities are already engaged in the question of how to make resource development work for them – they have already developed responses to these types of approaches. If we insert ourselves in this process, we are inserting ourselves into something that’s already going on. The question of taking money from mining companies definitely could complicate this process, and I’m not sure if ReSDA wants to be seen as a social licensing body of mega-development.

In summary, ReSDA offers the chance to link broad-scale historical research on industrial development to policy-driven work.

7.5. Ken Caine  
*University of Alberta*

My background relates to issues in the Arctic around watershed management planning and the protection of cultural landscapes, while looking at planning for development on a socio-cultural level. There are several areas for ReSDA to examine.

In ReSDA we talk a lot about the benefits of resource development, and as resource development automatically leading to negotiated agreements (such as Impact Benefit Agreements (IBAs)). We are living in an era highlighted by an ideology of agreement-making. IBAs need to be looked at as a precursor to development; rather than assuming they will always be good, though, we need to look at
how communities are benefitting. There are issues in the way that these agreements are structure, and people are interested in the long-term effects, so a longitudinal analysis of IBAs might be useful.

The roles of other actors must also be explored. Environmental NGOs have had a valuable role to play in the understanding of northern development, so it would be valuable to look at the roles these NGOs have played in the territorial North as compared to the provincial North and Circumpolar world. The role of companies is also important. Often, people don’t understand how junior mining companies operate and what happens when they redirect development to a larger company. Knowledge about their work is very relevant in making sure that people understand how the process works so that the best decisions can be made.

There is also great power in the ideas of language and stories. People place a value on stories and we need to return to this on a planning scale and on a community scale. I would like to see more research put into the idea of stories and narratives, not just of Aboriginal people but also of researchers, planners and government scientists. There has also been talk of social impacts and their assessments in processes. Research could look at moving away from the assessment of social impacts to the decision-making tools that the communities can use.

7.6. Chris Southcott (updates from other ReSDA researchers)
Lakehead University

This is a review of areas from the ReSDA researchers that were unable to attend this workshop.

a) Ben Bradshaw, University of Guelph – discussion on IBAs.
   o Importance of understanding how they came along, how they vary, why they vary, impacts they have, and alternatives.

b) Gerard Duhaime, Université Laval – importance of sustainability.
   o What does this notion mean in the North?
   o Relation to Plan Nord.
   o ReSDA can look at a critical analysis of the notion of social dynamics of sustainable development around the ideas expressed in Plan Nord.

c) Kue Young, University of Toronto.
   o Importance of using existing data to measure the impacts of resource development on community health – health as a community aspect.

d) Arctic Social Indicators project.
   o Workshop in September with the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation.
   o Would like ReSDA to coordinate an analysis of a more practical application of these indicators for various regions, use of alternative indicators, qualitative indicators.
   o Range of discussion around measuring of indicators and impacts.

e) Matthew Berman, University of Alaska Anchorage.
   o Importance of understanding institutions and how they vary.
   o How can one determine if the goal of increasing benefits to northern communities has been achieved?
   o Question of indicators and data to measure benefits received at a community level, how to ascertain cause and effects, role of policy and practices in raising the level of benefits – these are challenging research issues.
Comparison of case studies to examine resource development outcomes under different institutional regimes – but these are only useful if there are agreed-upon indicators at the community level and if there is some credible method for tying outcomes to institutional differences.

f) Larisa Riabova, Kola Science Centre.
   - Interested in ReSDA becoming involved in the question of resource rent distribution in Russian far North and how it varies from North American and European perspectives.
   - How does redistribution and meet the needs of the region and local communities.

7.7. Discussion

**Question:** Definition of sustainable has come up a number of times. In work on migration it is thought of mostly as a rural question. In terms of migration, is the idea of people moving from villages a bad thing because villages aren’t being sustained, or a good thing because people show more choice? When framed on individual level, does the notion of resiliency matters more?

- Not good to have rigid approach to what sustainability is because we all come from different disciplines.
- We should have some consensus, but it is not necessarily that important because “sustainability” is not fundable in the US - everyone is talking about resilience. Do we want to spend time and money on this or do we want to move on?

**Comment:** Two very big concepts and keywords are sovereignty and security. Sovereignty is a keyword because it includes security when we define it as based on nation-states. Both concepts are very powerful. We should reify what we mean by sovereignty and security. We are stuck on a traditional definition of security. We have to go beyond this. We could have a very different kind of approach.

- Sovereignty isn’t military; it’s a secure community, housing, education and so on. In the end it is the same thing as sustainability, so we shouldn’t spend too much time around this definition.

**Comment:** Agree with the point that was made about looking at work we do in the community. We shouldn’t tell them what to do, but give them the tools and information they need. We can provide information - like any government they need information.

- Not sure about researchers being information providers based on our research – main interest in science is empowerment.
  - What we should think of more is that by doing research, Aboriginal people from the community can be empowered.
- We have changed the way we are doing research within the communities – at first we were doing only research that was interesting for us, but then we started doing work that was interesting for other people.
  - New issue is arising - Aboriginal people are vocal about ownership of research.
  - We need to address this – will we be owners of the research, will the community be the co-owners or the only owners? What will be the guideline in the network?
• In terms of this business of telling people what to do – I have been in situations where academics don’t tell people what they think and people get frustrated - we’re not forcing them to make a choice.
  o Caution that there are different approaches – some might not choose to give opinions.
  o Collecting and providing information is easy - the hard part is saying, what does it mean?, how do you implement it? and what effect it will have?
  o We’re not imposing our will, but providing advice.
• We’re not getting asked about what communities should do about development, but communities are excited about taking what we have to offer and mobilizing it in their own way – broader point is that there are dangers in “helping people” and how it can reiterate and reinforce colonial relationships that have existed throughout history.
  o Wouldn’t say we should never insert ourselves, but this sort of interventionist approach needs to be thought through and mandated.
• Know about colonial past and relationship that exists here and the relation that science has with this.
  o Out of this workshop and subsequent discussions we will think more carefully about the branding of the network and where we position ourselves because ReSDA is getting attention from various corners of the North.

Comment: Another point is that it’s important to spend as much time studying achievement as we do studying crisis. There is an implicit enthusiasm amongst academics to problematize the North and Aboriginal people. There are changes that have been constructive over the years. We haven’t been talking about Native-white relations – this is a different relationship now that we don’t know much about. Let’s look at things that have succeeded in terms of self-government and institution building, business development, education. Let’s look at what has happened, what the mechanisms were and why they were successful. We might learn something important.

Comment: Getting back to the sustainability discussion – it is in the title and is a very crucial part of this network. One of the outcomes that I hope comes out of this is that we define sustainability principles and inform community and literature about it. This might be a theme across the different clusters that might occur.
• There are alternative ideas of what is a sustainable livelihood in the Arctic.
• There are people like Charles Emerson and Lawrence Smith who are starting to lay down markers in this discussion on what the North will be like.
• Many ideas floating around that use the concept of sustainability and may be applicable to ReSDA.
• In Russia, they are sometimes surprised about how these generic ideas about sustainability from the Soviet Union in the 1970s are being returned to.

8. Final Remarks and Next Steps

There is a process outlined already. The next steps are to look at your ideas and how they dovetail with the themes and ideas already in the proposal, already defined by our partners and how those ideas might address some of the specific problems at a local level. We need to connect skills, knowledge, interests, and capacity with the issues we know to be critical around resource
development. We will create a draft research plan that will be circulated to everyone. We are starting to see some clusters and commonality emerging and it will be the Management Committee’s job to organize that, and we hope you can contribute to the process. There are a lot of costs when doing research in the North, and so we have to find out how we can best use the money to accomplish the things that you want to do. We will have a workshop every year so that we have the opportunity to give this network direction over the next seven years.

9. Appendices

Appendix A – Group Planning and Flipcharts

Group Planning
Cluster – Knowledge, Labor and Education

Saxinger, Mills, Berger, Dowsley, Schott, Sandlos, Petrov
1. Resource development and knowledge spillover and transfer to local economy
2. Resource development related to education and training across the Arctic
3. Wage and knowledge retention prior, during and after resource boom

Cluster – Observing framework of socio-economic well-being and sustainable human development

Petrov, Schott, Huskey, Irlbacher-Fox, ASI people: Larson, Fondahl, Schweitzer
1. Circumpolar indicators – baseline framework
2. Regional/local SIS
3. ReSDA data infrastructure
4. Review of project-specific indicator systems (SE assessment)

Flip Chart #1
• Two questions:
  1. Commodity chains
  2. Community attitudes to development
     ▪ Method: Varied!!
     ▪ Outcome – community generated histories
• Labour, training and mobility
• People-Company – who for whom?
  o Workers work for people in the first place, companies in the second
  o ...and it is not that companies “are kind” to provide (“give”) gas
• Power-relation
  o Explore power relations between companies and “labour” (e.g. education, training, knowledge, allocation of skills)

Flip Chart #2
• Questions
o What are the best ways of assessing full life-cycle impacts of resource extractions and identify best practices of community viability through extraction?

o How do communities adapt to the co-existence of land-based economies with extractive industries? Comparatively across all Arctic areas and resources

• Method
  o Anthropological participant designation carried out in teams of two: one researcher and one community member (one senior, one junior)

• Success indicator/monitoring systems
  o If we train competent researchers for assessing and monitoring resource extraction impacts
  o If we leave understanding the determinants of community viability, both urban and rural, in resource communities

Flip Chart #3

• How are contemporary problems of “development” rooted in the historical geographies of Arctic colonialism and development?

• How can we involve and integrate Indigenous intellectuals in the ReSDA process and goals?

• What are the gendered dimensions of resource extraction in the Arctic (past and present)?

• What can “we” achieve through dynamic cartography?
  o New geography of power? Awareness? Analysis of political power?
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Appendix C – Workshop Agenda

Wednesday, November 23 - 7:00 PM to 9:30 PM
Welcoming Reception (Explorer Hotel – Janvier Room)

Day 1 of the Workshop
Thursday November 24th - 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM
Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (Continental breakfast and lunch provided)

Morning
8:00 - Continental Breakfast / pick up packages

8:30 to 10:00  Introduction of the Project and Research Planning Approach
   Chris Southcott - Principal Investigator & Theme 2 – Sustainable Communities
   Frances Abele - Theme 1 – Sustainable Regions
   David Natcher - Theme 3 – Sustainable Cultures
   Brenda Parlee - Theme 4 – Sustainable Environments

10:00 to 10:30 - Coffee break

10:30 to 12:00 - Northern Partners Panel
   Jennifer Johnston, Inuvialuit Regional Corporation
   Aynslie Ogden, Yukon Government
   Charles Dorais, Makivik Corporation
   Jennifer Butler Wight, Labrador Institute
   Mary Ellen Thomas, Nunavut Research Institute
   Andrew Applejohn, Government of the NWT

12:00 to 1:00 - Buffet Lunch

Afternoon
Taking into account the initial research proposal, the current research plan, and the presentations made by community partners, ReSDA researchers are asked to make a short presentation on what central research questions will best enable us to meet the overall objectives of the project. This will assist the project in designing the state of knowledge work and allow us to plan for future activities.

1:00 to 2:45 - Panel 1 - Meta questions
Followed by questions and discussions
Lee Huskey, Ken Coates, Arn Keeling, Suzanne Mills, Emilie Cameron

2:45 - Coffee break

3:00 to 4:45 - Panel 2 – International Perspectives
Followed by questions and discussions
Florian Stammler, Gertrude Eilmsteiner-Saxinger, Stephanie Martin, Lassi Heininen, Southcott (Assorted)
Day 2 of the Workshop  
Friday November 25th  8:00 AM to 4:00 PM
Continental breakfast & lunch provided
Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre

Morning
8:00 am – Continental breakfast

8:30 to 10:15  Panel 3 – Methodological Issues
Followed by questions and discussions
Andrey Petrov, Chris Furgal, Harvey Lemelin, Ron Harpelle, Michel Beaulieu

10:15 Coffee Break

10:30 to 12:15  Panel 4 – Issues and Approaches 1
Followed by questions and discussions
Martha Dowsley, Stephan Schott, Paul Berger, Deb Simmons, Remy Rouillard

12:15 to 1:00 Buffet lunch

Afternoon

1:00 to 2:15  Panel 5 – Issues and Approaches 2
Followed by questions and discussions
Thibault Martin, Natalia Loukacheva, Thierry Rodon, John Sandlos, Southcott (Assorted)

2:15 Coffee Break

2:30 to 3:00  Final Remarks and Next Steps

3:00 to 4:00  Informal discussions and group planning