

Traditional Knowledge of Caribou and Caribou People

APPENDIX B:

Traditional Knowledge Workshop Methodology

Traditional Knowledge workshops were held March 30-31, 2016 and June 5-6, 2017 with participation from Indigenous partners. The workshops included representatives from the Athabasca Denesōᓂiné, Burnside Hunters and Trappers Organization, Ekaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization, Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board, Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers Association, Łutsel K'e Dene First Nation (LKDFN), North Slave Métis Association (NSMA), NWT Métis Nation (NWTMN), Tłı̨chǫ Government (TG) and the Wek'èezhii Renewable Resources Board (WRRB).

In 2016, 14 delegates participated, while an additional 10 individuals were observers who occasionally provided comments. Of the delegates, only two were women. This two-day workshop focused on the following questions:

- How can the relationship between people and caribou be healed? Who needs to be involved? When? Where?
- What do the youth need to understand to continue a healthy relationship with caribou?
- How do you know that you are being listened to?

In 2017, 22 delegates participated, of which four were women. There were no observers. Workshop participants were tasked with reviewing the *BCRP Interim Discussion Paper* and *BCRP Interim Range Assessment Technical Report* such that workshop discussions focused on:

- Proposed Principles, Goals, Objectives, Tools and Approaches
- Comments and Direction provided on BCRP Discussion Paper from each Indigenous Government and/or Organization
- Special Areas for Caribou (Water Crossings, Land Bridges, etc.)
- Watching Caribou: Community-Based Monitoring / Guardianship Recommendation

In summary, the delegates provided suggestions for the Plan such as: rewording the BCRP “framework” (goal, objectives, principles, and tools/approaches) to be more specific to Traditional Knowledge and community issues; highlighting where Traditional Knowledge informs the BCRP (drawing from the technical document); dividing the BCRP technical report into a Traditional Knowledge report and science report (of which i.e. the current report); and respecting existing land use plans and other processes.

Accordingly, changes to the proposed Range Plan were made as follows:

- Wording for goal, objective, principles, and tools/approaches was changed
- Monitoring (watching) was added as a tool
- The sections on compliance and enforcement were strengthened
- The importance of teaching youth the traditional laws as well as the role of youth in guardianship programs were better highlighted

- Protected areas: crossings were revisited
- Protected areas: calving grounds were revisited
- Protected areas: caribou fences were revisited
- The importance of supporting traditional laws was emphasized; and
- The cumulative disturbance frameworks were revisited.

Participants underwent a free, prior and informed consent process before having their insights recorded. In addition, they filled out evaluation forms to provide additional feedback or to contribute insights that they weren't otherwise able to share in the workshop setting. Follow-up emails were sent to participants to confirm their preferences to remain anonymous (or not) in the quotes used in the Plan and supporting documents.

In 2016, a modified combined semi-directed and ethnospatial interview process was adapted to a workshop setting by facilitators Joanne Barnaby and Natasha Thorpe. A draft workshop agenda was presented to participants as a guide for discussion, but ultimately workshop participants led the direction in which the discussions followed. In 2017, these same facilitators guided the group through the overall approach and structure proposed for the Plan, seeking input on how best to ensure that Traditional Knowledge was considered appropriately, respectfully and meaningfully.

A transcriber made detailed notes each day of the workshops so that clarification or edits could be made as quickly as possible. Based on these transcripts, a stand-alone report documenting activities and insights shared during the workshops was prepared and reviewed by participants. A draft version of each workshop reports was circulated by email through Aboriginal organizations and participants were given several months to submit edits. All feedback was subsequently incorporated.