

LNG Environmental Stewardship Initiative

Breakout Session #1

We are developing a proposal to support the work of the Environmental Stewardship Initiative. This harvesting tool is designed to gather feedback and further refine the Interim Governance Working Group.

The vision of the LNG Environmental Stewardship Initiative is First Nation Government and LNG proponents collaborating to generate high quality, accessible environmental information. Fulfilling this vision will result in the parties:

- Identifying long-term environmental issues that may be potential risks to specific ecosystem values; and,
- Building a platform for collaboration between proponents, First Nations, and government agencies that would increase the collective trust around the management of natural resources.

The purpose:

The Governance Working Group provides the venue for collaborative design of the ESI governance model. Supported by a contracted facilitator, this group will create recommendations on the vision, structure, strategic direction, project funding criteria, decision making process and other components such as the terms of reference for the Board, necessary for full ESI implementation. In order to achieve these objectives, the Governance Working Group includes representation from First Nations whose territory lies within regional ecological boundaries where LNG projects are being developed, Provincial and Federal Governments, and LNG facility and associated gas pipeline proponents.

ESI GOVERNANCE WORKING GROUP MANDATE

The definition of a mandate is the authority to carry out a policy or course of action. The mandate is often known as the purpose statement, which clearly outlines what the group has been created to do.

The project mandate must contain a clear statement of the project objectives showing what it is expected to achieve this may be in the form of outcomes or benefits.

The typical content of a project mandate should include:

- **The scope of the project.** Expressed in terms of what it will deliver, and most importantly, what it will not deliver by clearly defining the project boundaries.
- **Assumptions.** At this early point in time there may be many assumptions and these should be stated.
- **Known risks or issues.** Including these here will help the work and the creation of the project brief during the starting up a project process.
- **Constraints.** Most projects have constraints or limits that the project must work within, these will often be in the form of a fixed end date or budget limitation.

What specific actions do you believe the ESI Governance Working group should do to fulfill the vision?

1. Setting common understanding/criteria of how funding is allocated
2. Setting milestones, beyond just funding
3. Critical path for strategic decisions – consistency
4. Strategic direction – under the consistency banner, a common understanding of how \$ can and need to allocated – criteria?
5. Identify the critical path, strategic items
6. How would priorities be defined is a part of this, how does the governance groups be accountable
7. Consistency in governance
8. Mandate to represent all levels re: environmental stewardship issues
9. Tech structure to move issues forward – TOR – reviewing projects that come out of
10. Action: determine representation – how much? (larger territories)
11. Communication to community – relate to traditional knowledge
12. How to reach the right people: now to influence program guidelines to reflect
13. Helping with funding allocations
14. Who does GWG report to
15. Consider different structures available to us
16. Timing – Pine Beetle Trust Fund - model

What things do you feel are outside of the scope of the ESI Governance Working Group mandate?

1. Decision making on individual projects
2. Don't get into the details – only broad parameters
3. Not specific project description or technical parameters
4. Technical parameters, project decisions – criteria ditch lines for projects
5. Weeds of technical guidance and parameters
6. Social vs environmental – CE: how are those determined?
7. Can we broaden scope?
8. Not at community level, EA level
9. Higher level – change management response
10. Making decision on projects in the regions

What are some known risks or issues we may encounter during our work to fulfill the ESI vision?

1. Resources/priorities/capacity
2. Technical expertise/availability
3. Communication _____ capacity/across all groups – FN gov and industry
4. Program sunseting after 3 years – no guarantee of extension
5. Flow of funds to regional projects – where does that leave the governance group
6. Communication and info sharing maybe disconnected
7. Resources technical to meet deadlines, engagement capacity, capacity in FNs communities
8. 3 year window – sustainability for the long term
9. Communication plan (lack of)
10. Issue – scope of ESI – vehicle for policy change?
11. Should be able to affect change
12. Need to take recommendations up the line
13. Is policy within the scope?

14. Risk: not going to call LNG ESI – it's a template for LNG ESI - perception of LNG only as other industry
15. Misinterpretation of data – poor methodology, poor recommendations
16. Going beyond scope and vision
17. Political will changes business

PRINCIPLES

The following principles have, and will continue to guide the parties in the development of the ESI:

- Collaboration – must be the foundation of both the process and the structure.
- Trust and Accountability – the cornerstones of good governance and relationship building.
- Respect and Reconciliation – respect for differing worldviews and knowledge systems, with the goal of reconciling all participants' interests.
- Quality and Excellence – high quality environmental stewardship research, processes and outcomes that are evidence-based.
- Effectiveness and Efficiency – solutions that are complementary (not duplicative) to existing legislation, regulation, and policy and focus on achieving high value outcomes for ESI expenditures.

Are we missing any principles that are necessary to the carrying out our work? If yes, what are we missing?

1. Commitment from participants and follow through – action and delivery
2. Sharing of information, ideas, not duplicating - Some things can be built on, as long as
3. Commitment to action and delivery
4. Sharing of information and ideas
5. Sensitivity to individual FN needs get to grass roots
6. Consistency – keep sending the same people
7. Principles for engagement – ensure participation
8. Transparency and access to data and project results respect for sensitive info
9. Representation – ensure balanced and sufficient representation
10. Transparency
11. Deliver outcomes, majority to go the projects implementation
12. Apply sound methodology recognizing TK and science
13. Lots of talk, no walk
14. Outcomes must be evident at community level
15. Have to find projects that will build communities confidence

ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

What do you feel the roles & responsibilities of the ESIGWG should be? For example, seeking cross-sector representation from First Nations, Industry & Crown Governments; seeking out funding, etc.

1. Guidance (rapid) of _____ could impede progress of regions. What do the regions want?
2. Consistency

3. Communication/informing of actual process, what each group does, how to participate
4. How to design a feedback mechanism for those who are not in the room
5. Common what is better done centrally: 1) communication; 2) strategic planning; 3) funding broad parameters; 4) key policies and procedures; 5) dispute resolution
6. How can the GWG support the TWG – how do we ensure we are working on what they need?
7. Attendance link to decision makers
8. Create a link to regional groups
9. Think outside the box – brainstorming
10. Ensuring that spiritual and cultural values are represented in ESI projects
11. Communication of results
12. Review and develop policy proposals to government and industry
13. Also back to grassroots
14. Re: consultation side letter to say whether this is or isn't consultation
15. Need to know its without prejudice
16. Need to be clear in what we're here for – develop a document that we could all come to agreement on
17. Don't decide on project \$ design and execution
18. Don't get into multi sectors too quickly
19. Propose design for governance
20. Make the design happen and implementation

MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

The following are draft individual member responsibilities:

- Regularly attend and participate in ESIGWG meetings.
- Actively participate in meeting discussions.
- Represent the views of their members and have authority to speak on their behalf.
- Be accountable to the members being represented, keeping them informed on the progress of the ESIGWG, acquainting them with the issues being discussed, and gathering opinions in advance of the meeting.

Do you feel these will be effective in assisting the ESIGWG to undertake the mandate?

Yes No Don't Know

Y

Maybe – necessary but not sufficient (good starting point)



What other specific responsibilities should be expected of ESIGWG members?

1. Participants are advocates/champion – internal and external
2. Representing views of members – collaboration mandate
3. Advocacy for ESI – within their organizations (need mandate)
4. Management level group (not political) – develop recommendations go into G2G relationships. Need to develop clear and consistent communications
5. Is this a political or bureaucratic process? We are not politicians, our recommendation go the Chiefs, and they take them up
6. Dispute resolution should not be driven by Province

7. Ensure mandate and representation
8. Industry should have skin in the game
9. Avoid duplication

How should we ensure that ESI working group members have the political and community mandate and represent the interests of their groups?

1. Develop a document that everyone is signatory to 'management team' (not governance/political level) – LOU, MOU
2. Be sensitive to trigger words for FNs – discussion of what it looks like at tier 1, nations sign off, addendum to TOR – directly related to consultation.