

# A SHARED Future: Achieving Strength, Health and Autonomy through Renewable Energy Development for the Future

---

MEETING MINUTES  
TELECONFERENCE WITH PROGRAMMATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

2:00PM-4:00PM ET  
MONDAY JULY 17<sup>TH</sup> 2017

## Attendees:

Emily Root (Cape Breton University), Diana Lewis (Dalhousie University), Chantelle Richmond (Western University), Jeffrey Masuda (Queen's University), Derek Kornelsen (University of Manitoba), Gregory Lowan-Trudeau (University of Calgary), Heather Castleden (Queen's University), and Robert Stefanelli (Queen's University)

## Regrets:

Debbie Martin (Dalhousie University), Hannah Tait-Neufeld (University of Guelph)

---

Opening remarks from Heather Castleden, followed by introductions from teleconference attendees.

General notes about the call:

- Heather provided a PowerPoint presentation via email to all invited participants, and gave an overview of each of the slides.
- Much of the discussion focused on background information for the project, and this consisted largely of what CIHR asked for in their call, and how we answered that call with language from our own proposal.
- We did not have time to give an overview of each of the individual projects, though there are notes within the slide deck that can be reviewed. Robert Stefanelli also has recorded minutes from meetings with Mi'gmawei Mawiomi Secretariat, NunatuKavut Community Council, Bras d'Or Lakes CEPI, Natural Resources Canada, National Association of Friendship Centres, Native Women's Association of Canada, Summer Field Schools with Gregory Lowan-Trudeau, and Solar Community with T'Sou-ke Nation and Hannah Tait-Neufeld, and he can send those upon request.

Diana Lewis - Troy Jerome is no longer with the Mi'gmawei Mawiomi Secretariat (MMS), and Tanya Barnaby is the point of contact now for MMS and will be working closely with Diana during this research project.

Chantelle Richmond – It is an interesting time politically in her community as they are finally getting into courts regarding the ongoing comprehensive land claim agreements. A meeting

between Chantelle and Heather Castleden is needed to determine best ways to move forward in consideration of this.

Heather Castleden – Raised a point that arose during the teleconference with Hannah Tait-Neufeld and Andrew Moore of T’Sou-ke Nation – We need to broaden our understanding of the concept of energy across projects – even beyond development and conservation and consider human energy (including food security, the focus of Hannah’s work).

Jeff Masuda – Noted the terms within CIHR’s call, particularly “to examine” – want to ensure that we are doing what the funder is expecting we will do and produce a deliverable on it. Argued that there isn’t a lot of gender across the projects yet, though acknowledged that these projects are just beginning. This presents an opportunity to consider what exactly does sex/gender considerations look like for each project? Is it a forced gendered analysis in projects, or is it our job to champion gender and health equity in new ways?

Jeff also discussed the idea of “intersectoral” as the language put forth by CIHR in their call – raised questions about how applicable this term is to our current projects, but Emily Root did note that intersectoral partnerships are very important to the CEPI project as it stands right now. Jeff agreed that the CEPI context is where these partnerships are most evident.

Next, Jeff proposed the idea of maintaining a glossary of important terms and concepts, as well as the agreed-upon definitions of those terms and concepts for use in future conversations, writings, presentations, as well as in meetings with the other funded groups who will be tasked with using the same CIHR language but may have a different understanding of how it is used.

After Heather mentioned the negative impact that policies can have, and how we can go about studying these issues, Derek Kornelsen noted that in his experience new policies can often be supportive and work towards reconciliation, but can be hamstrung by old policies that do not consider things like UNDRIP or the TRC.

Heather raised the idea of contributing an article to the academic, open-access website [theconversation.com](http://theconversation.com) in which we outline what we are doing here with the A SHARED Future, and provide an introduction to the project. This is just another way to share the work we are doing (like the video) without waiting until we have completed the 5-year project.

Heather then discussed the governance aspects of the project. As it stands now, we have an international advisory committee co-chaired by Simon Brascoupe (Carleton University), as well as the programmatic steering committee (this group of PIs). There was a discussion about adding each community co-lead to this programmatic steering committee, but size then becomes a factor and may become unmanageable. For now, it was decided to rely on the academic and community expertise of the PIs to provide guidance for this program. There will also be a Knowledge Translation sub-committee led by Jeffrey Masuda with some overlap in membership from the international and programmatic steering committees. Finally, it was agreed that each of the PIs would have the freedom to create their own project-specific advisory committees to

shape their individual projects, and could seek feedback from the other committees when necessary.

Jeff suggested that we consider just how involved this programmatic steering committee should be in each project – top-down approach, or allow for free range at the project level? He then suggested that we draft terms of reference for this committee and how each of the PIs see this group contributing to each project moving forward (and to allow for a critique/negotiation to fit what each of the PIs are capable of regarding their own expertise and schedule).

Chantelle – It is important to detail what exactly each PI (and their co-lead) will do at the project level – writing the ethics, seeking band council approval, etc. Suggested that each PI creates a one pager outlining the roles that each of the PIs are committing to for the program as a whole, and then create a second part outlining their commitments to their own case studies – e.g. I will do ethics, I will manage the money, I will hire a student etc.

Jeff, in speaking about the KT and SGBA aspects of the project in addition to the slide deck, stated that we need to deconstruct our understanding of what knowledge is in the context of reconciliation. He argued that ultimately KT is about reflexive relationship building, and that we must consider this when thinking about our own KT and SGBA contributions moving forward.

Chantelle also made a point about this project, stating that there are a lot more men involved in this realm and that can be important to the SGBA components moving forward. She then noted that the Indigenous Health field is comprised largely of Indigenous women, and so one of the ways we can be contributing is by noting the contributions from Indigenous men as well.

Heather then proposed that each of the PIs outline their project proposal according to the same style of the CIHR project scheme grants (see slide 25 of the slide deck for further details). These “proposals” will then be submitted to, and reviewed by members of the programmatic steering committee and feedback will be provided. This will provide opportunities for mid-career researchers to act as mentors to the early-career researchers on our team, as well as provide an opportunity for each team lead to receive constructive feedback on their project moving forward. While the actual CIHR project scheme proposals are quite large, we are asking for only a 4-6 page document that summarizes the key points of the project (significance, methods, detailed proposed budget, resources needed).

Finally, the conversation concluded by discussing a proposed in-person meeting during the fall semester – date and location forthcoming.