
A SHARED FUTURE: ACHIEVING STRENGTH, HEALTH AND AUTONOMY THROUGH RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT FOR THE FUTURE

MEETING MINUTES
MEETING OF THE PROGRAMMATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

TORONTO, ONTARIO
DECEMBER 6-8, 2017

Attendees:

Emily Root, Diana Lewis, Debbie Martin, Hannah Tait Neufeld, Jeff Masuda, Erica Phipps, Sophy Chan, Sarah Harney, Sarah Rotz, Derek Kornelsen, Greg Lowan-Trudeau, Heather Castleden, Chad Walker, Jon Aarssen, and Robert Stefanelli

Regrets:

Chantelle Richmond, Cheryl Bartlett, and Barbara Dumont-Hill

Meeting Day One

1. Introduction, Overview, and Logistics

- Diana (Dee) Lewis led an introduction ceremony to begin our time together in a good way
- Heather Castleden then led an introduction circle in which participants provided a brief introduction and comment on their role within the A SHARED Future program
- Rob Stefanelli gave an overview of the meeting logistics, and Jon Aarssen began filming

2. Sex and Gender Considerations

- Jeff Masuda, Sarah Harney, and Sophy Chan facilitated this discussion
- Jeff discussed:
 - The literature review process used to better understand current SGBA 'stories', particularly in Indigenous and renewable energy contexts
 - Noted a general failure within SGBA to attend to the impacts of Indigenous cultures on how gender is conceptualized.
 - Reconciliation is not possible without gender equality, so PIs have been asked to consider gender in their individual projects, and specifically to address the following three questions:
 - 1. What might a S/CR/GBA approach reveal in the context of your communities
 - 2. What steps will you need to take to ensure you are ready to bring S/CR/GBA on board?
 - 3. How will you fill out 'the box' from CIHR?
- Sarah then talked about:
 - Gender-based analyses being inadequate when considering Indigenous women, and noted the importance of culturally-relevant gender based analysis at NWAC. CRGBA is a

better tool for fully accounting for historical and cultural contexts – particularly those affiliated with colonization including prescribed gender roles.

- Without considering intersectionality, we risk replicating the prescriptive structures of colonialism that caused the health disparities in the first place.
- Relationship between land/body/culture and health is one of great significance to Indigenous women, and it is often a relationship of responsibility – responsibility to ensure viability for current and future generations. Relationship exemplified through example of whitefish and breastfeeding – as the fish were poisoned, this teaching was no longer relevant to the community.
- Making space ≠ making safe. There are still instances of homophobia and transphobia in Indigenous communities.

3. Ethical, Legal and/or Social (ELS) Considerations

- In the interest of time and at the decision of the Programmatic Steering Committee, discussions continued in Sex and Gender, and the ELS agenda item was moved until Day Two

4. Indigenous Knowledge Translation and Equity-Focused Knowledge Translation

- Jeff Masuda and Erica Phipps facilitated this discussion
- Jeff discussed how knowledge is relational, and that equity-focused knowledge translation occurs at the nexus of institutional, communicative, and governing powers.
 - 5 Ingredients for EqKT:
 - 1) make time - building relationships takes time
 - 2) ensure safety – ceremonies may be essential to making safe space
 - 3) embody equity – our actions and verbal cues can be exclusionary
 - 4) learn together – facilitation of co-learning is essential
 - 5) see the full picture – expose oppression within institutions
- *“Our contribution is related to a difficult choice facing Indigenous communities: the choice of seeking inclusion (for survival) into a system that is inherently destructive while at the same time keeping alive possibilities of alternatives. Rather than focusing on specificities, our connections to the land have driven us to connect with each other and explore “inter- knowing” beyond modern reasoning and artificially created boundaries.”*
- May be inappropriate to assume Indigenous Knowledge and Western Knowledge can be incorporated equally – 4 schools of thought on how this can happen (Latulippe et al., 2015)
 - 1) Ecological – Indigenous Knowledge complements post-positivist science
 - 2) Critical – epistemic colonization renders Indigenous Knowledge unintelligible
 - 3) Relational – Distinct knowledge systems shared for mutual benefit
 - 4) Collaborative – There is potential for knowledge co-production
- Things for ASF to consider: Our power in knowledge, our engagement with all our relations, indirect teaching, allowing the world to teach
- Parting question: **“What are the ingredients for an integrated and relational KT strategy for A SHARED future (consider project and programmatic elements)?”**

5. Project Updates and Proposals from Principal Investigators

Questions and Comments for Emily Root:

- Is there appetite at CEPI for doing an institutional ethnography, as 'looking back' is a large part of this proposed research?
 - Co-lead Lisa Young would prefer to do a current analysis, but Emily wants to review the history as well as the current work
- Strong appreciation for *The Voice of the Lake* and there is an opportunity to convey this voice in the write-up of the methods for this research. This could be done in consultation with folks, or to have someone with the responsibility and 'authority' to speak for the lake. This would also bring this project more in-line with the program and its energy focus. Voice of the lake gives water agency.
- Retrospection isn't palatable for everyone affiliated with this project, as folks have expressed that they do not want to keep looking back and would prefer to seek innovation for the future.

Larger Questions to Consider:

- This research program has a 5-year funding timeline, but many of our projects will carry on afterwards. This is something that must be considered as we think of deliverables and reciprocity.
- Is renewable energy the ultimate goal of each of the projects within the program? Or is there a common goal within these projects that may not be renewable energy development.
- How do we determine the final budget for each project, and how do we determine which projects will be approved and which will be dropped from program?

Resolution: Each proposal will be read by 2 principal investigators, as determined by the co-chairs of the PSC, and provide feedback. Where the reviewers disagree, a third reviewer will provide feedback and final decision.

Questions and Comments for Dee Lewis:

- **ACTION: Dee to forward "Facilitation" and "More than Wind" to Debbie Martin for discussions with NCC.**
- Is it outside the scope of the project, or too sensitive of a topic to discuss within this project, about financial autonomy – who controls the money that comes in from the energy project, where those funds are put to use?
- Relationships between NB Power and Tobique have started out on bad footing, but have since proved to be more fruitful. Is this new lens really about reconciliation? Early impression is that it is about reconciliation, but how are these efforts reflected in the 5MW project versus a larger project?
- In terms of urgency (thinking about referendum), what are the short-term objectives needed before then?
 - Educational materials for the community so that they can make informed decisions in negotiations and voting.
- Follow up – Addressing these short-term objectives, is that outside of the scope of A SHARED Future, or part of reciprocity that comes with CBPR?
 - As part of CBPR, we need to assist in meeting the short-term objectives even at the risk of losing the entire project based on referendum decision.

- Providing educational materials is great, and it will lead to informed decisions, but the referendum vote is not likely to be unanimous. At that point, you may be at odds with certain groups of voters in the community and your relationship there will change. Something to think about as this project moves forward.

Questions and Comments for Debbie Martin

- What happens in the period between there not being any diesel, and not a renewable energy plan, or plan for drinking water? This has created resilience in the community, though, and a desire to improve these conditions instead of moving.
- Has there been any feasibility studies completed, and is bringing in engineers on the table?
- What is the scope for this project? Will you expand your research to the other 3 communities, or would be working with the SSHRC project out of University of Waterloo?

Questions and Comments for Derek Kornelsen

- NRCan putting more resources into building capacity and are opening themselves up to critical inquiry – this is new for them, and we are somewhat hesitant to believe in this.
- What does ‘success’ look like for communities that want to participate in this program?
- Having a contribution agreement (instead of a contract) allows us to work beyond the deadlines set by NRCan. Has NRCan mentioned a firm end-date? Pressuring communities into projects is a tactic that has been used in the past, and communities will walk away if that happens.
- If we are doing this real-time analysis, is there any promise that our recommendations will be taken up?
- What happens to communities that are not funded? Is there a way to discuss with them as well, or is that too cumbersome on capacity?
- When this project was first proposed, there were fears about NRCan borrowing our legitimacy. How has this project shifted since then?
 - The Nature of the contribution agreement gives us the ability to actually be critical – whether or not they implement our critiques is to be determined.
 - There is a sense of optimism that they aren’t just whitewashing this process and borrowing our legitimacy – a real belief that they want to be a test project and make real change.
- When does reconciliation work best? Settler to Ally? No Indigenous people on this project.

Questions and Comments for Hannah Tait Neufeld

- There is need for more opportunities to share what has been done in this community
- Ethical dilemma here that Andrew Moore has a vision for this project, and that includes the Catholic church. However, it seems that the Roman Catholic church and reconciliation in Canada seem incongruent and that maybe this is not a direction we should go with A SHARED Future
- Other tensions in this program: Changes to ASF after the Letter of Intent stage; filming these meetings and what happens with that video; having a lean towards supporting renewable energy; working closely with government and the historical issues there; the Church.
- Also tension in this project as Andrew is of the capital investment mindset, whereas Hannah wants to bring more of KT element and learning for communities.
- There is a need to establish an advisory committee and to continue to meet people from the community – Andrew is a great gatekeeper, but he is not from the community so it limits voice

- At present, not a lot of Indigenous leadership and guidance, so this advisory committee is important

Questions and Comments for IISD-ELA

- Have you met with any of the First Nations in the area and engaged with them, and what was their interest level?
- There was a sense of their presence at these meetings being unclear – What does ELA want from us, and why are they just engaging with us now?
- Why, when the Feds pulled out, was there no conversation (or coverage of the conversation), about giving those lands back to the First Nations with the right of first refusal?
- This project could present an opportunity to re-present how these lands can be used, based on the histories of First Nations in the area.
- There are certainly elements of eco-toxicology that are not reconcilable with Indigenous Ways of Knowing – intentional pollution, chemical modification, etc.
- This may not fit within ASF, but it can be continued elsewhere - perhaps through Heather's CRC. It makes sense to wait until first interviews are completed, and see if there really is an entry point
- NRCan and ELA, we are helping out naïve institutions by guiding them out of the dark, to be more progressive, etc. Do we want to help both Indigenous communities with renewable energy stories, and help Settler institutions with reconciliation efforts?

Questions and Comments for Greg Lowan-Trudeau

- Thinking about this symposium at the end of the Field School/Summer Institute, there could be possible opportunities to connect with Jeff's project re: bringing youth together.
- Interesting option could be to look at more than Alberta, and see what curriculum development looks like under 40 years of conservative leadership, as compared to say, Ontario.
- There needs to be a value/education piece to this. Communities (and the public writ large) are generally unaware of their power situations, and how to hold a discussion on important related topics. There is an opportunity then, to create a tool for communities to assist with information on the topics of discussion.
- In Tobique, they have changed the curriculum to include discussions on renewable energy so that it becomes the norm with the youth, and those youth become leaders/champions in this realm.

Questions and Comments for Jeff Masuda

- There are good synergistic opportunities with the IMNPs.
- Having a youth representative at future ASF events could be a KT opportunity, and maybe this fits more with a symposium in the Field School proposal.
- WEPGN has promised funding in the next calendar year, so could be a workshop opportunity there.

6. Summer Institutes and Field Schools

- WEPGN has offered to cover meeting costs in the next 12 months, so maybe we can make this work.
- Do we want this to be a one-off thing, or are we attempting to set up something that can be carried on beyond this project?

- Details still needed about Programmatic Steering Committee and International Advisory Committee levels of participation in FS/SI.
- A working group was created on this topic. It includes: Derek Kornelsen, Debbie Martin, Emily Root, Hannah Tait Neufeld. Additional participants are welcome.
- Attempt to time the Field School so that incoming graduate students will have an opportunity to participate for credit, while also serving in an RA role if necessary

7. Catalyst 20/20 Program

- Unsure about Henderson and the economic model here. Can circumvent him as the gatekeeper, but unsure if this is the best way forward.
- No further action items to consider here.

8. SSHRC Postdoctoral Proposals

Chad Walker

- Proposal shared for comment

Sarah Rotz

- Proposals shared for comment

9. Program Evaluation

- To consider: What is our financial and personnel capacity to evaluate internally how we are meeting targets for 'collective self-reflection'.
- SSHRC post-doc might not be funded, and if that is the case, we will need to re-evaluate budget around this.
- Our evaluation outputs will likely just 'sit on a shelf' at CIHR, but we can have a rich dataset, and produce something that goes beyond just the numbers CIHR is looking for.
- Action – Review Indigenous Evaluation set out by Jeff Masuda.

10. Trainees

- Plan needed to provide financial support to trainees. In advertisement for students, it was agreed that A SHARED Future funds would not be the only source of funds for students, and that external and internal scholarships would be sought in an effort to maximize allocated funds.
- Action: PIs to send **one or two paragraphs** about their projects so that a description can be added to ASF website.
- Action: Rob to reconstruct website to be used for recruitment.

11. Governance and Terms of Reference

- Action: Produce two documents: 1) Outline the terms for PIs 2) outline the terms of PSC
- Action: Change roles in PSC to director and members and chair, and delineate from PI obligations.
- Combine Ethics, KT, SGBA committees into one committee.
- Action: Include revised Terms of Reference(s) on the agenda for next teleconference.

12. Closing Discussions and Future Commitments

- Each Principal Investigator to create a timeline, budget, ethics, advisory committee, research tasks, and anticipated deliverables and share with Rob. Rob to compile and share to team. **DUE BEFORE NEXT TELECONFERENCE.**
- Two PSC members will review finalized proposals, and give the approval for the PI to move ahead with their research. Heather to facilitate which PSC members to review proposal as they come in.
- Future Meeting Dates:
 - **February 9, 2018 – Teleconference – 1:00pm-3:00pm ET**
 - **April 6, 2018 – Teleconference – 1:00pm-3:00pm ET**
 - **June 8, 2018 – Teleconference – 1:00pm-3:00pm ET**
 - **December 5th-7th, 2018 – In-Person Steering Committee Meeting – Kingston, Ontario**