

Exploring the Governance Outcomes of Social Learning through the Indigenous Circle of Experts  
(ICE) work with Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs)

By

Sophie J. Boardman

Submitted for the Combined Honours Degree program in the Faculty of Science in Environment,  
Sustainability, Society and Environmental Science

At

Dalhousie University  
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada  
April 2020

Supervisor: Dr. Melanie Zurba

© Copyright by Sophie J. Boardman, 2020

## DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

DATE: April 27, 2020

AUTHOR: Sophie J. Boardman

TITLE: Exploring the Governance Outcomes of Social Learning through the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) work with Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs)

DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL: College of Sustainability

DEGREE: Bachelor of Science  
Environment, Sustainability and Society, and  
Environmental Science

Convocation: TBD

Permission is herewith granted to Dalhousie University to circulate and to have copied for non-commercial purposes, at its discretion, the above title upon the request of individuals or institutions. I understand that my thesis will be electronically available to the public. The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

The author attests that permission has been obtained for the use of any copyrighted material appearing in the thesis (other than the brief excerpts requiring only proper acknowledgement in scholarly writing), and that all such use is clearly acknowledged.

---

Signature of Author

## Abstract

As Canada strives towards meeting Target 1 of conserving at least 17 percent of terrestrial areas and inland water, and 10 percent of coastal and marine areas by 2020, Indigenous protected and conserved areas (IPCAs) are viable options to completing Target 1. One important group doing work with IPCAs was the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE). ICE formed in 2017 to examine how Canada's Target 1 would be met equitably and influence the development of IPCAs. They released their report in 2018 providing recommendations for governments and Indigenous Nations across Canada in implementing IPCAs. This paper examines the social learning and collaboration throughout their work and the media surrounding IPCAs currently using social learning and governance theory. This research found collective learning and a true collaborative process enabled ICE to be effective. In media a paradigm shift around Indigenous people's importance in conservation occurred in the mainstream with more support for Indigenous led conservation and IPCAs. ICE's collaborative learning will pave the way forward in reconciliation, equitable IPCAs and truly Indigenous-led governance.

Key words: Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs), Protected Areas (PA) Aichi Targets, Target 1, social learning, governance, sovereignty, collaborative management

### Acronyms:

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)

Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE)

Indigenous Community and Conserved Areas (ICCA)

Indigenous Leadership Initiative (ILI)

Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs)

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Other effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs)

Protected Areas (PAs)

Social Learning Theory (SLT)

Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP)

World Parks Congress (WPC)

## **Acknowledgments**

I first would like to extend my biggest thanks to my amazing supervisor Melanie Zurba for all the support and knowledge throughout my research. Her guidance throughout my research was key. Additionally, the kind checkups when Dalhousie closed for Covid-19 were really appreciated.

I would also like to thank my other ESS Honours teachers, Andrew Medeiros and Andrew Bergel for their support, questions, and constructive feedback throughout the year. I learned so much from their different points of view. Additionally, my cohort in the ESS Honours class were filled with supportive folx and I am really glad to have gone through this process with them. Thank you to all my supportive family and friends that supported me emotionally and sometimes giving constructive feedback. I could not have done this without them.

I am grateful and humbled to have spoken to the ICE members and made my research possible. As a settler conducting research, I am forever grateful for this research opportunity. Additionally, I am thankful to have connected and met Eli Enns who provided great conversation and direction to this research. This amazing group fills me with hope for the future of Reconciliation and conservation in Canada.

## Table of Contents

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 1     | Introduction.....  | 7  |
| 1.1   | Global Influences on Canadian Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCA)..... | 7  |
| 1.2   | Canadian Advances in Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas.....                 | 8  |
| 1.3   | Research Objectives.....   | 9  |
| 1.4   | Research Significance.....   | 9  |
| 1.5   | Thesis Outline.....  | 10 |
| 2     | Literature Review.....   | 11 |
| 2.1   | Global Influences on Canadian Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas.....        | 11 |
| 2.1.1 | Conservation Paradigm Shift.....   | 11 |
| 2.1.2 | Indigenous Community and Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium.....                    | 12 |
| 2.1.3 | Classification of Protected Areas.....   | 13 |
| 2.2   | Status of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas in Canada.....                  | 14 |
| 2.3   | Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas Moving Forward.....                       | 16 |
| 2.3.1 | Protected Areas Within Indigenous Sovereignty.....                                 | 16 |
| 2.3.2 | Ethical Space.....   | 18 |
| 2.4   | Governance Models for Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas.....                | 19 |
| 2.5   | Other Barriers of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas.....                    | 22 |
| 2.6   | Social Learning in Protected Area Governance.....                                  | 23 |
| 2.7   | Conclusion.....  | 24 |
| 3     | Methods.....   | 26 |
| 3.1   | Methodology.....   | 26 |
| 3.1.1 | Semi-Structured Interviews.....  | 26 |
| 3.1.2 | Document Review.....   | 27 |
| 3.2   | Analysis.....  | 28 |
| 3.3   | Limitations.....   | 29 |
| 4     | Results.....   | 30 |
| 4.1   | Semi-structured Interviews.....  | 30 |
| 4.1.1 | Process.....   | 30 |
| 4.1.2 | Working with other Stakeholders.....   | 37 |
| 4.1.3 | The Future of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCA).....                 | 39 |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.1.4 | Improvements .....                         | 39 |
| 4.1.5 | Indigenous vs. Non-Indigenous Values ..... | 40 |
| 4.1.6 | Reconciliation .....                       | 40 |
| 4.2   | Document Review.....                       | 41 |
| 4.2.1 | Collaboration.....                         | 41 |
| 4.2.2 | Support of the 2018 ICE Report .....       | 45 |
| 4.3   | Conclusion .....                           | 46 |
| 5     | Discussion .....                           | 47 |
| 5.1   | Collective Learning.....                   | 47 |
| 5.1.1 | New Relationships .....                    | 48 |
| 5.2   | Governance .....                           | 49 |
| 5.3   | Reconciliation .....                       | 50 |
| 5.4   | Paradigm Shift .....                       | 51 |
| 5.5   | Conclusion .....                           | 51 |
| 6     | Conclusion .....                           | 52 |
| 7     | References.....                            | 53 |
| 8     | Appendices.....                            | 53 |
| 8.1   | I Ethics Approval .....                    | 61 |
| 8.2   | II Consent Form .....                      | 64 |
| 8.3   | III Semi-structured Interview Guide .....  | 67 |

Figure 1 What the ICE learned throughout their experience and work separated by instrumental and communicative learning .....

32

## 1 Introduction

The process of creating Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs) in Canada is being developed by a variety of stakeholders with a stake in protecting or having access to the environment. With Canada's commitment to conservation targets, IPCAs are being seen as a viable option towards Canada's Commitment of the Aichi Targets (Zurba, Beazley, English & Buchmann-Duck, 2019). Since Canada is still in the early stages of developing and implementing IPCAs, it is important to discuss the history of international influences on Canadian protected areas.

### 1.1 Global Influences on Canadian Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs)

The Durban Accords were adopted at the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) V<sup>th</sup> World Parks Congress meeting in Durban, South Africa in 2003 (Hockings, Ervin & Vincent, 2004; Zurba et al., 2019). At the V<sup>th</sup> World Parks Congress meeting, it was a turning point for the paradigm of conservation as local, often Indigenous populations, were recognized for their importance in conserving the landscape (Hockings et al., 2004). The Durban Accords were also important in creating a new framework of how to create, govern and manage national parks and PAs to decolonize colonial conservation (Zurba et al., 2019).

The Aichi Targets were adopted at The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) meeting in Nagoya, Japan in October of 2010 with the adoption of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* (Woodley, Bertzky & Crawhall, 2012; Jonas, Barbuto, Jonas, Kothari & Nelson, 2014; Zurba et al., 2019). The Aichi Targets are a set of 20 targets part of five larger goals towards conservation and sustainable biodiversity use (Jonas et al., 2014; Zurba et al., 2019). While all 20 Aichi Targets have relevance towards protected areas (PAs), the most relevant is Aichi Target 11 since it directly addresses PAs (Woodley et al., 2012). Target 11 states:

By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape (Jonas et al., 2014, p. 111).

The Aichi targets are meant to be achieved by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) parties, which includes Canada, by 2020 (Zurba et al., 2019). Canada's implementation of the Aichi Targets came in their national goals known as *The 2020 Biodiversity Goals and Targets for Canada* (Zurba et al., 2019). Canada's Target 1 specifically address Aichi Target 11 and the goal states, "By 2020, at least 17 percent of terrestrial areas and inland water, and 10 percent of coastal and marine areas, are conserved through networks of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures" (Biodivcanada, 2016).

An important paradigm shift which affects conservation and protected areas came with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) adopted on September 13, 2007 (United Nations (UN), 2007). This international declaration defined how Indigenous people's rights, livelihoods and lands should be treated equitably (UN, 2007). It was not until May of 2016 that Canada fully supported the declaration (Northern Affairs Canada, 2017). In addition to UNDRIP, the Canadian government also released the Calls to Action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in 2008 (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). The Calls to Action is paving the way for reconciliation to happen within Canada by providing guidelines of a possible frameworks for the Government of Canada and all Canadians to use (Zurba et al., 2019).

## 1.2 Canadian Advances in Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas

Within the settler colonial context of Canada, land and resource management has been historically based on the concept that Indigenous peoples are not the main decision makers (Hockings et al., 2004). There has been a recent shift in recognizing and elevating Indigenous led approaches to conservation in Canada. This can be seen in various management schemes of PA across Canada.

One important group, the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE), was important in advancing the creation of IPCAs in Canada (Zurba et al., 2019). ICE formed in 2017 to examine how Canada's Target 1 would be met equitably and influence the development of IPCAs (Zurba et al., 2019). The Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) is headed by two Indigenous Co-Chairs, nine core Indigenous experts and nine governmental and other organizational jurisdictions from across Canada (ICE, 2018). One Indigenous Co-Chairs is female, and one is male to bring a gender



balance to the committee (ICE, 2018). The nine core Indigenous members are from different areas of government with different areas of expertise relating to protected areas and governance (ICE, 2018). The nine government ICE committee members are from provincial and federal jurisdictions, as well as other governmental organizations such as Parks Canada, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) (ICE, 2018). ICE recently released their report called, *We Rise Together: Achieving Pathway to Canada Target 1 through the creation of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas in the spirit and practice of reconciliation*, in the Spring of 2018 (Zurba et al., 2019). In the report, ICE (2018) provides key characteristics of IPCAs and the different types of governance models of what an IPCA could look like and how these spaces could address reconciliation (Zurba et al., 2019). The report also outlines 28 key recommendations that governments and Indigenous Nations across Canada should implement and follow for something to truly be an IPCA (ICE, 2018).

### 1.3 Research Objectives

This research aims to build insights around collaboration and learning within the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) and how the outcomes of collaboration and learning influenced the development of key policy recommendations, as articulated through the “We Rise Together” report. The research will be focused around the following objectives:

1. Understand the ICE’s visions for Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs) and what this means for adaptive governance of protected areas in Canada;
2. Determine the social learning processes and outcomes among ICE members through their development of the “We Rise Together” report;
3. Explore ICEs framework for and approach to reconciliation within IPCAs and how it fits into adaptive governance with other stakeholders; and,
4. Explore ICE members’ perspectives regarding potential barriers and conflicts in the creation of IPCAs with other stakeholders.

### 1.4 Research Significance

Due to Canada’s colonial land policies and Canada’s rush towards the Aichi Targets, implementation of IPCAs could be at risk for causing Indigenous peoples more harm (Zurba et al.,

2019). With IPCAs being at the preliminary stage of implementation and few in Canada, research into its implementation and collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders in Canada is vital. ICE's research and work is key to Indigenous implementation of IPCAs in Canada. Moving forward, ICEs (2018) work is vital in ensuring that IPCAs are just and inclusive of Indigenous people's values and practices.

### 1.5 Thesis Outline

The literature review has six main sections. The first talks about the global influences on Canadian Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs). The second covers what current IPCAs look like in Canada and showcase possible examples. The third talks about what needs to happen in IPCAs moving forward. The fourth talks about governance models and theories which could be applied to IPCAs. The last section covers barriers and other things to implementing IPCAs in Canada are. The last section covers the social learning theory since this underpins the analysis of this research.

The rest of the paper will outline the results from interviews conduct the document review. The methodology of research will be explained, looking at semi-structured interviews and document analysis more closely. The results and analysis of interviews and document review will be next, followed by a discussion of findings. The end of the paper will summarize findings and future research opportunities.

## 2 Literature Review

International frameworks and advances globally which affect Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs) in Canada are important because they have shaped how Canadian policies towards their Indigenous population and protected area (PA) governance and strategies. I will also discuss the current state of Indigenous led PA in Canada to give context and what these PA relationships currently look like. A discussion of literature suggestions about IPCAs moving forward in Canada is also important in the face of reconciliation efforts and the shifting conservation paradigms. Indigenous sovereignty, collaborative models of governance and other barriers to implementing IPCAs are especially important to address because of the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) recommendations for future IPCAs touches upon these areas. Additionally, social learning theory within the context of resource management is important to discuss because IPCAs are a type of model of social learning due to the changing structure and actors' relationships.

### 2.1 Global Influences on Canadian Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas

#### 2.1.1 Conservation Paradigm Shift

Historically, conservation policies have disproportionately removed Indigenous populations from their land and outlawed their cultural and livelihood activities (Hockings, Ervin & Vincent, 2004; Moola & Roth, 2019). Canada has a history of colonial conservation policies, as many PA and parks were created that displaced Indigenous peoples (Moola & Roth, 2019). There has been a recognition of the need to shift conservation practices for increasingly larger conservation targets by international agencies and conservation scientists (Dudley, Jonas, Nelson, Parrish, Pyhälä, Stolton, & Watson, 2018). Additionally, there has been an emergence of including Indigenous populations in conservation policies (Hockings et al., 2004). Murray and King (2012) describe the shift in conservation as having two components, desired outcomes for protected areas (PA) and governance of PA. Conservationists believed that PA outcomes would be more successful if they directly benefitted local communities, as well as biodiversity (Murray & King, 2012). The governance piece was focused on community inclusion in managing these PAs and the rationale for this change was usually placed in efficacy and social justice (Murray & King, 2012).

These large conservation shifts towards inclusion of Indigenous populations in conservation policies and planning have also been in conjunction with international frameworks

and treaties, which has translated to Indigenous inclusion and championing of protected areas (PA) (Zurba, Beazley, English & Buchmann-Duck, 2019). The Durban Accords of 2003 provided a framework for how to decolonize PAs (Zurba et al., 2019). At this same meeting in Durban, a sub-committee of the IUCN, the World Parks Congress (WPC), recognized the importance of Indigenous populations in conserving the landscape (Hockings et al., 2004). This is important as Indigenous peoples claim and manage over half the world's surfaces (Dudley et al., 2018). At the meeting in Durban parties also discussed management effectiveness, social and economic aspects of PAs and local engagement (Hockings et al., 2004).

Another recent shift came from the international adoption of the Aichi Targets (Jonas, Barbuto, Jonas, Kothari & Nelson, 2014). In Target 11, the term other effective area-based conservation measures (OECM) was introduced (Jonas et al., 2014). At the time of conference in Japan, it was unclear how to define, manage and what OECMs were exactly (Jonas et al., 2014). This new language in the Aichi Targets, other effective area-based conservation measures, recognizes the importance of management practices that contribute to biodiversity conservation but are not necessarily a specific IUCN PA designation (Woodley et al., 2012). This was also in direct support of Indigenous peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs) (Woodley et al., 2012). This support of Indigenous peoples and ICCAs shows the global shift towards a more just and equitable conservation creation and management models (Jonas et al., 2014; Zurba et al., 2019).

### 2.1.2 Indigenous Community and Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium

Formed in 2010, the Indigenous Community and Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium is a global organization comprised of different civil society actors that works to promote the recognition of Indigenous peoples and provide support at international, regional and local levels for Indigenous peoples and Indigenous Community and Conserved Areas (ICCA) (Zurba et al., 2019). Kothari, Camill and Brown (2013) define ICCAs as a,

Natural and/or modified ecosystems containing significant biodiversity values, ecological services and cultural values, voluntarily conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities (sedentary or mobile), through customary laws or other effective means. (p. 4)

The ICCA Consortiums three main characterizations of ICCAs are that the community has a meaningful relationship towards their land, the community is the main governing body for management and regulation purposes and the outcome of the managed site is conservation regardless of motivation (Zurba et al., 2019). ICCAs have recently been receiving global recognition of their importance in championing Indigenous rights and Indigenous led management practices (Zurba et al., 2019; Kothari & Neumann, 2014). ICCAs vary widely in how they are managed, what is being managed and the overall goal (Kothari et al., 2013). While ICCAs are important towards achieving conservation goals, they are also important in securing the rights and lands for Indigenous peoples (Kothari et al., 2013).

### 2.1.3 Classification of Protected Areas

The internationally trusted protected area (PA) classifications come from The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (Dudley, Parrish, Redford & Stolton, 2010; Zurba et al., 2019). The IUCN is a globally recognized authority made up of a variety of stakeholders from many sectors to help different organizations make informed conservation decisions (IUCN, 2019). Member organizations, such as governments, non-government organizations (NGOs), and communities, and key knowledge holders help provide a basis for best practices and international guidelines for organizations (IUCN, 2019). They are comprised of different committees who deal with different aspects of conservation (IUCN, 2019). The IUCN defines a PA as:

A clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values. (Dudley et al., 2010, p. 486)

The seven defined categories are based on management and usage: Strict nature reserve, wilderness area, national park, natural monument or feature, habitat/species management area, protected landscape, and protected areas with sustainable use of natural resources (Dudley et al., 2010). While the IUCN provides guidelines on how countries may align to these categories, it is ultimately up to countries on how to classify their own PA (Dudley et al., 2010). At a global level these classification schemes have been important in providing countries a framework and as more inclusive models of conservation are being shaped, the IUCN must reflect these changes as well at an international level (Dudley et al., 2018).

## 2.2 Status of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas in Canada

According to the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) (2018), IPCAs are lands and waters which are governed by Indigenous governments who primarily protect and conserve ecosystems through Indigenous law, governance, and knowledge systems. While IPCAs may vary throughout Canada due to the mosaic of Indigenous communities and governance strategies, ICE found three common characteristics across Canada (ICE, 2018). IPCAs are primarily managed and led by Indigenous peoples, IPCAs are managed for long-term conservation goals, and Indigenous people's rights and responsibilities with the land are properly acknowledged and elevated (ICE, 2018).

IPCAs could be an addition to Canada's Target 1 as a PA or an OECM depending on its ability to fit within certain criteria (Zurba et al., 2019). Canada has only recently designated an IPCA called the Edéhezíe Protected Area (Zurba et al., 2019). Many different types of land management strategies with differing levels of Indigenous involvement exist within Canada, but since these areas are not usually specifically Indigenous led, they are not able to be classified as an IPCA (Zurba et al., 2019). There is currently no national legislation that recognizes voluntary Indigenous conservation areas conserved for cultural or ecological importance to Indigenous peoples (ICE, 2018). Some provinces have created their own laws to protect areas of Indigenous significance (ICE, 2018). For example, conservancies have been defined legally under British Columbia law since 2006 and have designated 156 as of 2014 (Stronghill, Rutherford & Haider, 2015; ICE, 2018). There is also a lack of legal mechanisms in Canada to formally recognize or establish an IPCA (ICE, 2018). Additionally, protected areas (PA) laws are in conflict and do not allow for the types of governance arrangements required for an IPCA (ICE, 2018). Even in one case, the Crown did not acknowledge the Tla-o-qui-aht First Nation who had formally declared to protect an area (ICE, 2018).

Conservancies are a type of PA which is legally defined in British Columbia (BC) after legislation was successfully passed in 2014 (Stronghill et al., 2015). Specifically, conservancies are legally defined under the BC Parks Act and the Protected Areas of British Columbia Act (Stronghill et al., 2015). The management and development of conservancies are described in the Parks Act regulations (Stronghill et al., 2015). Conservancies are designed to protect and preserve

biological diversity and the natural environment, preserve the ceremony and other social and cultural practices and values of First Nations (FN), and that the development and use of resources from the land are in conjunction with the previous statements (Stronghill et al., 2015). Conservancies received mixed support from FN communities (Stronghill et al., 2015). Some FN were in support of the model because of the inclusion and protection of their values and continued usage of the land (Stronghill et al., 2015), while other FN communities saw conservancies as another colonial settler mechanism which took decision making power away from their communities and reduced sovereignty over their lands since the province of BC would still be the final decision maker (Stronghill et al., 2015).

Another type of IPCA model in Canada is led by the Indigenous Leadership Initiative (ILI). The ILI was formed to help Indigenous nations be able to lead and partake in Indigenous led conservation and sustainable development efforts (Indigenous Leadership Initiative (ILI), 2019). One of their programs is the Guardian program (ILI, 2019). Guardians are Indigenous people in FN communities who provide on the ground guidance and learning opportunities to manage their lands better (ILI, 2019). Guardians draw on traditional knowledge and science to have a more holistic understanding that leads to better management of PAs, monitoring of development projects and in restoring animals and plants (ILI, 2019). There are over 40 guardian programs across Canada and a national guardian's network is in the works to better empower and provide for the numerous guardians (ILI, 2019).

Tribal Parks are another type of PA management type which has been deemed successful by scholars and FN communities in Canada. Tribal parks are understood as a projection of sovereignty over contested area in BC (Murry & King, 2012). Eli Enns, the North American Regional Coordinator for the Indigenous Peoples and Community Conserved Territories and Areas Consortium and a Co-Chair of the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE), helped found the Ha'uukmin Tribal Park (Enns, 2015; ICE, 2018). Enns (2015) says that the tribal park model is grounded by a different way of thinking than traditional parks which fully endorses and allows the park management to flow from a foundation of Indigenous beliefs and practices. The park model also focuses on human well-being and the connection with the environment (Zurba et al., 2019). Enns (2015) believes the tribal park structure also allows for activities which can only benefit

people and the community while protecting the environment. The Tla-o-qui-aht Tribal Parks are hailed as a successful Tribal Park, with overlapping usage and ownership by different groups in the region (Murray & King, 2012; Zurba et al., 2019). The Tla-o-qui-aht Tribal Parks are also seen as a model for Indigenous peoples and Community Conserved territories and Areas (ICCAs), which was discussed above (Murray & Burrow, 2017). It must also be noted that tribal parks are not formally recognized by the Canadian government (Murray & King, 2012; Zurba et al., 2019). This has the potential to conflict with support needed for Indigenous rights and responsibilities (Zurba et al., 2019).

## 2.3 Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas Moving Forward

### 2.3.1 Protected Areas Within Indigenous Sovereignty

The paradigm shift in conservation has increasingly led to the recognition that Indigenous peoples play a key role in conserving biodiversity and landscapes (Hockings et al., 2004; Jonas et al., 2014). Canada's colonial history is the main reason for taking land and resources from Indigenous peoples and how conservation has played out (Zurba et al., 2019). Tuck & Yang (2012) argue that we live in an external and internal colonial system in Canada due to our system operating as a settler colonialism system. The settler colonial system does not differentiate between colony and home country and the new settlers move into an already inhabited land, effectively placing themselves as higher beings among the people already living on that land (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Tuck and Yang (2012) also discuss how problematic the use of decolonization in education and social science has changed the power and meaning behind it. They argue that it has been converged into the settler mind-set about social justice and grouped Indigenous peoples with other specially deemed groups or classes (Tuck & Yang, 2012). In doing so, this action of settlers is just another form of settler appropriation (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Tuck and Yang (2012) also argue that settlers have disengaged themselves from believing they are in the destructive system but are still harming Indigenous people's rights and identities. As well, a settlers' move to innocence is an attempt for the settler to relieve guilt and responsibility without giving up power and having to change (Tuck & Yang, 2012). This unwillingness of all settlers, people in power and individuals, to give up power and concede to a more just equity of resources and other services, will affect how Indigenous peoples will gain sovereignty within the settler nation. This is especially harmful to



Indigenous people's resurgence of formal governance, law and cultural practices and the space this must happen in (ICE, 2018).

Another concept which applies to Indigenous sovereignty within the implementation of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCA) is the idea of certainty and uncertainty (Blackburn, 2005). Blackburn (2005) discusses the intersection of uncertainty in Aboriginal title and resource management and how uncertainty can impede resource management and market profit in the sphere of globalization. Blackburn's (2005) research found that establishing treaties in the traditional territory of the Nisga'a First Nation (FN) in British Columbia would cause economic uncertainty in the province because of the logging industry and the province did not want to risk that for decades. When the treaty was finally established in April of 2000, it provided certainty in law and how to manage the lands and the relationship between the government and Indigenous populations (Blackburn, 2005). While Blackburn (2005) argues that establishing title is important, she argues it does not necessarily establish separate sovereignty for FN, but rather an inclusion in Canadian sovereignty. Mackey (2014) also studied certainty and uncertainty and the intersection of Indigenous land rights and decolonization within the settler state. Mackey (2014) expands upon Blackburn (2005) research and asserts that settler certainty is a result of settler colonialism and that in understanding certainty and uncertainty in this context will help understand settler law and feeling. Since the settler system had deemed the stealing of land by settlers as a certain and quite normal process, Mackey (2014) argues that settlers operate on the assumption that the crown will continue to have underlying title to Indigenous lands. Mackey (2014) concludes, decolonization will require society to go into a place of grounded uncertainty.

Both Mackey (2014) and Felix Hoehn (2016) argue that the Doctrine of Discovery must be abolished in Canadian Law for First Nations to fully realize Indigenous sovereignty. The Doctrine of Discovery is predicated on the assumption that Canadians discovered the land, when in reality this is not true (Hoehn, 2016). Hoehn (2016) also argues that Aboriginal Title is outdated and still relies on the narrative that settlers discovered the land and the peoples on the land. Hoehn (2016) also argues how the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and how the Calls to Action could help lay out reconciliation and that working towards sovereignty can help work towards reconciliation.

### 2.3.2 Ethical Space

In their paper, *We Rise Together*, the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) (2018) describes the ethical space conservation must take place in future endeavours due to the violent past inflicted on Indigenous peoples in Canada. ICE (2018) has come to understand ethical space as a place which acknowledges and integrates all knowledge systems, leading to cross collaboration and can apply Indigenous knowledge towards Canada Target 1 and in future conservation. Ethical space should also work to make sure relationships are focused on at multiple levels, not just at a political level (ICE, 2018). Through this space, ICE (2018) hopes it can foster an environment of mutual respect, which signifies the paradigm that all knowledge systems are equal and means Indigenous knowledge does not need validation. Further, ICE (2018) hopes that by following this framework the qualitative aspects of Target 1 can be achieved while in addition to the quantitative. In working in an ethical space, ICE (2018) says this can be done by following the recommendations laid out in their report, following Indigenous protocols and implementing Indigenous knowledge.

In addition to the ethical space, ICE (2018) also explored reconciliation and provided a framework and steps to follow to make the creation of IPCAs successful. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) provides a possible framework for Canadians to follow (Zurba et al., 2019). Within this framework, the TRC calls for repairing damaged relationships and trust by providing apologies and reparation when appropriate and concrete actions to show true system change (ICE, 2018). ICE (2018) also asserts that creating these new relationships will require the acceptance and bringing back of Indigenous law and legal traditions. Finegan (2018) also discusses a possible framework and the steps needed to undergo reconciliation in parks. He calls for a committee, which could be guided by the Truth and Reconciliation Committee (TRC), truth telling as a way of establishing the true narrative of lands and providing appropriate justice through a community driven healing process (Finegan, 2018). Finegan's (2018) steps are but just a small proportion of what ICE (2018) asserts needed to be done. As part of the reconciliation process, nation-to-nation relationships must be revived through the re-visitation of original treaties between the Crown and Indigenous peoples (Coyle & Borrows, 2017; ICE, 2018). This is important because treaties serve as a moral basis of interaction and are relationship based in nature (Poelzer & Coates, 2015). Their secondary purpose was to be a legal document intended to guide the relationships between the Crown and indigenous peoples but were largely misunderstood by the two sides

resulting in confusion and violent undertakings (Zurba et al., 2019). This could be done by looking at the original intent of treaties and abandonment of certain concepts such as the Doctrine of Discovery (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015; Hoehn, 2016). It is also important to acknowledge and restore indigenous relationships with the land (Courtois & Nitah, 2018). This is important because Indigenous people's ways of caring for the land is linked to other social and cultural responsibilities (ICE, 2018). In restoring Indigenous people's relationship with their land, the space for Indigenous law and social practices can be created and address the long history of expulsion and appropriation (UN, 2007; Zurba et al., 2019). In addition, ICE (2018) also stresses the importance of the differing regional and structural capacities of Indigenous communities and the need for the Crown to recognize this.

#### 2.4 Governance Models for Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas

There are a plethora of differing models and methods which have governed how resources and protected areas (PA) are managed. One type that is commonly employed is community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) (Berkes, 2004). CBNRM is when communities are at the forefront of conservation, but this has become less popular due to the realization that not all communities conserve or preserve their natural resources and should be treated less as a fad (Berkes, 2004). This has also emerged when multiple fields came to the realization that nature is more complex and the types of management must reflect this (Berkes, 2004). This was also at the same time when the conservation paradigm shift discussed earlier that communities play a key role in conserving landscapes (Hockings et al., 2004; Berkes, 2004). Berkes (2004) goes on to discuss another emerging form of resource management, co-management and adaptive co-management. There are many different definitions found in the literature about the exact definition of co-management, but in general it is when there is a sharing of power between the government and local resource users (Berkes, 2004; Mabee & Hoberg, 2006). Often, co-management was used to negotiate and re-define relationships between stakeholders who had differing authority over a certain resource (Goetze, 2005). Although co-management structures can be seen as more equal for stakeholders, in cases with managing lands or resources with Indigenous peoples, the other stakeholder receives the final decision-making authority (Goetze, 2005). For example, in Clayoquot Sound, the Indigenous management board only delivers recommendation and is not the ultimate the decision maker, the provincial government is still the main decision maker (Mabee &

Hoberg, 2006). Co-management also works to negotiate and embed the differing world views of Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders (Goetze, 2005). In contrast, adaptive co-management is more of an iterative management scheme that works to combine ecological and governance processes and build and maintain relationships (Berkes, 2004). Berkes (2004) also asserts that adaptive co-management integrates some parts of adaptive management, making it more of a feedback and learning process.

Another type of management scheme is adaptive governance, which has emerged from co-management and adaptive co-management (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018). Adaptive governance is as a form of management of ecosystems across land and seascapes that has an undercurrent of how humans interact and cope with complexity, such as the effects of climate change, environmental degradation and population growth (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018). Adaptive governance emerged from the combining of co-management and adaptive management and need for more resilient ways of management when dealing with the complexities of the social and natural environment (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018). Adaptive governance is founded on the assumptions that change and uncertainty are to be lived with, human and natural systems are not separate, and that resiliency should be the desirable outcome (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018). Adaptive governance also promotes social learning relationships, powering sharing between stakeholders, and flexibility during changing circumstances (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018). While adaptive governance may look like it is a better form of management, it still disadvantages Indigenous peoples in resource management (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018).

A recent form of management has been collaborative governance to deal with complex natural resource issues (Conely & Moote, 2003). Collaborative governance has recently been applied to the management of PA (Zurba, Ross, Izurieta, Rist, Bock, & Berkes, 2012). An idealized version of collaborative governance is often pictured and seen as reducing conflict among stakeholders, building social capital, allowing environmental, social and economical issues to be addressed at one time and produce better decisions and outcomes (Conely & Moote, 2003). In collaborative governance, goal setting is also a prominent feature which is often used for evaluative purposes (Conely & Moote, 2003). In order for collaborative governance to be meaningful for Indigenous nations, there must be an appropriate environment that allows for cross-cultural

exchange and social learning to happen (Bowie, 2013). This space must be a priority because without it, the management scheme would continue to leave Indigenous peoples powerless in these agreements (Bowie, 2013). Indigenous knowledge holders must be present throughout the entire process and real action beyond inclusion of Indigenous peoples must be undertaken (Bowie, 2013). Collaborative governance also differs from adaptive governance in that it is a process undertaken by all stakeholders who must work through a social learning process and must keep revisiting the process and investing in it for management to be effective (Ansell & Gash, 2008). The collaborative process also rests upon stakeholder's willingness and effectiveness to nurture trust, have on-going communication and maintain relationships (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Commitment to the process is different than securing means to see a specific need of a stakeholder is met, but rather the idea that mutual gains by all parties is the best way to achieve the goals set out in the beginning of the process (Ansell & Gash, 2008). The process undertaken by stakeholders may include the steps of negotiating common management objectives, nurturing and developing trust and mutual respect and building capacity (Zurba et al., 2012). To stress further, these steps are not meant to be linear in nature but involve much feedback and social learning, so the best outcome is produced by all parties involved (Conely & Moote, 2003; Zurba et al., 2012).

Moving forward, Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) (2018) outlines the types of governance and partnerships which could exist in an Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area (IPCA), which is ultimately up to the Indigenous community and what would best serve them (ICE, 2018). ICE (2018) outlines four possible models. The first is Indigenous government with Crown government partnerships, which is when Indigenous governments work with Crown governments at either federal, provincial, territorial or municipal level and cooperate to establish and manage a PA (ICE, 2018). The second being Indigenous government with non-governmental partnerships, which could be Indigenous governments working with Industry, land trusts or conservation organizations and often used when private property is used for conservation (ICE, 2018). The third is hybrid partnerships when multiple stakeholders of both government and non-government work collaboratively to provide resources and management a PA and requires all stakeholders to play a clear role in the collaborative model (ICE, 2018). The last possible model is sole Indigenous governance where Indigenous governments make all decisions and manage

lands, such as treaty lands, reserves, Aboriginal title, for protection or conservation purposes (ICE, 2018).

While ICE (2018) supports governance that is fully Indigenous led, which encompasses management and operation responsibilities, ICE also recognizes that this may not easily be attainable by all Indigenous nations, so it will be up to the nation which governance model best fits their needs and situation. It is stressed that the type of collaboration is up to the Indigenous nation because in order for it to be considered an IPCA it must come from the Indigenous nation (ICE, 2018; Zurba et al., 2019). While ICE (2018) has come up with potential IPCA models, they acknowledge that there could be possible models for other areas which may not be able to qualify as an IPCA. According to ICE's qualifications of IPCAs, conservancies, Tribal Parks, Indigenous management and Indigenous governance are currently the type of PA which exists in Canada that would qualify as an IPCA (ICE, 2018; Zurba et al., 2019, Table 1, p. 9; Moola & Roth, 2019).

## 2.5 Other Barriers of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas

One barrier that will continue to persist is the paradigm between Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders about land and environment as a whole. The current paradigm and system are always in an effort to manage the land, which is in contrast to how Indigenous peoples view the land as a valuable cultural and environmental value since their traditions and history are closely tied to their lands (Carroll, 2014; ICE, 2018). This difference of what land means will continue to underpin conservation and the implementation of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCA) if Indigenous values are not fully endorsed (ICE, 2018). Another barrier is the ambiguity of what an other effective area-based conservation measure is (OECM) and has led to designations that have not fully addressed conservation goals and in practice have been a sloppy addition to Target 11 (Lemieux et al., 2019). While ICE (2018) laid out what IPCAs could look like, they mentioned OECMs but never defined them in the Canadian context. This lack of clear guidance and regulations could interfere with intentions to deliver certain conservation outcomes and make management of a place worse (Jonas et al., 2014; Zurba et al., 2019; Lemieux et al., 2019).

A barrier that was touched upon earlier is the Crown's reluctance to give up centralized power (Mackey, 2014; Hoehn, 2016; Murray & Burrows, 2017; ICE, 2018). The Canadian government does not want to give up power in a system made for them, a settler, to benefit

(Blackburn, 2005). Although the the Tla-o-qui-aht have achieved some power through different management strategies and established norms of Indigenous culture, the Crown still asserts power over the tribal park due to system power structures and unclear land tenure (Murray & Burrows, 2017). Although these new processes of IPCA call for a collaborative process of all stakeholders (Ansell & Gash, 2008), the Crowns reluctance to recognize Indigenous led management of their lands is a clear signal they are not willing to let go of their power (ICE, 2018; Murray & Burrows, 2017). As the socio-political landscape is changing, power structures are changing along with them and new developments could be arising (Murray & Burrows, 2017) and especially if the recommendations laid out by ICE (2018) are undertaken.

## 2.6 Social Learning in Protected Area Governance

Social learning is often applied to environmental governance situations due to the relationship building and interactive learning employed (Cundill & Rodela, 2012). Due to the large body of literature behind social learning, this will be explained before I use it as a basis in my methodology section in chapter 3. Social learning comes from the psychology field when it was used to study the behaviour of people in situations (Bandura & Walters, 1977). It emerged from the field of psychodynamic theory which over-simplified human drivers and their choices (Bandura & Walters, 1977). Cundill & Rodela (2012) defined social learning as:

A change in understanding that goes beyond the individual to become situated within wider social units or communities of practice through social interactions between actors within social networks. (p. 7)

Social learning has changed over time due to shifts in conservation practices and governance methods (Cundill & Rodela, 2012). Social learning initially began as a way to describe the process of learning from goal setting and following through, but now includes how stakeholders interact and learn from each other (Cundill & Rodela, 2012). In the beginning, the learning process was only for the elite few, but now includes all stakeholders and people who are involved with protected area (PA) management and other responsibilities (Cundill & Rodela, 2012).

Social learning therefore occurs as a result of social interaction (Siddiki, Kim, & Leach, 2017; Cundill & Rodela, 2012). It can be seen through new obtained knowledge or as improved

interpersonal relations (Siddiki et al., 2017). These are new types of learning are often what collaborative governance seeks to attain, due to the kinds of processes being done and how often people from very different backgrounds work together (Siddiki et al., 2017). Schusler, Decker and Pfeffer (2003) stress the importance of social learning to address the complexity and uncertainty of natural resource management. Schusler et al. (2003) definition of social learning is more in line with resource management and defines it as the following:

As learning that occurs when people engage one another, sharing diverse perspectives and experiences to develop a common framework of understanding and basis for joint action.  
(p. 311)

Schusler et al. (2003) also argue that by employing social learning, the building of relationships can happen. Although social learning could incur action, the right kinds of structures must be in place for further action to be pursued (Schusler et al., 2003).

Learning can also be broken down into two types, communicative and instrumental learning (Sims & Sinclair, 2008). Sims and Sinclair (2008) describe instrumental learning as learning which has to do with controlling the environment or people. Instrumental learning is generally tactile or something more tangible, such as such as obtaining skills and information, determining cause-effect relationships and task-oriented problem solving (Sims & Sinclair, 2008). Communicative learning is learning which is housed in understanding and when concepts and values are being wrestled with (Sims & Sinclair, 2008).

## 2.7 Conclusion

The recent shifts conservation in planning and ways to achieve biodiversity goals have been more inclusive of including Indigenous populations in planning and championing their values and goals (Hockings et al., 2004; Woodley et al., 2012; Dudley et al., 2018; Zurba et al., 2019). As Canada enters into formal and informal discussions and actions towards reconciliation, ICEs (2018) recommendations pave the way for meaningful and just Indigenous protected and conserved areas (IPCAs) across Canada (Zurba et al., 2019). Thus, it is important to examine and learn from ICEs (2018) report and process as Canada moves forwards. Social learning theory will be used to examine ICEs process because their process and outcomes were a result of social interactions (Siddiki et al., 2017). As IPCAs begin to be formed across Canada, it will important



to learn from ICE (2018) and put their recommendations into action and policies in these new IPCAs.

## 3 Methods

### 3.1 Methodology

A qualitative approach was applied to this study due to the nature of the research objectives. Since the study is focused on the learning that Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) (2018) engaged in to produce their report titled, *We Rise Together*, a qualitative approach is the most appropriate so participants views can be expressed properly (Paly & Atchison, 2014). As well, my research objectives are based around exploring and following both a deductive and inductive approach. Inductive approaches are used when the researcher is making observations and then draws conclusions from these observations (Paly & Atchison, 2014). In contrast, deductive approaches are when the researcher finds a theory to analyze and observe a given phenomenon (Paly & Atchison, 2014).

#### 3.1.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

The Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) is comprised of two Indigenous Co-Chairs, nine core Indigenous experts and nine government and other important organizational jurisdictions from across Canada (ICE, 2018). One Indigenous Co-Chairs is female, and one is male to bring a gender balance to the committee (ICE, 2018). The nine core Indigenous members are from different areas of government with different areas of expertise relating to protected areas and governance (ICE, 2018). The nine government ICE committee members are from provincial and federal jurisdictions, as well as other governmental organizations such as Parks Canada, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) (ICE, 2018).

My research was invited by one of the ICE Co-Chairs Eli Enns, who is also a key member of the Conservation through Reconciliation Project (CRP). The CRP is comprised of Indigenous thought leaders, organizations, youth, elders, scholars, conservation agencies and organizations and Indigenous Peoples and Nations, including several core ICE members (Conservation through Reconciliation Project (CRP), 2020). The CRP launched in May of 2019 to act on the recommendations presented by ICE (2018) (CRP, 2020). Eli was contacted first because my supervisor has a pre-existing relationship with him, and I had met him when he visited Dalhousie previously. I contacted ICE committee members through my supervisor's relationship with

different ICE members and her membership in the Conservation through Reconciliation Project (CRP). I obtained ethics approval to conduct this research on January 9, 2020 (Appendix I REB 2019-5021). ICE members were sent an email asking to participate in the study with the consent form and consent script attached (Appendix II). Informed Consent was followed properly before each interview. I read the consent script and answered questions so participants would feel fully comfortable participating in this research (Appendix II). Beyond obtaining consent, I also asked if each participant if the interview could be recorded. I also asked if the participant wished to be self-identified and if I could quote them (Appendix II). There was also the option if the participant did not wish to be self-identified, but I could still quote them (Appendix II). I was able to interview 2 Indigenous core members and 4 governmental jurisdictional experts on the ICE committee.

Semi-structured interviews were chosen since social learning is what someone perceives they have learned and how they have learned something (Cundill & Rodela, 2012; Siddiki et al., 2017). As this research is looking at a process that has already happened, talking to the participants was the best way to glean information about learning and governance (Cundill & Rodela, 2012). The semi-structured interview questions were guided by social learning theory to uncover and look at if ICE's process was intentional or not, what ICE learned and what kinds of learning happened in the process and how the learning attributed to the policy and recommendations outcomes described in their report (Appendix III). I looked at instrumental and communicative learning (Sims & Sinclair, 2008). Sims and Sinclair (2008) describe instrumental learning as learning which has to do with controlling the environment or people and could be things such as obtaining skills and information, determining cause-effect relationships and task-oriented problem solving. Communicative learning is learning which is housed in understanding and when concepts and values are being wrestled with (Sims & Sinclair, 2008).

### 3.1.2 Document Review

The document review primarily gathered data about governance in and around the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) (2018) work with coming up with their key recommendations in their report titled, *We Rise Together*. The document review was important in triangulating information found on governance and some learning outcomes (Bowen, 2009). Document reviews are useful because key documents can be used in addition to other qualitative methods used within

a research study (Bowen, 2009). The document review was engaged in before the semi-structured interviews and ongoing throughout to check information and look into important points that interviewees raised. Documents were obtained from media sources and grey literature from when ICE was first formed and until as recently as possible.

The governance lens was informed by literature on adaptive and collaborative governance. Adaptive governance grew from co-management and adaptive co-management to deal with increasing complexities in the environment and the increasing social management process (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018). Adaptive governance also works to promote learning, relationship building, powering sharing and flexibility and increasing resiliency (Cleaver & Whaley, 2018). Collaborative governance has emerged to address social inequality in management, as well as placing goal setting at a higher importance (Conely & Moote, 2003). Collaborative governance differs from adaptative governance since it heavily relies on the effectiveness of stakeholders to communicate and maintain relationships (Ansell & Gash, 2008). It also pushes the idea of mutual gain for all stakeholders, rather than each party gaining an upper hand and only working towards their own goal (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

### 3.2 Analysis

The six interviews were transcribed and then coded. No coding software was used because of the small number of interviews and using software would have added unnecessary work. Data from interviews was analyzed using both inductive and deductive coding systems. Two families of coding trees were used: one was social learning and the other was governance. The social learning coding tree was primarily used for the semi-structured interviews as learning was mainly gathered during these interviews. The learning was analyzed by looking at instrumental and communicative learning (Sims & Sinclair, 2008). Some themes selected before were based on tables and pre-selected learning found in studies conducted by Schusler et al. (2003), Bull, Petts, and Evans (2008), Brummel, Nelson, Souter, Jakes, and Williams (2010), and Eguny, Reed, and Sinclair, (2016). The governance coding tree was mainly applied to the document review. Phrasing and terms such as mutual gain, collective benefits, consensus, value Indigenous knowledge, and Indigenous methods (Conley & Moote, 2003: Ansell & Gash, 2008: Bowie, 2013) Other key

themes and new information were coded as seen fit for the semi-structured interviews and document review.

### 3.3 Limitations

There were a couple of limitations due to the nature of this research. Since this is an undergraduate research project, there was limited time for interviews to be conducted. Additionally, there was difficulty contacting and hearing back from ICE interviewees. The results of this study would have benefited from increased participation of the Core Indigenous ICE committee members. This means the results and findings of this study are mostly of non-Indigenous people's views and perspectives.

## 4 Results

The results and learning exhibited by the six Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) will be discussed first by following the flow of the interview guide (Appendix III). Indigenous and non-Indigenous members responses will be separated when discussing certain themes. The themes will be separated further by instrumental and communicative learning (Sims & Sinclair, 2008), but in general these were often mixed and when talking about their experiences these types of learnings were hand in hand. The results of the media review will be discussed in the second half of the chapter focusing on governance and some learning when applicable.

### 4.1 Semi-structured Interviews

#### 4.1.1 Process

ICE's overall experience and way it worked was described as a consensus and truly collaborative governance model. A non-Indigenous member conveyed this when they were explaining the collaborative model that committee members undertook. This person explained how everyone had an equal voice with their views being acknowledged as equally as all others. This also shows the collaborative working model of the experience of ICE was key in making sure all viewpoints were heard and respected. This model also meant that everything was reached by consensus, including recommendations and what to discuss along the way. Eli explained it further recounting a specific meeting in the beginning stage of ICE's work where the committee decided that including implementational guidance was too aspirational within the scope of ICE's work, so it was decided by the entire group that it would no longer be providing this anymore. Other members explained this by stating they personally wished other topics would have been discussed, but as a group the direction was different.

All ICE members in general described the "process" as very well put together and thought out. This was especially clear when Co-Chair Eli Enns described his experience at the international and national level and talking to governments. The creation of ICE was thought out with care and the centering of Indigenous voices at the heart of it all. The non-Indigenous members of ICE point to Eli's commitment to the group and his work long before their arrival as a laying the groundwork for ICE's success and why the process was what it turned into. Additionally, many members of

ICE felt that their participation in ICE was a life-changing experience and transformative. This sentiment was expressed to the Co-Chairs throughout the experience as well.

When ICE members were asked about the process, some were reluctant to even call what they went through a process. One member explained that much of the work was unplanned, so work felt more organic than if everything was to be set in stone. Although the way the ICE committee was set up was very intentional, ICE work was engaged in a very flexible space which helped to make the workflow fit the needs of the committee in the given time frame. All ICE committee members knew that the certain things would evolve over time since the ICE committee was really the first of its kind. The non-Indigenous ICE members view of the process was in terms of flexibility and how much ICE in it of itself was a product of the people who were on the committee. In contrast, Co-Chair Eli and core member Steven Nitah viewed the process as being centered around relationship building and trusting relationships. Eli described this as the fundamental reason behind having the ICE core being entirely made up of only Indigenous peoples. Additionally, the way in which they were brought to ICE contrasted with the non-Indigenous members of ICE. Co-Chairs Eli and Danika Deerchild selected and invited the core members and two were recommended by their National Indigenous Organizations (NIO). Once brought in and being told about ethical space, this core circle was the foundation and the driving force and voices of Indigenous methodology and values within ICE.

Additionally, building trust within the committee and members getting to know each other informally and formally really set the stage for the high commitment and the collaboration throughout the work. The formation of personal relationships within the committee helped make the group more cohesive and ground them during particularly tough conversations. It was clear that for the non-Indigenous ICE members this high level of investment into relationship building was very new for them. One non-Indigenous member even described ICE as becoming a family after the whole experience. Many ICE members even stated how a member's baby was often brought to meetings and gatherings, which really just shows the familiarity and closeness of the whole committee.

Ethical space was identified by all ICE members of how important it was to be grounded in and important for all of ICE's work, including committee meetings, meeting with other

stakeholders and governments and at regional gatherings. Ethical space was identified as a key foundational aspect of the work ICE did which helped to achieve the desired outcomes and facilitated other learning along the way. This grounding in ethical space meant that as a collective, ICE members all had a shared understanding and viewpoint that helped to foster the inclusive space. ICE members described this in meetings, but also during the regional gatherings in which some described the ethical space being even more important to be able to have respectful exchanges of information. Others described the ethical space as a way in which the consensus model of collaboration emerged. One member explained how because ICE was operating in this space, everyone felt like their opinions and views were seen, but never at odds with another person's.

The rest of the learning which ICE members discussed was separated into themes identified by either instrumental or communicative learning (Sims & Sinclair, 2008). These themes will be discussed below with some being intertwined with the larger themes discussed above.



Figure 1 What the ICE learned throughout their experience and work separated by instrumental and communicative learning.

#### 4.1.1.1 Report writing

While only discussed by a couple of members explicitly, this was still important for the overall process since the culmination of ICE's work was their report (Figure 1). This is classified as instrumental learning because report writing is a skill (Sims & Sinclair, 2008). One member reflected on how writing the report and different sections was never challenging because people would step up to research and write sections in the document, they felt most comfortable. In



general, ICE members identified that writing a report with so many people were challenging because they had to coordinate when sections would be finished. One member even identified a key person on the committee who helped lead the report be written and making sure everyone else was on track with their sections.

#### *4.1.1.2 Constructive conflict*

This was not as explicitly stated by ICE members but just as important as part of the learning which occurred during the work together through ICE. This is classified as instrumental learning because working through conflict is a skill (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). Many members did talk about how if there were disagreements, they were handled very respectfully because of the ethical space and the high level of respect people had for each other. One member did explain how conflict was handled in the group. They noted that disagreements were handled “very diplomatically, very respectfully” and handled in a way in which “[the conflict] did not cause further damage”. This person noted that the way conflict was handled is important because there are always disagreements during work like this. As another member noted, since not all ICE members viewed certain topics or issues the same way, members openness and honesty helped to work through these differences and disagreements. Additionally, another member noted that there needed to be some adversity and overcoming disagreements to work together best as a team.

#### *4.1.1.3 Time management*

This was brought up by nearly all ICE members throughout their work because of the short timeline that the ICE committee was allotted. Time management was classified as instrumental learning because it is a skill to be learned (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). Many people felt the time in which they needed to complete their work was very short and that they had to invest a lot more time into the group than anticipated. One member noted that it was so time intensive, they were unable to attend all the work gatherings and some of the regional gatherings. Since the work was so intensive, one member noted that when other ICE members put so much time into ICE work, it really showed their character and how much they brought to this work because of the sacrifices they had to make at certain times. Other committee members talked about time management when talking about the regional gatherings since they at first underestimated the amount of time facilitating and unpacking of the gatherings would take. A few talked about the gatherings and explaining how their work did not end after the prescribed workday was over and

that discussion and work would continue late into the night, sometimes until two or three in the morning. They would then resume work at 7:30 the next morning.

#### *4.1.1.4 Terms of Reference Setting*

This was mentioned by all ICE members as something that helped ICE be successful, while also laying the groundwork for the committee to be what it was (Figure 1). The non-Indigenous members viewed this as two separate things which happened. The first was all the work that Eli had done in setting up the committee at an international and national level in gaining the momentum for ICE to be created. All the non-Indigenous members acknowledged this and the work that Eli had done prior to being invited to be part of ICE as key to how ICE was laid out even before they arrive. This was particularly explained by Paul Dyke who discussed the work and partnerships which Eli had developed with the federal government before ICE was created. This work was when the Four Moose Narrative (ICE, 2018) was created to which some members described. Another member discussed the importance of talking about the Four Moose because although they were outside of ICE's context a bit, they were central for ICE to consider and for all parties involved in IPCAs in the future. They noted the high importance felt by the whole ICE committee, which is why they are talked about early on in the report. The second part of this was when the committee came together, and everyone met. People described the first couple of meetings and getting to know each other, while also deciding how they would work together and what ICE was to be. As demonstrated by the members, this was instrumental learning because members learned how to do something (Figure 1).

A non-Indigenous member also pointed out how important the terms of reference also provided an opportunity for non-Indigenous members to ask questions. It was also made clear that non-Indigenous members would not understand or see certain things in the same ways the core members do. During this time, it was also made clear the importance of lifting up Indigenous peoples and their roles in conservation. This was important for the non-Indigenous members to realize their positionality and differing of value systems. This then makes the learning also communicative since they began to understand values (Sims & Sinclair, 2008).

#### *4.1.1.5 Strong Leadership*

All ICE members identified leadership by various ICE members as something which helped ICE conduct their work. Leadership was classified as instrumental learning because people identified certain members who led or pointed to members as having this skill (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). One ICE member explained how there were different types of leaders throughout the group, which enabled ICE to be effective at different stages throughout its work. For example, they identified Eli as a “visionary” and good at facilitating conversations and situations where disagreements might be high as very important. They also identified Eduardo Sousa as a key leader when it came to the final report. Another ICE member also identified both Co-Chairs as key leaders in setting up the collaborative space of ICE which allowed ICE to flourish. Eli identified Steven Nitah as a leader because at different times throughout the ICE working together, Steven would step up and lead a sub-group or project and would be the acting Co-Chair when Danika would be unable to attend meetings. Eli also mentioned how many ICE members would step up for certain tasks and leading when it was needed.

#### *4.1.1.6 Shared Purpose*

All ICE members felt strongly about being part of the group and working towards a common goal, which helped created a collective shared purpose. This is classified as communicative learning since ICE members had to wrestle with values (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). They felt the importance of their work, which helped created a collective shared purpose. This shared purpose helped ICE members be extremely committed to the work and bring them all closer together. One member, Tom Soehl stated that “this was one where the level of commitment and engagement by all team members it was probably the most committed team I’ve ever been on”. He felt this shared purpose was also driven by the fact that there was a hard deadline, so ICE members dug even further. Other ICE members also identified this sense of shared purpose as a driving force to the group. It enabled the group to bond more quickly and as a result, strengthened and solidified relationships after the groups work was officially done. There was also a sense of shared purpose because different members understood the significance of what they represented for conversation and governance across Canada.

#### *4.1.1.7 Strength in Diverse Knowledge of Members*

Another important theme identified by all ICE members was the idea of what the role of people on the committee were supposed to be. Since all members came from varying backgrounds and affiliations with different organizations, very early on it was decided that no one was there to represent any organizations. When this was decided, ICE members felt their knowledges and viewpoints became more valuable and more well received because they were not representing anyone. This is classified as communicative learning since ICE members learned to value different types of skills and knowledge (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). As the committee continue to work together and get to know each other better, people began to see what type of knowledge and skills everyone brought to the table. Members learned to value people's knowledge and skillsets, as everyone had something different to offer either personally or professionally. As everyone was valued, everyone knew they were even more committed.

#### *4.1.1.8 Importance of Ceremony*

All ICE members conveyed the importance of ceremonial practices and protocols throughout their work. This is classified as communicative learning since ICE members learned to value something new and understand it more by putting it into practice (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). One ICE member said “[the ceremonies] provided almost a sense of sacredness of the work... it wasn't just a job; it was a calling”. This truly highlights the sense of camaraderie and commitment to being fully present and engaged in the important work, while also showcasing the grounding of ceremony and the role it played in all the engagements within and outside of ICE. Additionally, ICE members explained how ceremonies at different points helped to provide a platform for ICE's work. Multiple members acknowledged the importance of handing over the report to the minister at the end of their work. One member explained how at every major step along the way, some type of ceremonial protocol was integrated. They also felt that the ceremony helped created the shared purpose and deep commitment all ICE members felt.

#### *4.1.1.9 Cooperation*

All ICE members identified cooperation and navigating through the space of ICE as a learning process along the way, though not explicitly. This is classified as communicative learning since ICE members learned to value and understand motivations to increase cooperation (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). One member described their thoughts on cooperation as remarkable

because the ICE truly worked as a group and no one was ever at odds with each other. This same sentiment was echoed by many others. One member thought that cooperation was made easier because the members of ICE were not traditionally people who would be opposed to each other in other settings. Another ICE member said that the cooperation was made possible because everyone worked to understand different work styles and trust each other, while also being open, respectful, and curious. As the group continued to gain trust and intimacy, cooperation within the group became easier.

#### *4.1.1.10 Open Communication*

This was a main theme brought up by ICE members which was learned by all members and something that aided their work and made ICE successful. This is classified as communicative learning because ICE members had to work to navigate their space and what openly communicating looks like in within ethical space and trust (Sims & Sinclair, 2008: Figure 1). This open communication was felt by all ICE members in various aspects of their work. One member described the atmosphere of meetings and working together as open and everyone getting to say what they wanted without the fear of judgment or that their views were not valued. One member also noted that since ICE's work and experience was designed to be open, it allowed for proper and meaningful feedback that helped to shape the written report. Additionally, open communication was felt and seen at interactions outside of the committee, where people felt comfortable to be open since ICE members were practicing it as well. Many members also felt that the collaborative and ethical space made open communication possible within ICE and with all other interactions.

#### *4.1.2 Working with other Stakeholders*

When asked about interactions with other stakeholders most ICE members spoke of the regional gatherings with few of the other meetings. The non-Indigenous ICE members mentioned that they knew other meetings were going on because Eli and Danika would attend meetings with federal officials and the minister regularly. ICE members also talked about meetings with the secretariat and other key people who helped with logistical and organizational planning. A couple also talked about the role that Parks Canada played in making sure ICE's work was supported and properly funded throughout their work. ICE members learned about the importance of organizational help that outside groups provided.

#### *4.1.2.1 Regional Gatherings*

When asked about ICE's interactions with other stakeholders throughout their experience, the regional gatherings always came up as being very important. The regional gatherings were key in gathering information about what local and regional Indigenous peoples and governments thought about IPCAs. As one non-Indigenous member put it, "these [gatherings] can be described as two-way learning". This was because the ICE committee would talk about what work they were engaging in, what their mandate was, and what ICE had learned so far. Then the rest of the gathering would be focused on hearing what Indigenous peoples thought about IPCAs and their issues. Non-Indigenous ICE members described the gathering an opportunity to hear from the people which would then shape their report and guide the direction of IPCAs in Canada. As many ICE members described, these gatherings were an opportunity for the committee to hear from people, but in an open and non-judgmental atmosphere. This was important, as some described the meetings as respectful and wanting to hear from people even if they had issues with IPCAs. For example, the Indigenous members of ICE described how the meetings would start out in consensus until one person would raise a dissenting opinion and then more people would follow that dissenting opinion. Additionally, Eli Enns discussed the importance of talking about the story of ICE and the four moose narrative because it showed ICE's commitment to implementing real solutions and recommendations that communities would be able to connect to and not false hope that many Indigenous peoples felt the provincial and federal governments gave them. This further helped participants at the gatherings to feel like their views were represented and being heard.

Three non-Indigenous ICE members specifically described what happened during the regional gatherings as sharing stories, experiences, and giving teachings. One even described these things as "constructive". For many of these people, they had limited experience facilitating and being part of such large gatherings of Indigenous peoples. One committee member also explained how the regional gatherings were an opportunity to learn about Indigenous community led conservation schemes and things that were happening on the ground that were already working. Other members described the gatherings as energetic because of all the information being shared at a fast pace. These were also described as a way for ICE committee members to understand how their visions and thoughts would be seen by communities and how inline they were with

communities. Although ICE had their mandate it was also important that communities felt heard and that ICE's report would mean something to them after it was completed.

#### 4.1.3 The Future of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs)

Throughout the process, ICE members learned new information about IPCAs and through being part of ICE have learned various things about the future of IPCAs in Canada. Depending on the members proximity to protected area (PA) and IPCA work after the ICE report was finished affected members thoughts about IPCAs. Many members who generally worked at a provincial level thought the ICE report had great recommendations for Canada as a whole but had seen very little come together by Indigenous communities and mobilization. All ICE members were hopeful about the future of IPCAs and that governments, especially the federal, and communities were in a good space to come together. Collaboration and mobilization were seen as possible, but all ICE members said big work needs to continue to happen in communities and by federal and provincial governments endorsing ICE's work and IPCAs in general. Many ICE members pointed to Eli and Danika and the other Indigenous core members as having more insights about the future of IPCAs because they are doing the work, either at the federal level or working directly with communities. Specifically, Steven Nitah explained his interactions with the territorial and federal governments as hopeful as the creation of a new IPCA had been in the works throughout his experience with ICE. Steven Nitah felt that communities were stepping up and mobilizing as best they could. Another non-Indigenous ICE member saw IPCAs as the only way forward for conservation in Canada. They explained that since IPCAs are consistent with Indigenous values, laws, and traditions, these are the best systems to deal with land management. The member also saw that much of what makes up an IPCA and the kinds of values upheld, communities are already doing. Another member observed that traditional PA management is not equipped with the best tools and a limited model compared to Indigenous government strategies and methods. This member also was interested in the kinds of collaborations which could happen in the future, highlighting the histories of collaboration across Canada as a basis for the future.

#### 4.1.4 Improvements

When ICE members were asked about improvements to their experience and if they felt ICE was successful, ICE members were very supportive and felt like their work made a big impact.

ICE members conveyed the importance of their work describing it using words like monumental, major shift, life changing, and Eli said “We [ICE] made major and continue to make major shifts in the future of conservation of Canada”. All ICE members, except Eli, felt like the experience could not have been made better with one member noting how unique the circumstances of the politics and work surrounding ICE at the time. A couple of ICE members mentioned that there were some topics that they wished ICE could have discussed or worked on, which meant that other jurisdictions and people will have to discuss. Eli explained some events that had been planned to happen during ICE, but for unknown reasons were cancelled and always at the last minute. These events were always with other governments or the minister, but at the last minute something vague came up and he was left feeling in the dark about the reasons. Many ICE members did identify that they wished there had been a more concrete action or idea of what came after ICE plan. There seemed to be little follow through and less of a concrete way for communities to use it.

#### 4.1.5 Indigenous vs. Non-Indigenous Values

All ICE members felt that there was a balance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous values during the experience. This was expressed through various sentiments and statements by ICE members. One member felt there was never a divide between Indigenous ways of knowing and non-Indigenous knowledge. This person felt the expertise of the group relied on both views and values, making ICE a cohesive team. Another member explained her experience learning information and teaching through storytelling. They said storytelling was an important part of Indigenous culture, so as a non-Indigenous person they felt and understood the power of it. This member viewed these stories as very personal and effective ways of conveying knowledge, noting that as non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples continue to work together this type of knowledge transfer needs to be worked at understand by non-Indigenous peoples.

#### 4.1.6 Reconciliation

Co-Chair Eli Enns was the only ICE member who specifically referenced reconciliation when he discussed his experience with ICE. Eli described his experience at the international and national level and conversations with federal government members and ministers which led to the formation the ICE. Throughout his experience, he mentioned how interactions and asks were in part of him “testing the waters of good faith”. Eli explained how the formation of the ICE was and



setting the terms of reference before was all about making sure him being asked to work on this initiative was not just a meaningless thing. That he did not want to be the token Indigenous person. When talking about how ICE conducted their work, Eli says “the committee in it of itself became an exercise in reconciliation, a combination of the four moose narrative, trusting relationships, the spirit of collaboration across federal, territorial, and provincial (FTP) agencies environments across Canada”. This statement shows the clear connection between reconciliation and IPCAs.

## 4.2 Document Review

Most of the documents found were newspapers with a few published reports from nonprofits. The newspapers were largely of federal news which covered anywhere from Canada’s Pathway to Target 1, the ICE committee, federal funding or partnerships of conversation efforts across Canada, and the creation of new IPCAs. This will be discussed further focusing on the governance aspects found in the media.

### 4.2.1 Collaboration

Different types of collaboration have been present in the media. NGOs and nonprofits continue to showcase their support of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs) (Targeted News Service, 2018a; Targeted News Service, 2018b; Nature United, 2019). Many of the newspaper articles about federal and provincial governments and conservation showcase their commitment to conservation efforts and supporting Indigenous led conservation efforts. Phrasing and words such as collaboration, working closely, supported by, Indigenous reconciliation were used throughout articles to discuss the relationship between Indigenous nations and the federal government (Government of Canada, 2018; Canada NewsWire, 2018; MENA Report, 2018; Government of Canada, 2019). When discussing collaboration, phrases like Indigenous reconciliation, “in the spirit of reconciliation” (Government of Canada, 2018), nation-to-nation, and government-to-government, and partnerships were used frequently (Canada NewsWire, 2018; Government of Canada, 2019). Some of these collaborations have been revived Crown or other non-Indigenous governments to Indigenous government partnerships or in the form of funding (MENA Report, 2019b; Canada NewsWire, 2019). These sentiments show the Federal government’s commitment to true collaboration with Indigenous Nations.

Further, Catherine McKenna, Minister of Environment and Climate Change, has stated that “the Government of Canada is proud to be working closely with First Nations to renew our nation-to-nation and government-to-government relationships based on the recognition of rights, respect, and cooperation” (MENA Report, 2019a) and that “Canada is committed to reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples...” (Canada NewsWire, 2019a). Statements by the government in conjunction with the efforts towards reconciliation also point to the value the government sees Indigenous nations in fighting climate change and prominence in protecting the environment (MENA Report, 2018: Canada NewsWire, 2019a). The Government also recognizes that IPCAs and reconciliation go hand in hand (MENA Report, 2018: Canada NewsWire, 2019a).

#### *4.2.1.1 Indigenous Guardian Programs*

A specific type of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area (IPCA) management program to have recently gained momentum in the news was the Indigenous Guardian Program. In 2017, the Canadian Federal Government committed to support and give \$25 million to the Indigenous Guardians Pilot Program (MENA Report, 2019b: Canada NewsWire, 2019a). On November 13, 2018, Catherine McKenna Minister of Environment and Climate Change announced that 28 Indigenous projects have been selected for early funding as part of the Indigenous Guardians Pilot Program (Canada Newswire, 2018b). These early round projects totaled about \$5.7 million of the total funding (MENA Report, 2019b). By July of 2019, the Canadian Government had invested \$6.4 million into 22 specific First Nations led Indigenous Guardians Pilot Program (MENA Report, 2019a).

One of these programs is through the Indigenous Guardians Pilot Program when the federal government invested \$3 million supporting five Métis Nation led projects (Canada NewsWire, 2019b). These projects are Askîy located in Alberta, the Métis Youth Boreal Forest Stewardship Program, The Métis Lands and Waters Guardians Program in Ontario, the Métis Nation Saskatchewan Indigenous Guardians Program and supporting the Métis Guardians in British Columbia (Canada NewsWire, 2019b). The Federal Government also announced the funding of \$4.7 million towards six Inuit led Guardian Programs in June of 2019 (Canada NewsWire, 2019a). These programs are the Munaqsi Community-Based Monitoring, Nunavik Guardians, Hebron Ambassador and Nain Conservation Officer, Kugluktuk Angoniatic Monitoring and Management, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, and the Ujjiqsuiniq Young Hunters

Programs (Canada NewsWire, 2019a). These programs were identified by representatives from the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) (Canada NewsWire, 2019a).

#### *4.2.1.2 Edézhíe Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area*

The Edézhíe Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area (IPCA) is about 14,258 km<sup>2</sup> was the first to be created under the Budget 2018 Nature Legacy (Government of Canada, 2018: Government of Canada, 2019). It was announced by the Dehcho First Nations (FN) Assembly in October of 2018 in collaboration with the Government at a ceremony headed by Minister of Environment and Climate Change Catherine McKenna and Grand Chief Gladys Norwegian (Government of Canada, 2018: MENA Report, 2018, October 12). The management structure will follow a consensus model headed by the Edézhíe management board comprised of representatives from Dehcho FN and ECCC (Government of Canada, 2018). This IPCA, located in the Northwest Territories (NWT), protects water, conserves biodiversity and wildlife habit, while also preserving the relationship the Dehcho Dene have with their lands (MENA Report, 2018). This area is spiritually, ecologically, and culturally important and contains diverse habitats (Government of Canada, 2018). A key part of this IPCA is the growth of their Indigenous Guardians program where more peoples and youth will be trained to be better stewards of their lands (Government of Canada, 2018).

This IPCA received high media attention because it was the first announced after the ICE Report came out in March of 2018 (ICE, 2018: Government of Canada, 2018). Most of the same information about the Edehzhie IPCA was repeated by various news outlets. At the time of the announcement, Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) also announced they were working with the Nation to establish it as a national wildlife area by 2020 since it would complement and add additional protection to the planned management strategy and ensure the land would be receiving proper support (Government of Canada, 2018). As this area is classified as an IPCA, it has gone towards Canada's commitment towards the Aichi Targets (Government of Canada, 2018). The Government identified this area as key in fighting in towards climate change and Indigenous reconciliation (Canada Newswire, 2018: Government of Canada, 2019).

#### 4.2.1.3 *Ts'udé Niljné Tuyeta Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area*

In November of 2019, this new 10,060 km<sup>2</sup> sized IPCA was announced by the K'asho Got'ine Chief Daniel Masuzumi (Peacock, 2019: Environment and Natural Resources (ENR), 2020). Located west of Fort Good Hope, bordered by the Gwich'in Settlement Area to the west and the Mackenzie River to the east in the Northwest Territories (NWT) (Peacock, 2019: ENR, 2020). This IPCA is in collaboration with the K'asho Got'ine, Yamoga Land Corporation, the Métis Nation Local #54 Land Corporation, For Good Hope Dene Band, and NWT government (Peacock, 2019: ENR, 2020). This IPCA received \$6.2 million in funding from the Canadian Nature Fund (Peacock, 2019: ENR, 2020). The K'asho Got'ine and NWT will jointly manage this IPA through a management board and plan (Peacock, 2019). This area has long since been identified as ecologically and significantly important by governments and NGOs for decades (Peacock, 2019: ENR, 2020). Through this new IPA, Indigenous and treaty rights will be recognized and respected (Peacock, 2019).

#### 4.2.1.4 *Thaidene Nëné Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area*

On August 21<sup>st</sup> 2019, the Łutsël K'é Dene First Nation (FN) in collaboration with Parks Canada and Northwest Territories Government signed an agreement to protect Thaidene Nëné (Nature United, 2019). It is an area which spans 6.5 million acres covering boreal forest and tundra (Łutsël K'é Dene First Nation, 2020). This area will be co-governed by the Łutsël K'é Dene FN and federal and provincial government (Nature United, 2019: Łutsël K'é Dene First Nation, 2020). Within this area, traditional practices and economic activity will continue while also advancing the Indigenous Guardian project, Ni Hat'Ni Dene Rangers (Nature United, 2019). This IPA is being funded by Nature United by raising \$15 million and being matched by the Government and may receive supplemental funding by Parks Canada if needed (Łutsël K'é Dene First Nation, 2020).

#### 4.2.1.5 *Qat'muk Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area*

Announced in January of 2020 was the plan for Qat'muk to be an IPCA (Page, 2020). This IPCA is located in the territory of the Ktunaza Nation in the Purcell Mountains of British Columbia (BC), covering an area of 700 km<sup>2</sup> including Jumbo Valley (Page, 2020). This announcement by the Ktunaxa Nation Council (KNC) came in conjunction with the cancellation the Jumbo Glacier Ski Resort would not be built, ending 30 years of conflict (Ktunaxa Nation, 2020b). This IPCA

will be in collaboration with the KNC, the Canadian Federal Government, the BC Provincial Government, and the Nature Conservancy of Canada (Ktunaxa Nation, 2020b). The Canada Nature Fund is providing \$16.1 million and the Wyss Foundation, Wilburforce Foundation, Patagonia, the Columbia Basin Trust, Donner Canadian Foundation are providing \$5 million from (Ktunaxa Nation, 2020b).

#### 4.2.2 Support of the 2018 ICE Report

After ICE (2018) published their report, it has received much attention from national Indigenous organizations, conservation nonprofits and governments across Canada. For example, the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) commended the report in a statement regarding the work of ICE (Ahnationtalk, 2018). AFN National Chief Perry Bellegarde said ICE's (2018) report would provide a way forward for Indigenous peoples and governments across Canada to work together and in ways to respect and benefit Indigenous peoples (Ahnationtalk, 2018). The Chief urged the Government of Canada to work properly with Indigenous peoples and implement the recommendations in the report. Greenpeace Canada also issued a statement in support of ICE's (2018) report (Targeted New Service, 2018a). Executive Director Joanna Kerr said the report places conservation with the people who should be making the decisions and serving, Indigenous governments (Targeted New Service, 2018a). The executive director also noted the report was a big paradigm shift for Canada in how protected areas (PAs) and parks are normally managed (Targeted New Service, 2018a). Water Canada also wrote a short piece in support of ICE's (2018) report, noting the shift in values of an IPCA (Westcott, 2018). The David Suzuki Foundation also issued a statement in support of ICE's (2018) report (David Suzuki Foundation, 2018). The Foundation said they welcomed the recommendations because they support more holistic approaches to conservation based on rights and interests (David Suzuki Foundation, 2018). The Foundation noted that the recommendations are important, but Canada has a lot work to do in supporting Indigenous peoples (David Suzuki Foundation, 2018). The concept of IPCAs was also supported by other conservation organizations, such as Water Canada (Westcott, 2018). Water Canada highlights the importance of IPCAs in conserving the landscapes and watersheds for Indigenous Nations, while also being an important shift in conservation practices (Westcott, 2018).

### 4.3 Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, it has been clear the shift in conservation after ICE's (2018) *We Rise Together* was published. Governments across Canada have been called up to implement the recommendations by ICE (2018) and work with Indigenous Nations, advancing conservation and reconciliation. While many of the observations and analysis are important, the results of learning by ICE in this study are mainly of non-Indigenous members. This does not take away the importance of this research, just in understanding what voices are being portrayed. ICE's (2018) learning throughout their work and collaborative process will pave a new way forward in conservation.

## 5 Discussion

This chapter will focus on the importance of ICE's learning process and what this means for future collaborative governance schemes in Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs). Collective learning, reconciliation, and the paradigm shift of non-Indigenous peoples and governments will be discussed in greater deal. Additionally, new relationships of different organizations will be discussed in advancing collaboration and reconciliation efforts of conservation.

### 5.1 Collective Learning

The learning exhibited by the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) clearly shows how all members learned communicative and instrumental skills in some capacity. When ICE members were asked about whether ICE's experience and way work carried out was effectively all members saw the process as transformative and done well. This is in contrast to studies which found that social learning does not happen just because of collaboration (Schusler et al., 2003; Bull et al., 2008; Brummel et al., 2010). The study conducted by Brummel et al. (2010) looked at three cases of policy mandated wildfire management collaboration and if learning happened. Their study found that learning was not present throughout each of their three cases (Brummel et al., 2010). In one of the case studies they found certain elements of collaboration, the agency-dominated planning group and short planning process, limited potential for social learning (Brummel et al., 2010). This meant that participants were more likely to maintain their organizations values and practices (Brummel et al., 2010). This contrasted with ICE because of the terms of reference setting in the beginning when it was decided that ICE members were experts and not representatives of their Indigenous or non-Indigenous governments. The fact that learning did happen because of no organizational pull shows how an understated element carries importance for a true collaborative experience that ICE members fostered.

There is also much evidence that the learning exhibited by ICE members was done so collectively, in addition to individually. This collective learning means the collaborative process was more effective than anticipated (Muro & Jeffrey, 2008). While ICE members learned new individual value shifts and new skills (Sims & Sinclair, 2008), rather largely seen was a huge shift in the collective resulting in a shift that is then presented in their report. Since the process was

collaborative, it allowed this collective shift described by Meinzen-Dick, Digregorio, and Mccarthy (2004) that takes place in resource management. In their paper, Meinzen-Dick, Digregorio, and Mccarthy (2004) looked at methods of measuring collective action in the literature. They found the idea that social or collective action is often described as action taken by people who share an interest and take common action because of the shared interest (Meinzen-Dick et al., 2004). This idea of collective action is seen in ICE's work and helped ICE members to be more effective.

Similar to studies conducted by Brummel et al. (2010) and Eguny et al. (2016), at the outset ICE's learning was influenced by external mandates but over time it was the internal decisions that influence the learning. The terms of reference setting set the stage for learning throughout ICE's experience and allowed for a collective shift which allowed ICEs recommendations to be even more effective. Additionally, Eli Enns work before ICE was brought into being made sure the learning and process would truly be effective. This show of careful governance creation allowed for increased learning and outcomes. This shows how internal dialogues and actions internally may be more effective at facilitating learning in certain environmental governance situations. This is useful for future collaborative processes of IPCAs.

### 5.1.1 New Relationships

My research found the possibility or lack of new relationships and groups to be a possible outcome of ICE's learning. Although new relationships within ICE emerged, this did not necessarily translate to members starting new relationships as a result of their learning as part of ICE. That type of learning would be transformative learning, when instrumental and communicative skills are developed and new frames of reference are realized (Sims & Sinclair, 2008). This is important to bring up because of ICE's concern with continuing their work and the lack of follow through by other organizations. One thing that was noted by ICE members was the lack of institution and people continuing their work and providing more resources to communities. This lack of new action being taken lines up with Schusler et al. (2003) observation in their study that for new action to be taken from the learning, there needs to be other structures or mechanisms in place to facilitate further action.



A couple of members did mention one group as possibly being poised to take the lead, there did not seem to be consensus and what kind of group or who would best be equipped to continue ICE's work. The new group mentioned by ICE members was the Conservation through Reconciliation Project (CRP) who is made up of Indigenous thought leaders, organizations, youth, elders, scholars, conservation agencies and organizations and Indigenous Peoples and Nations (Conservation through Reconciliation Project (CRP), 2020). Members of the CRP also include several core ICE members (CRP, 2020). The CRP launched in May of 2019 to act on the recommendations presented by ICE (2018) in their report (CRP, 2020). While the CRP is not a direct result of learning, it shows the importance of ICE's report and the learning happening outside of ICE members.

## 5.2 Governance

While this study did not focus on evaluating the effectiveness of ICE's collaboration on the broader field and moreover the impact of their report (Mandarano, 2008), there are still some important things to be drawn from their work regarding governance. When ICE members were asked about their perceived effectiveness of how the process went, all responses showed how highly all ICE members felt about the process. As ICE's learning was studied and it is clear things like ethical space, the truly collaborative process, building relationships and trust were vital in ICE's process to facilitate learning.

ICE's collaborative process holds up to literature on collaborative governance. As Ansell and Gash (2008) described collaborative processes as relying on stakeholder's commitment to trust, on-going communication and maintaining of relationship, these were all present in ICE's process. This research found evidence of all of those factors throughout ICE's experience, which helped facilitate learning and leading to effective change. Ansell and Gash also point to collaborative processes needing commitment to the process to mean mutual gains as a collective not individually (Ansell & Gash, 2008). This was seen in ICE's process because everyone was working towards a common goal, even if members individual needs and interests were not met because the group dictated the work to be done. Additionally, for collaboration to be effective there must be continual revisiting of the process and real investments from stakeholders in the process (Ansell & Gash, 2008). This commitment to the experience of ICE and revisiting and

working through the set process as a collective was highly present with all ICE members. This process was also meaningful for Indigenous peoples since there was cross-cultural exchange and appropriate space (Bowie, 2013). This was facilitated by the ethical space and terms of reference which was decided by the entire ICE collective.

Another interest of note was collaboration and interactions with stakeholders outside of ICE. While ICE's process within was truly collaborative, engagements with other stakeholders and groups were also collaborative just as open. These observations of openness and important back and forth dialogue was seen at the regional gatherings. As Sims and Sinclair (2008) observed in their study, learning did facilitate greater interaction outside of their immediate groups and changed how their work was conducted. This was similar to ICE in that facilitation and interactions at regional meetings were dictated by their learning and experience along the way. All these factors made ICE's process truly collaborative. These are also important factors which show when properly engaged, truly collaborative governance is possible in PA government.

### 5.3 Reconciliation

Reconciliation in conservation requires making space for Indigenous knowledge systems, worldviews, laws and so on (Zurba et al., 2019). This can be seen in ICE throughout all of their practices and structures. ICE was Indigenous led with core members all being Indigenous to ensure that the voices of the right people were being properly elevated. For example, ICE was led by centering on practices which value Indigenous methodology and practices, such as story-telling and ceremony. The ethical space was a clear assertion of Indigenous values and weaving Indigenous values throughout driving the notion and practice of reconciliation into practice. Members also observed that Indigenous values and knowledge were seen as equal to the science presented by non-Indigenous folks. This shows clearly how members were practicing reconciliation, whether they knew it or no.

Collaborative governance and reconciliation are similar because they are both a process where people and groups are required to learn and continually adapt effectively reevaluating their values and learning new skills (Zurba, 2014). Additionally, mutual participation and commitment grounded in the past where people are working towards a collective future creates the space for reconciliation as a cycle and dialogue (Zurba, 2014). Since ICE's experience was truly

collaborative, this demonstrates how on some level the collaboration facilitated the reconciliation. As well as ICE was working towards a shared future in creation their report and the recommendations because the creation of ICE was grounded in a shared present where all members were highly committed to the work. As Eli Enns observed and can clearly be seen, the ICE committee was evidence of reconciliation in action.

#### 5.4 Paradigm Shift

Throughout all the media and NGO reports, it is clear that federal, territorial and provincial governments are recognizing the role of Indigenous peoples in managing lands. This paradigm shift once only seen in academia has shifted into governance and media (Targeted News Service, 2018b). While the federal government has provided funding for Indigenous led conservation and entered into new partnerships in various IPCAs across Canada, it is unclear if the government is still filling empty promises or living up to the standards of IPCAs that ICE (2018) laid out in their report. Many Indigenous Nations are still entering into talks with federal and provincial governments. On the one hand, this deliberation will ensure that proper governance and collective management happens, but this could also turn into another failing of the government. There is limited research and coverage on the management talks and strategies, but hopefully this will happen soon. Hopefully this paradigm shift is truly happening within the government.

#### 5.5 Conclusion

ICE's learning and collaborative process show the importance of not only their process, but of their outcomes and practice of reconciliation. What should be noted is that ICE had unique circumstances externally created by broader politics which may have elevated or made possible certain learning outcomes. Additionally, the idea and need for collective learning is especially important as the future of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs) rely on collaborative management where significant learning will be expected to happen.

## 6 Conclusion

As Canada is engaging in reconciliation, ICEs (2018) recommendations pave the way for meaningful recognition in PA management and just Indigenous protected and conserved areas (IPCAs) across Canada (Zurba et al., 2019). Additionally, there is a risk in implementation of IPCAs causing Indigenous peoples more harm because of Canada rushing to meet Target 1 and the Aichi Targets (Zurba et al., 2019). With IPCAs being at the preliminary stage of implementation and few in Canada, research into its implementation and collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders in Canada is vital. ICE's research and work is key to Indigenous implementation of IPCAs in Canada. Moving forward, ICEs (2018) work is vital in ensuring that IPCAs are just and inclusive of Indigenous people's values and practices.

Eli described ICE as a "Combination of what did we decide, how did we decide, serendipity and the story of coming together of lives". Looking back on ICE's experience and the learning which happened, there was personal and collective learning that will benefit conservation and governance of PA and IPCAs. The collaborative methods and creation of ICE facilitated learning, but effectively managed to have ICE be an exercise in reconciliation. This shows how importance collaborative governance and upholding Indigenous rights and values are important in PAs moving forward.

While many of the observations and analysis are important, the results of learning by ICE in this study are mainly of non-Indigenous members. This does not take away the importance of this research, just in understanding what voices are being portrayed. ICE's (2018) learning throughout their work and collaborative process will pave a new way forward in conservation.

While this research provided new information about governance and learning in IPCAs, there still needs to be much more research and encompassing more aspects of IPCAs beyond governance. There needs to be studies looking at the learning taking place within newly formed IPCAs across Canada, studies examining the impacts of ICE's report and more research on reconciliation within governance and PAs and IPCAs across Canada.

## 7 References

- Ahnationtalk. (2019, April 9). Assembly of First Nations Supports Indigenous-Led Conservation in Canada, Report by Indigenous Circle of Experts Points the Way Forward. NationTalk. Retrieved from <http://nationtalk.ca/story/assembly-of-first-nations-supports-Indigenous-led-conservation-in-canada-report-by-Indigenous-circle-of-experts-points-the-way-forward>
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory* (Vol. 1). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-hall.
- Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking Community-Based Conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18(3), 621-630.
- Biodivcanada. (2016). 2020 Biodiversity Goals and Targets for Canada. Retrieved from [https://biodivcanada.chm-cbd.net/2020-biodiversity-goals-and-targets-canada#target\\_1](https://biodivcanada.chm-cbd.net/2020-biodiversity-goals-and-targets-canada#target_1).
- Blackburn, C. (2005). Searching for guarantees in the midst of uncertainty: Negotiating Aboriginal rights and title in British Columbia. *American Anthropologist*, 107(4), 586-596.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27-40. Bowie, R. (2013). Indigenous Self-Governance and the Deployment of Knowledge in Collaborative Environmental Management in Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 47(1), 91-121, 256.
- Brummel, R., Nelson, K., Souter, S., Jakes, P., & Williams, D. (2010). Social learning in a policy-mandated collaboration: Community wildfire protection planning in the eastern United States. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 53(6), 681-699.
- Bull, R., Petts, J. and Evans, J. 2008. Social learning from public engagement: dreaming the impossible?. *Journal of environmental planning and management*, 51(5): 701–716.

- Canada NewsWire. (2018a, October 11). Dehcho First Nations and Government of Canada announce first of new Indigenous protected areas in Canada: Edézhíe Protected Area.
- Canada NewsWire. (2018b, November 13). Government of Canada supports Indigenous leadership in conservation. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.library.dal.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/2132316147?accountid=10406>
- Canada NewsWire. (2019a, June 21). Government of Canada invests in Inuit leadership through the Indigenous Guardians Pilot Program. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.library.dal.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/2244153867?accountid=10406>
- Canada NewsWire. (2019b, August 8). Government of Canada invests in Métis Nation leadership through the Indigenous Guardians Pilot Program. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/2269529600?accountid=10406>
- Cleaver, F., & Whaley, L. (2018). Understanding process, power, and meaning in adaptive governance: A critical institutional reading. *Ecology and Society*, 23(2), 49.
- Conley, A., & Moote, M. (2003). Evaluating Collaborative Natural Resource Management. *Society & Natural Resources*, 16(5), 371-386.
- Conservation Through Reconciliation (CRP). (2020). About. Retrieved from <https://conservation-reconciliation.ca/about>
- Convention on Biological Diversity. (2017, December 20). Introduction. Retrieved from <https://www.cbd.int/convention/bodies/intro.shtml>.
- Courtois, V., & Nitah, S. (2018, January 23). Indigenous-led conservation offers a path to global leadership and reconciliation. *The Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/contributors/2018/01/23/Indigenous-led-conservation-offers-a-path-to-global-leadership-and-reconciliation.html>

- Coyle, M., & Borrows, J. (2017). *The right relationship : Reimagining the implementation of historical treaties*. Toronto ; Buffalo ; London: University of Toronto Press.
- Cundill, G., & Rodela, R. (2012). A review of assertions about the processes and outcomes of social learning in natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 113, 7-14. David Suzuki Foundation. (2018, March 28).
- Indigenous Circle of Experts' recommendations integral to shared governance of protected lands and waters in Canada. Retrieved from <https://davidsuzuki.org/press/Indigenous-circle-experts-recommendations-integral-shared-governance-protected-lands-waters-canada/>
- Dudley, N., Jonas, H., Nelson, F., Parrish, J., Pyhälä, A., Stolton, S., & Watson, J. (2018). The essential role of other effective area-based conservation measures in achieving big bold conservation targets. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 15, 424-435.
- Dudley, N., Parrish, J., Redford, K., & Stolton, S. (2010). The revised IUCN protected area management categories: The debate and ways forward. *Oryx*, 44(4), 485-490.
- Egunyu, F., Reed, M., & Sinclair, G. (2016). Learning Through New Approaches to Forest Governance: Evidence from Harrop-Procter Community Forest, Canada. *Environmental Management*, 57(4), 784-797.
- Enns, E. (2015). A TRIBAL NATIONAL PARK RISES IN CANADA. *Earth Island Journal*, 30(3), 49.
- Environment and Natural Resources. (2020, March 12). Ts'udé Niliné Tuyeta. Retrieved from <https://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/en/services/conservation-network-planning/tsude-niline-tuyeta>
- Finegan, C. (2018). Reflection, acknowledgement, and justice: A framework for Indigenous-Protected Area Reconciliation. *International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 9(3).
- Goetze, T. (2005). Empowered Co-management: Towards Power-Sharing and Indigenous Rights in Clayoquot Sound, BC. *Anthropologica*, 47(2), 247-265.
- Government of Canada. (2018, October 11). First new Indigenous protected area in Canada: Edézhíe Protected Area. Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment->

climate-change/news/2018/10/first-new-Indigenous-protected-area-in-canada-edehzhie-protected-area.html

Government of Canada. (2019, April 25). Protecting nature across Canada. Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/news/2019/04/protecting-nature-across-canada.html>

Hockings, M., Ervin, J., & Vincent, G. (2004). ASSESSING THE MANAGEMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS: THE WORK OF THE WORLD PARKS CONGRESS BEFORE AND AFTER DURBAN. *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy*, 7(1-2), 31-42.

Hoehn, F. (2016). Back to the future - reconciliation and Indigenous sovereignty after Tsilhqot'in. *University of New Brunswick Law Journal*, 67, 109-145.

Indigenous Circles of Experts (ICE). (2018) We Rise Together: Achieving Pathway to Canada Target 1 through the creation of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas in the Spirit of Practice of Reconciliation. The Indigenous Circle of Experts' Report and Recommendations. Retrieved from <https://www.conservation2020canada.ca/resources/>

Indigenous Leadership Initiative. (2019, November 1). Retrieved from <https://www.ilinationhood.ca/>

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (2019, August 19). About. Retrieved from <https://www.iucn.org/about>.

Jonas, H., Barbuto, V., Jonas, H., Kothari, A. & Nelson, F. (2014). New steps of change: Looking beyond protected areas to consider other effective area-based conservation measures. *Parks*, 20(2), 111-127. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.CH.2014.PARKS-20-2.HDJ.en

Kothari, A., Camill, P., & Brown, J. (2013). Conservation as if People Also Mattered: Policy and Practice of Community-based Conservation. *Conservation and Society*, 11(1), 1-15.

Kothari, A. & Neumann, A. (2014). ICCAs and Aichi Targets: The contribution of Indigenous Peoples' and local community conserved territories and areas to the strategic plan for biodiversity 2011-20 (Aichi Targets). 10.13140/2.1.3546.2403.



55

Ktunaxa Nation. (2020a, January 17). Backgrounder: Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area.

Retrieved from [https://ourtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/IPCA\\_Media\\_Backgrounder\\_Jan-2020.pdf](https://ourtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/IPCA_Media_Backgrounder_Jan-2020.pdf)

Ktunaxa Nation. (2020b, January 18). Jumbo Valley to remain wild through permanent retirement of development rights. Clears path for creation of Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area in the Central Purcell Mountains. Retrieved from <https://ourtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/Jumbo-Qatmuk-IPCA-MR-January-20-2020-final.pdf>

Lemieux, C., Gray, P., Devillers, R., Wright, P., Dearden, P., Halpenny, E., . . . Beazley, K. (2019). How the race to achieve Aichi Target 11 could jeopardize the effective conservation of biodiversity in Canada and beyond. *Marine Policy*, 99, 312-323.

Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. (2020, March 12). Land of the Ancestors. Retrieved from <http://www.landoftheancestors.ca/>

Mabee, H., & Hoberg, G. (2006). Equal Partners? Assessing Comanagement of Forest Resources in Clayoquot Sound. *Society & Natural Resources*, 19(10), 875-888.

Mackey, E. (2014). Unsettling expectations: (Un)certainly, settler states of feeling, law, and decolonization. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 29(2), 235-252.

Mandarano, L. (2008). Evaluating Collaborative Environmental Planning Outputs and Outcomes: Restoring and Protecting Habitat and the New York—New Jersey Harbor Estuary Program. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 27(4), 456-468.

MENA Report. (2018, October 12). Canada : Dehcho First Nations and Government of Canada announce first of new Indigenous protected areas in Canada: Edehzhie Protected Area.

MENA Report. (2019a, July 18). Canada : Canada invests \$6.4 million to support first nations leadership in conservation. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.library.dal.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/2260250591?accountid=10406>

- MENA Report. (2019b, July 18). Canada, United States : Canada invests in 22 First Nations-led Projects to conserve Environment. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/2260242557?accountid=10406>
- Meinzen-Dick, R., Digregorio, M., & McCarthy, N. (2004). Methods for studying collective action in rural development. *Agricultural Systems*, 82(3), 197-214.
- Moola, F., & Roth, R. (2019). Moving beyond colonial conservation models: Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas offer hope for biodiversity and advancing reconciliation in the Canadian boreal forest<sup>1</sup>. *Environmental Reviews*, 27(2), 200–201. doi: 10.1139/er-2018-0091
- Muro, M., & Jeffrey, P. (2008). A critical review of the theory and application of social learning in participatory natural resource management processes. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 51(3), 325-344.
- Murray, G., & Burrows, D. (2017). Understanding power in Indigenous Protected Areas: The case of the Tla-o-qui-aht Tribal Parks. *Human Ecology*, 45(6), 763-772.
- Murray, G., & King, L. (2012). First Nations values in Protected Area governance: Tla-o-qui-aht Tribal Parks and Pacific Rim National Park Reserve. *Human Ecology*, 40(3), 385-395.
- Nature United. (2019, August 21). Thaidene Nene: Land of the Ancestors. Retrieved from <https://www.natureunited.ca/what-we-do/our-priorities/conserving-at-scale/thaidene-nene---land-of-the-ancestors/>
- Northern Affairs Canada. (2017, August 3). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Retrieved from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1309374407406/1309374458958>.
- Page, D. (2020, January 12). How the Qat'muk Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area will protect Jumbo Valley for good. Ecojustice. Retrieved from <https://www.ecojustice.ca/how-the-qatmuk-Indigenous-protected-and-conserved-area-will-protect-jumbo-valley-for-good/>

- Palys, T. S., & Atchison, C. (2014). *Research decisions: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed method approaches*. Toronto, Ont.: Nelson Education.
- Peacock, E. (2019, November 27). Fort Good Hope celebration makes Sahtu protected area a reality. Cabin Radio. Retrieved from <https://cabinradio.ca/26074/news/environment/fort-good-hope-celebration-makes-sahtu-protected-area-a-reality/>
- Poelzer, G., & Coates, K. (2015). *From treaty peoples to treaty nation : A road map for all Canadians*. Vancouver ; Toronto: UBC Press.
- Schusler, T., Decker, D., & Pfeffer, M. (2003). Social Learning for Collaborative Natural Resource Management. *Society & Natural Resources*, 16(4), 309-326.
- Siddiki, S., Kim, J., & Leach, W. (2017). Diversity, Trust, and Social Learning in Collaborative Governance. *Public Administration Review*, 77(6), 863-874.
- Sims, L., & Sinclair, A. (2008). Learning Through Participatory Resource Management Programs: Case Studies From Costa Rica. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 58(2), 151-168.
- Stronghill, J., Rutherford, M., & Haider, W. (2015). Conservancies in Coastal British Columbia: A New Approach to Protected Areas in the Traditional Territories of First Nations. *Conservation and Society*, 13(1), 39-50.
- Targeted New Service. (2018a, March 29). Greenpeace canada issues statement on Indigenous circle of experts report. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.library.dal.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/2031896703?accountid=10406>
- Targeted News Service. (2018b, December 5). Federal Government Launches Part of Canada's Nature Fund: Resourcing Is Welcome, Strong Indigenous Participation Is a Must.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Retrieved from [http://trc.ca/assets/pdf/Calls\\_to\\_Action\\_English2.pdf](http://trc.ca/assets/pdf/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf)

- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- United Nations (UN). (2007, September 13). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Retrieved from [https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS\\_en.pdf](https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf)
- Westcott, T. (2018, April 9). Indigenous Circle of Experts Report on Indigenous-led Conservation. Retrieved from <https://www.watercanada.net/Indigenous-circle-of-experts-report-on-Indigenous-led-conservation/>
- Woodley, S., Bertzky, B., & Crawhall, N. (2012) Meeting Aichi Target 11: What does success look like for Protected Area systems? *Parks*, 18(1), 23-36. doi: 10.2305/IUCN.CH.2012.
- Zurba, M., Ross, H., Izurieta, A., Rist, P., Bock, E., & Berkes, F. (2012). Building Co-Management as a Process: Problem Solving Through Partnerships in Aboriginal Country, Australia. *Environmental Management*, 49(6), 1130-1142.
- Zurba, M. (2014). Leveling the Playing Field: Fostering Collaborative Governance Towards On-Going Reconciliation. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 24(2), 134-146.
- Zurba, M., Beazley, K., English, E., & Buchmann-Duck, J. (2019). Indigenous protected and conserved areas (IPCAs), Aichi Target 11 and Canada's pathway to target 1: Focusing conservation on reconciliation. *Land*, 8(1), 10. doi: 10.3390/land8010010.

## 8 Appendices

### 8.1 I Ethics Approval

REB Ethics Approval Letter

January 09, 2020

Sophie Boardman  
College of Sustainability\College of Sustainability

Dear Sophie,

**REB #:** 2019-5021  
**Project Title:** Exploring the Governance Outcomes of Social Learning Through the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) work with Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPACs)

**Effective Date:** January 09, 2020  
**Expiry Date:** January 09, 2021

The Social Sciences & Humanities Research Ethics Board has reviewed your application for research involving humans and found the proposed research to be in accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement on *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. This approval will be in effect for 12 months as indicated above. This approval is subject to the conditions listed below which constitute your on-going responsibilities with respect to the ethical conduct of this research.

Sincerely,



Dr. Karen Foster, Chair

FUNDED  
SSHRC  
895-2019-1019

---

#### Post REB Approval: On-going Responsibilities of Researchers

After receiving ethical approval for the conduct of research involving humans, there are several ongoing responsibilities that researchers must meet to remain in compliance with University and Tri-Council policies.

##### 1. Additional Research Ethics approval

Prior to conducting any research, researchers must ensure that all required research ethics approvals are secured (in addition to this one). This includes, but is not limited to, securing appropriate research ethics approvals from: other institutions with whom the PI is affiliated; the research institutions of research team members; the institution at which participants may be recruited or from which data may be collected; organizations or groups (e.g. school boards, Aboriginal communities, correctional services, long-term care facilities, service agencies and community groups) and from any other responsible review body or bodies at the research site

## 2. Reporting adverse events

Any significant adverse events experienced by research participants must be reported **in writing** to Research Ethics **within 24 hours** of their occurrence. Examples of what might be considered “significant” include: an emotional breakdown of a participant during an interview, a negative physical reaction by a participant (e.g. fainting, nausea, unexpected pain, allergic reaction), report by a participant of some sort of negative repercussion from their participation (e.g. reaction of spouse or employer) or complaint by a participant with respect to their participation. The above list is indicative but not all-inclusive. The written report must include details of the adverse event and actions taken by the researcher in response to the incident.

## 3. Seeking approval for protocol / consent form changes

Prior to implementing any changes to your research plan, whether to the protocol or consent form, researchers must submit a description of the proposed changes to the Research Ethics Board for review and approval. This is done by completing an Amendment Request (available on the website). Please note that no reviews are conducted in August.

## 4. Submitting annual reports

Ethics approvals are valid for up to 12 months. Prior to the end of the project’s approval deadline, the researcher must complete an Annual Report (available on the website) and return it to Research Ethics for review and approval before the approval end date in order to prevent a lapse of ethics approval for the research. Researchers should note that no research involving humans may be conducted in the absence of a valid ethical approval and that allowing REB approval to lapse is a violation of University policy, inconsistent with the TCPS (article 6.14) and may result in suspension of research and research funding, as required by the funding agency.

## 5. Submitting final reports

When the researcher is confident that no further data collection or participant contact will be required, a Final Report (available on the website) must be submitted to Research Ethics. After review and approval of the Final Report, the Research Ethics file will be closed.

## 6. Retaining records in a secure manner

Researchers must ensure that both during and after the research project, data is securely retained and/or disposed of in such a manner as to comply with confidentiality provisions specified in the protocol and consent forms. This may involve destruction of the data, or continued arrangements for secure storage. Casual storage of old data is not acceptable.

It is the Principal Investigator’s responsibility to keep a copy of the REB approval letters. This can be important to demonstrate that research was undertaken with Board approval, which can be a requirement to publish.

Please note that the University will securely store your REB project file for 5 years after the study closure date at which point the file records may be permanently destroyed.

#### 7. Current contact information and university affiliation

The Principal Investigator must inform the Research Ethics office of any changes to contact information for the PI (and supervisor, if appropriate), especially the electronic mail address, for the duration of the REB approval. The PI must inform Research Ethics if there is a termination or interruption of his or her affiliation with Dalhousie University.

#### 8. Legal Counsel

The Principal Investigator agrees to comply with all legislative and regulatory requirements that apply to the project. The Principal Investigator agrees to notify the University Legal Counsel office in the event that he or she receives a notice of non-compliance, complaint or other proceeding relating to such requirements.

#### 9. Supervision of students

Faculty must ensure that students conducting research under their supervision are aware of their responsibilities as described above, and have adequate support to conduct their research in a safe and ethical manner.

## 8.2 II Consent Form

**Project title:** Exploring the governance outcomes of social learning through the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) work with Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs)

**Lead researcher:** Sophie J. Boardman, Environmental Science and Environmental, Sustainability and Society (ESS) Honors Student in the College of Sustainability at Dalhousie University, [Sophie.boardman@dal.ca](mailto:Sophie.boardman@dal.ca), 902-410-0665

### **Supervisor**

Melanie Zurba, Assistant Professor - School for Resource and Environmental Studies (SRES) and the College of Sustainability, (902)494-2966

### **Introduction**

We invite you to take part in a research study being conducted by Sophie Boardman, who is an honours student in the College of Sustainability at Dalhousie University. Choosing whether or not to take part in this research is entirely your choice. There will be no impact on your employment if you decide not to participate in the research. The information below tells you about what is involved in the research, what you will be asked to do and about any benefit, risk, inconvenience or discomfort that you might experience.

You should discuss any questions you have about this study with Sophie Boardman. Please ask as many questions as you like. If you have questions later, please contact Sophie Boardman.

### **Purpose and Outline of the Research Study**

This research aims to understand and evaluate ICEs learning process and collaboration within the organization and how it influenced policy recommendations towards the creation of IPCAs, as described in ICEs report “We Rise Together”. Knowledge from this study will aim to aid in the future processes supporting the creation of IPCAs in Canada.

### **Who Can Take Part in the Research Study**

You are eligible to partake in the study if you are a member of the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE).

### **What You Will Be Asked to Do**

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to take part in a one-time interview. The interview may happen via phone, skype or in person if possible.

### **Possible Benefits, Risks and Discomforts**

While this research will not benefit you personally, it will benefit you indirectly because of the new knowledge gained about learning through collaboration and how collaboration might affect the future of IPCAs in Canada. This study will directly help ICE members because it will be able to give you a deeper look into the past work you have done. This study hopes also to benefit future research by providing clear paths for future work.

The risks associated with this study are minimal. There could be risk associated with opinions of individual ICE members which could affect their relationship within and outside of ICE. This will be mitigated through confidentiality and anonymizing participants.

### **Compensation / Reimbursement**

There will be no compensation for your participation in the research.



**How your information will be protected:**

The participation of ICE, as a group, in this research will be known, however individual participation and identification will not be public unless you choose to be identified. The information that you provide to us will be kept confidential. Only the lead researcher will have access to this information. During the study, all electronic records will be kept secure on a password protected USB in a secure location.

**Reports**

The lead researcher will describe and share findings in an honours thesis, a presentation, a journal article and on the Conservation for Reconciliation Project (CRP) website. Only report group results will be reported, unless you consent to being personally identified beyond being a member of ICE. This means that you will not be personally identified in any way in reports and presentations unless you explicitly give consent.

**Data retention**

You will have access to your data until August, 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022 when it will be destroyed.

**If You Decide to Stop Participating**

You are free to leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating during the study, you can decide whether you want any of the information that you have provided up to that point to be removed or if you will allow us to use that information. When you have access to your transcript or audio file, you may review it and choose to withdraw any information you do not want to be included in the study. After participating in the study, you can decide until March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020 if you want us to remove your data. After that time, it will become impossible for us to remove it because it will already be published in the thesis, which will be publicly available.

**How to Obtain Results**

A final report for the completion of a thesis and degree will be produced at the end of the study, as well as a published journal article and available on the CRP website. All participants will be sent the final report and will be notified of publications and other media.

**Questions**

We are happy to talk with you about any questions or concerns you may have about your participation in this research study. Please contact Sophie Boardman at 902-410-0665 or [Sophie.boardman@dal.ca](mailto:Sophie.boardman@dal.ca) or contact my supervisor Melanie Zurba at 902 494-2966 or [melanie.zurba@dal.ca](mailto:melanie.zurba@dal.ca), at any time with questions, comments, or concerns about the research study (if you are calling long distance, please call collect).

If you have any ethical concerns about your participation in this research, you may also contact Research Ethics, Dalhousie University at (902) 494-3423, or email: [ethics@dal.ca](mailto:ethics@dal.ca) (and reference REB file # 2019-5021).

### Consent Script

The following was read to the participant \_\_\_\_\_.  
Name

The title of the project is Exploring the governance outcomes of social learning through the Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) work with Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs).

My name is Sophie J. Boardman and I am the lead research. I am an Honors Student in the College of Sustainability at Dalhousie University. You can contact me by email at [Sophie.boardman@dal.ca](mailto:Sophie.boardman@dal.ca) or by phone at 902-410-0665.

My supervisor is Melanie Zurba. She is an Assistant Professor at the School for Resource and Environmental Studies (SRES) and the College of Sustainability. She can be reached by phone at (902)494-2966 or by email at [melanie.zurba@dal.ca](mailto:melanie.zurba@dal.ca).

Please state yes or no to the following questions.

Have you read the explanation about this study? Yes No

Have you been given the opportunity to discuss the study and your questions have been answered to your satisfaction? Yes No

Do you understand that participation is only a one-time interview that will occur at a location acceptable yourself? Yes No

Do you agree to take part in this study? Yes No

Do you realize that participation is voluntary and that you are free to withdraw from the study at any time, until March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020 after this interview is completed? Yes No

The following options will be read to you. You can still participate in the research if you say no to each option.

I agree that my interview may be audio-recorded Yes No

I agree to be self-identified and direct quotes from my interview may be used Yes No

I do not agree to be self-identified, but quotes from my interview may be used Yes No

Would you like to be sent a summary of the study results or the final publication after completion? Yes No.

(IF YES), what is your email address?

Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

### 8.3 III Semi-structured Interview Guide

1. What was your role in the work of the Indigenous Circle of Experts and the development of the “We Rise Together” report?
2. How did you and the other members of ICE work collaboratively and decide on how to conduct your work?
3. Did the chosen process change over time?
4. What are your thoughts of how the process went?
5. What did you learn about collaboration through being a part of ICE?
6. Is there anything that you learned about the future of IPCAs through being a member of ICE?
7. How were these things learned? Were there particular processes that facilitated the learning?
8. Do you think there could be any improvements made to the processes?
9. Can you describe the interactions of ICE members along the way to developing the “We Rise Together” report?
10. Can you describe the interactions with other parties?
11. Did ICE achieve what the members set out to do?
  - a. If yes, what do you think was important for realizing these achievements?
  - b. If not, how did ICE outcomes fall short and/or what was missing that you perceive is important?