



CANADA-ABORIGINAL PEOPLES ROUNDTABLE

SECTORAL FOLLOW-UP SESSIONS

FINAL ROLL-UP REPORT





Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	Page 2
1) Introduction.....	Page 3
2) Thematic Areas and Common Discussion Threads	Page 9
First Nations Breakout Groups	Page 9
Inuit Breakout Groups	Page 12
Métis Breakout Groups.....	Page 19
3) Conclusion	Page 22



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On behalf of the Facilitation Team this report is dedicated with respect, admiration and thanks to the Elders who provided their insights, guidance and prayers at the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Sectoral Follow-up Sessions.

Acknowledgement and recognition are also extended to the members of the overall Planning Committee and the planning subcommittees who worked on the individual Sectoral Follow-up Sessions.

Finally, particular gratitude and thanks go to the individual participants for their willingness to share their knowledge and experience, and to engage in the important, if sometimes difficult, task of exploring new and innovative approaches within the relationship between Canada and Aboriginal peoples.



1. INTRODUCTION

On April 19, 2004, the Prime Minister, members of the Cabinet, parliamentarians and Aboriginal leaders met in Ottawa for the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable on Strengthening the Relationship. The objective was to engage in a renewed dialogue that would contribute to transformative change and improve the lives of Aboriginal people in Canada.

Four commitments emerged from the Roundtable:

1. to publish a report on the event
2. to hold follow-up sessions, each focusing on a specific sector
3. to hold a policy retreat attended by members of the Cabinet Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and by national Aboriginal leaders, and
4. to develop an Aboriginal Report Card to track progress

In fulfilment of the second commitment, from November 2004 to January 2005, the Government of Canada convened seven facilitated sessions on the following topics:

- health
- lifelong learning (two sessions)
 - early childhood development and kindergarten to Grade 12
 - post-secondary education and skills training
- housing
- economic opportunities
- negotiations
- accountability for results

This Final Roll-up Report provides an overview of themes and crosscutting ideas noted by facilitators in the different follow-up sessions. Along with the facilitators' reports from the follow-up sessions and the background papers prepared earlier, the report will serve as a reference tool supporting efforts by Aboriginal organizations, governments and stakeholders to enhance policy and programs on Aboriginal issues in Canada.

Members of the facilitation team involved in the follow-up sessions have prepared this report using a template provided by the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Planning Committee¹, integrating its suggestions and drawing on the facilitators' reports for the follow-up sessions.

This Report is not a summary of ideas and recommendations from the follow-up sessions and should be read in conjunction with the individual session reports. It does not present a consensus achieved by the follow-up sessions, nor a consensus of the Planning Committee. In fact, some Planning Committee members have issued their own summary reports, and these should be consulted to fully understand the perspective of these organizations.

1 A description of the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Planning Committee and its membership can be found on page 4.



Planning the follow-up sessions

Following distribution of the *Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Report: Strengthening the Relationship* released on May 20, 2004, the Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat (AAS) within the Government of Canada's Privy Council Office (PCO) established a Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Planning Committee to organize the follow-up sessions. The committee included representatives from:

- five national Aboriginal organizations (NAOs): the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), the Métis National Council (MNC), the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (CAP), and the Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC);
- key federal departments and agencies that served as lead departments on specific follow-up sessions or have related responsibilities for Aboriginal peoples; and
- provincial and territorial officials.

For each session, a similarly structured planning subcommittee was formed, chaired by a lead department (Health Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Industry Canada, or Treasury Board Secretariat). The subcommittee was responsible for:

- applying overall session planning guidelines;

- identifying policy priority topics, "launch questions" and the session's discussion agenda;
- developing background papers on key issues for participants;
- selecting participants and officials (observers); and
- reviewing the facilitators' report on the session.

Purpose and objectives of the follow-up sessions

The purpose of the follow-up sessions was to identify and explore new and innovative ideas through which the Government of Canada and national Aboriginal organizations could work together to improve outcomes for Aboriginal peoples in the specific sectors under discussion, and to close the quality-of-life gap between Aboriginal peoples and all Canadians. The sessions sought to enhance understanding, and promote development of innovative approaches in priority topic areas (e.g. addressing jurisdiction, improving access, building capacity).

The plans called for each follow-up session to divide into First Nations, Inuit and Métis breakout groups. The breakout groups were required to consider the needs and concerns of Aboriginal women and of Aboriginal peoples living in urban, rural, remote and northern settings; these were designated as "crosscutting lenses."



Participants and officials

The planning subcommittees used a participant identification and selection process developed by the Planning Committee; this ensured a cross-section of leading experts and practitioners, as well as consideration of gender and regional balance within each session. The target was to have approximately 100 participants per session. The five national Aboriginal organizations each selected 10 participants. Generally, half were participants from each organization's leadership and staff, and half were experts who were practitioners or researchers in the sector under discussion. The rest of the participants were selected by the lead department from the combined recommendations of all members of the planning subcommittee. There were approximately 725 participants in the seven follow-up sessions.

The Aboriginal organization members and the government members of the planning subcommittee also designated officials to attend the session. The officials supported the participants and provided their organizations or governments with internal reports on the discussions. The national Aboriginal organizations each had three officials present, the federal government had up to 15 officials chosen from the lead department and other departments, and a total of 15 officials' seats were designated for participating provincial and territorial governments.

Plenary activities

At the opening ceremonies of the sessions, the speakers were Elders representing the First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples, and in some cases the First Nation in whose traditional territory the meeting took place. Some concerns were expressed that the Elders selected did not reflect urban or other Aboriginal constituencies. However, all participants recognized the value of the Elders' contributions in promoting the openness and cooperation necessary for a thorough dialogue on important matters.

For each session, the lead Cabinet Minister for the sector under discussion spoke on the first morning and at a reception for attendees. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians, on behalf of his Cabinet colleagues, called on federal officials to embrace the commitment to a renewed relationship and support the changes necessary to implement a new way of working with Aboriginal peoples. There was also a notable commitment to provide full disclosure and a comprehensive listing of all federal funds directed to Aboriginal programs and initiatives with a view of getting the federal house in order.

Leaders of the five national Aboriginal organizations or designated representatives also spoke at the receptions. They emphasized the sense of optimism generated in the Aboriginal community by the commitments emerging from the April 2004 Roundtable, particularly the commitment to engage in a renewed relationship. They also



reiterated key elements of their background papers, particularly those relating to Canada's relationship with their constituency, and stressed specific recommendations for action on the issues under consideration at the session. On several occasions, the speakers addressed differences that had arisen during the planning and/or conduct of the sessions relating to such matters as the use of identity rather than ancestry statistics, the level of inclusion in the process and discussions, and concern about pan-Aboriginal approaches.

The plenary sessions introduced the background papers that had been prepared in advance by federal departments, by each national Aboriginal organization, and (in some circumstances) by provincial and territorial governments represented on the planning subcommittees. The background papers were intended to support discussions and often responded directly to specific topics on the agenda for each session. In 10 to 12 pages, each paper generally provided an overview of the current environment within a particular sector.

The federal and provincial/territorial background papers reviewed current policies and initiatives in each area. The national Aboriginal organizations' papers reviewed issues and proposed solutions. For example, the Assembly of First Nations consistently stressed the recognition and implementation of First Nations governments as the only path to addressing troubling socio-economic conditions in the long term. The Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami stressed Inuit-specific approaches, implementation of land claim agreements, the signing of the proposed

Canada-Inuit partnership accord, and an arm's-length Inuit Secretariat. The Métis National Council stressed respect for Métis governance structures, institutional and capacity-building initiatives, and frameworks to guide the Canada-Métis relationship. The Native Women's Association of Canada called for the inclusion by all of culturally appropriate, gender-based analysis and responses to the socio-economic conditions of women, particularly violence and gendered racism. The Congress of Aboriginal Peoples emphasized the need for status- and residency-blind approaches, responsiveness to the needs of urban Aboriginal peoples, and inclusion of urban Aboriginal organizations in all processes.

Statistics Canada also prepared background papers for attendees at each follow-up session. These profiled Canada's Status Indian, Non-Status Indian, Métis and Inuit populations. The agency used census data based on identity rather than ancestry to provide statistical descriptions for each population group in terms of gender, age, education, employment and other socio-economic indicators.

Other common plenary activities included an overall introduction to each session and a review of the facilitation process to be followed in breakout sessions. At the close of each session, attendees were given an update on the progress of breakout group discussions and a description of next steps, including the reporting process, the planned Cabinet Committee retreat with Aboriginal leaders, and the First Ministers' Meeting on Aboriginal Issues.



Each session concluded with remarks and prayers from the Elders. The session then adjourned without further comment.

Breakout groups

A fundamental feature of the process was the recognition of the distinct interests of First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples. In each follow-up session, most of the time was allocated to breakout groups that were organized according to these three populations. The breakout groups were designed to be discussion forums on the issues as they affected the three groups, not caucus sessions of the specific national Aboriginal organizations. Participants were divided into roughly equal numbers for the three breakout groups. Organizations with constituents in more than one group (particularly urban Aboriginal organizations) often participated in only one group or focused on the First Nations and Métis breakout groups.

In the seven follow-up sessions, the First Nations breakout groups had a total of 315 participants, not including officials, or an average of 45 per follow-up session. Inuit breakout groups had a total of 201 participants, or an average of 29 per follow-up session. Métis breakout groups had a total of 215 participants, or an average of 31 per follow-up session.

Each breakout group addressed the discussion topics listed on the agenda prepared by the planning subcommittee. Discussion objectives and/or launch questions for each topic were included on the agenda and posted in the breakout

rooms. The questions helped focus discussion on issues that supported achievement of the particular objectives of the session. The priority discussion topics included broad issues such as jurisdiction and control, access and integration, and capacity. The discussion topics also included issues specific to the particular sector such as broad health determinants, research and curriculum development, housing supply, access to capital and investment, and improving the reporting processes.

Each breakout group had two co-facilitators selected from a list recommended by the NAOs during the planning stage. For each discussion, facilitators used various techniques and exercises to maximize participant input and output. Discussion methods were adapted to the specific circumstances of the particular follow-up session, including the agenda, time allotment, number of participants and participant/official composition within the breakout rooms.

Participants were generally asked first to examine the critical issues that they felt needed to be discussed for each agenda topic. Then, working in smaller groups to allow greater participation, they were asked to recommend actions for dealing with or resolving the critical issues. They were also asked to provide insight into how the recommended action could be implemented. Where possible, participants were asked to indicate immediate and long-term time frames for their recommended actions. As mentioned earlier, participants in the breakout groups were also required to



consider the “crosscutting lenses” established by the Planning Committee and described on the agenda for each session. The “crosscutting lenses” encouraged discussion of how the recommended actions under discussion would address the unique challenges facing Aboriginal women (including gender-based analysis and discriminatory barriers to equal access), Non-Status Indians, and Aboriginal peoples living in urban, rural, remote and northern communities. During the follow-up sessions, the participants added several more “crosscutting lenses”: Aboriginal persons living with a disability, Aboriginal youth, “two-spirited” (i.e. gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgendered Aboriginal) people, and Elders.

The environment was originally expected to be a “crosscutting lens” in all the sessions. A number of independent conferences and sessions have been and will be held on the environment. Further details are posted on the Web sites of the national Aboriginal organizations.

Individual Facilitators’ Sectoral Follow-up Session Reports

The results from each session are contained in the seven facilitators’ reports. These reports are based on flip chart notes prepared by the participants and facilitators during the individual sessions, and on a template approved by the Planning Committee. The facilitators made every effort to inform breakout group participants that issues, options and/or recommendations must be recorded on the flip charts to be included in the session report. There were

over 600 transcribed pages of flip chart notes produced during the sectoral sessions, making it impractical for the reports to reflect every idea placed on the charts.

Breakout group discussions also built on the content of background papers prepared for individual sectoral sessions. In certain cases, recommendations included in the background papers were not expanded on during the breakout group or restated on the flip charts. It is therefore important that the individual facilitators’ reports and this Roll-up Report be read together with the background papers and flip chart notes. (The background papers and flip chart notes are only available on-line.)

E-Links

Web-based electronic access to reports and materials has been a consistent feature of the follow-up session process. Before each sectoral session, participants could obtain background papers and other session materials in print form or through the Aboriginal-Canada Portal for many of the sectoral sessions. All reports and materials relating to the sectoral sessions are now available in French, English and Inuktitut through a dedicated Web site (<http://www.aboriginalroundtable.ca>).

Materials available include:

- agendas
- background papers provided by:
 - national Aboriginal organizations
 - lead federal departments



- provincial and territorial governments
- Facilitators' Sectoral Follow-up Session Reports
- Final Roll-up Report
- transcribed flip chart notes
- lists of participants and officials (including Elders)
- Statistics Canada overviews of Aboriginal populations

2. THEMATIC AREAS AND COMMON DISCUSSION THREADS

This section is an overview of similar themes, ideas and options put forward within the First Nations, Inuit and Métis breakout groups in the seven follow-up sessions. It is not an alternative to the individual follow-up session reports or a summary of them.

The following thematic areas were identified in the agenda-setting process at both the Planning Committee and planning subcommittee levels, and within the breakout groups:

- jurisdiction, control and governance
- improving access
- building capacity
- accountability/measuring progress
- application of the “crosscutting lenses”

Within each thematic area, common discussion threads emerged, with differences reflecting the different emphasis given by breakout groups to the issues, ideas and

recommendations raised. In general, the themes and threads in discussion indicate the need for increased recognition, authority and involvement of Aboriginal peoples within each of the respective thematic areas.

FIRST NATIONS BREAKOUT GROUPS

The participants of the First Nations breakout groups at all seven follow-up sessions produced a combined total of over 220 pages of transcribed flip chart notes. The facilitators' follow-up reports dedicated a combined total of 60 pages to the First Nations breakout groups.

Jurisdiction, control and governance

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights; (b) legislative and policy review; and (c) implementation of First Nations governments.

a) Recognition of Aboriginal and treaty rights

For a renewed relationship to be established, Aboriginal and treaty rights should be recognized and affirmed by federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments, and the federal government should accept its fiduciary responsibility. Government-to-government relationships should be acknowledged and implemented as partnerships between equals.

b) Legislative and policy review

Legislative and policy frameworks should be developed with First Nations taking the



lead and/or through collaborative processes in which First Nations and all levels of government examine transformative change. Legislative and policy frameworks should be based on First Nations cultural values and tied to community capacities, geographic considerations, and the needs and aspirations of the populations being served.

c) Implementation of First Nations governments

First Nations governance structures should be respected and acknowledged by all governments, and supported through the establishment of mandated institutions with corresponding authority at the local, regional or national level as appropriate. Governance models need to be inclusive of First Nations citizens regardless of geographic location or residence.

Building capacity

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) human resource development; (b) systems and capacity development; and (c) effective, culturally appropriate education systems.

a) Human resource development

In all sectors there is a need for more First Nations professionals, as well as accredited and/or skilled human resources to support the healthy functioning of First Nations communities. Also needed is access to employment, skills and accreditation training, both on and off reserve. Training and skills development efforts should be located closer to First Nations communities;

this would support professional development for members of the labour force. Capacity development of First Nations women needs to be considered, this may include providing access to childcare, and ensuring women are represented within the development of protocols, negotiations and governance bodies.

b) Systems and capacity development

First Nations need support to develop and maintain governance structures that meet community expectations and desired outcomes. First Nations cultural viewpoints should be integrated to set the framework for appropriate regulations and standards. Equally important for systems development would be ownership, control, access and possession for research and data collection.

In all sectors, First Nations need more institutions designed to meet the needs of communities at the local, tribal, regional and national level. These institutions should have financing to support their capacity, staffing and skills development in order to enable the delivery of programs and services.

c) Effective, culturally appropriate education systems

To achieve sustainable First Nations education systems, First Nations jurisdiction and control should be recognized; institutions should be developed; funding should be provided to meet real educational needs both on and off reserve; and support should be given to the development and integration of culture and language



curriculum, including a role for Elders.

Improving access

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) sustainable and increased funding arrangements; and (b) program and service coordination.

a) Sustainable and increased funding arrangements

Long-term, multi-year formulas should apply to government funding to First Nations. Financial arrangements should be similar to the government-to-government arrangements that the federal government has with provinces and territories. Current federal funding policies and formulas should be adjusted to reflect the real costs of delivering programs and services, provide flexibility in meeting diverse community interests and priorities, and streamline funding access by reducing the need for multiple proposals and reports.

b) Program and service coordination

An equitable partnership role for First Nations will support federal-provincial/territorial collaborations and give First Nations access to a wider range of programs and services. Partnership or collaborative approaches with other governments, agencies and organizations could more effectively support communities with smaller populations, isolated and remote communities, urban populations, and First Nations women.

Accountability/measuring progress

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) establishing a new accountability framework; and (b) policy review/machinery of government.

a) Establishing a new accountability framework

For an appropriate accountability framework to be established, First Nations should be included as equal partners, the federal government should acknowledge and fulfill its fiduciary responsibilities, and efforts should be made to clarify jurisdictional matters (including section 35 of the *Constitution Act 1982*). “Progress reports” should be preferred over “report cards,” and a shift should be made to a community accountability paradigm.

b) Policy review/machinery of government

A new accountability and reporting framework is needed. First Nations should participate fully in the review and adjustment of policies guiding Treasury Board’s Results-based Accountability Framework and the machinery of government initiatives if they are to be appropriate to First Nations communities, institutions and legal entities.

Application of the “crosscutting lenses”

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) rural, remote and northern communities; (b) First Nations people living in urban centres; (c) First Nations women;



and (d) First Nations persons with disabilities.

a) Rural, remote and northern communities

Policy development, program design and reporting guidelines should reflect the capacities of small communities in rural, remote and northern locations. They should include clear and separate definitions for rural, remote and northern communities. They should support increased connectivity for those communities.

b) First Nations people living in urban centres

First Nations people living in urban centres have “portable rights” and need acknowledgement, access and accountability. Governments should recognize the need to adjust First Nations funding formulas to meet urban population demands.

c) First Nations women

In all First Nations governments, programs and services, it should become standard policy to include gender-based analysis on all issues. Women need to be provided with a stronger voice in decision making and should be consulted on issues affecting them and their children. Matrimonial and real property rights need to be resolved, and there should be more programming on violence prevention. Full and equal representation of women in the decision making process—both political and non-political processes from the local to national

level—would help to improve the overall socio-economic status of women.

d) First Nations persons with disabilities

First Nations people with disabilities need a stronger voice and role in the establishment of programs and services across all sectors. Policy and program design and implementation should accommodate the physical environments as well as the health and educational needs of people living with a disability so that they can participate fully within their communities.

INUIT BREAKOUT GROUPS

The participants of the Inuit breakout groups at all seven follow-up sessions produced a combined total of over 190 pages of transcribed flip chart notes. The facilitators’ follow-up reports dedicated a combined total of 52 pages to the Inuit breakout groups.

Jurisdiction, control and governance

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) renewing the relationship; (b) implementation of land claim agreements; (c) negotiations; (d) establishing authorities; (e) institutional development/infrastructure support; and (f) Inuit-specific policies, programs and services.

a) Renewing the relationship

The relationship with the federal government should be expanded beyond the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. There needs to be a direct relationship between the Inuit and the Prime Minister



and/or Cabinet. There should also be a direct reporting relationship with other departments, such as Treasury Board and Privy Council Office.

A clear, Inuit-specific approach is needed in the federal government, including integration across departments and with provincial/territorial governments. Federal policies and programs need to be developed specifically for Inuit. Federal departments, other levels of government and Inuit need to collaborate in a consistent manner on Inuit issues, and support is needed across sectors ranging from health to education and housing; this would support Inuit programming and service implementation. Further integration would address cross-jurisdictional barriers in legislation and licensing inconsistencies, including interpretation and/or land claims implementation issues. Other benefits would be more communication and collaborative discussions among relevant stakeholders on issues affecting Inuit. Each federal/provincial/territorial government would be required to fulfill the responsibilities within its jurisdiction.

The proposed Partnership Accord and other protocol agreements should be established. Also essential is recognition by governments of Inuit representation at specific tables, such as the Council of the Federation and the Social Union Framework Agreement. Consideration should be given to establishing a separate federal Department of Inuit Affairs having sole responsibility for Inuit. A direct working relationship is needed with the two provinces and two territories having significant Inuit

populations, as well as with the federal government. Support should be provided for Inuit-to-Inuit relationships.

Policies, programs and approaches are needed that are not limited to north of latitude 60° and that deal with the Arctic (or more specifically, the Inuit homeland) as a single region including Nunavik (northern Quebec), Nunatsiavut (Labrador) and Nunakput (western Arctic), as well as Nunavut.

b) Implementation of land claim agreements

Federal, provincial and territorial reluctance to acknowledge that land claim agreements have not been fully implemented is a significant barrier to advancing Inuit jurisdiction, control and governance. Land claim negotiations and agreements are successful templates with crosscutting objectives in such areas as health, education, protection and enhancement of culture/language, and justice. All of Canada will benefit from the settlement of these claims. A new negotiating policy should be adopted, including a new land claims implementation policy. Implementation plans should include objectives, long-term strategies and clear commitments to renewed long-term funding. The plans should be flexible to allow for the changing circumstances of the Inuit.



c) Negotiations

Parties have a moral duty to negotiate in good faith. To be useful, however, the concept of “good faith” must be defined. An opportunity to do so is the spring 2005 Cabinet Retreat to be attended by the Prime Minister, members of the Cabinet and Aboriginal leaders. Since the Government of Canada’s new approach to certainty does not require the extinguishment of Aboriginal rights, clauses concerning extinguishment should be abolished and removed from existing treaties. The relationship needs to be based on respect for and continuation of Inuit rights.

d) Establishing authorities

The Government of Canada has a fiduciary relationship with Inuit and should devolve authorities to them. Devolution would support Inuit-specific policy making, the design of Inuit programs and services, and the incorporation of traditional Inuit culture and values; at the same time, it would ensure that accountability frameworks in all sectors include non-traditional measures.

To be effective, new Inuit institutional development must have the appropriate authorities. An example would be Inuit control of educational curriculum, allowing for enhanced Inuktitut-language programming in schools. Another example would be Inuit control over licences and permits affecting local and regional Inuit communities.

An independent body should monitor, review or regulate the federal government’s accountability to Inuit. An ombudsperson office should be established, as well as an oversight body to screen curriculum and research, and a tribunal to settle disputes about land claims agreements.

e) Institutional development/infrastructure support

A wide range of institutions need to be established, including:

- an Inuit Secretariat
- an Inuit Health Directorate
- a National Inuit Research Centre/Institute
- a National Inuit College Board
- a federal government department supporting Inuit-specific issues in housing, education, environment and health
- an Inuit Economic Development Secretariat

Consideration should be given to the establishment of an Inuit Cultural Centre and community-based centres offering “one-stop shopping” for information on education and training. The newly formed Inuit Secretariat has a supporting role in health, housing, education, economic development, negotiations and accountability.

These institutions should have corresponding authorities and mandates to be effective. Infrastructure development and capacity are also critically needed. More buildings are needed to house existing and additional services and provide for program delivery in all sectors.



f) Inuit-specific policies, programs and services

A wide range of policies, programs and/or services are needed in the Arctic to support actions recommended in the follow-up sessions. Together with the Inuit, the federal government should issue a policy statement distinguishing between the terms “Inuit” and “Aboriginal” (often understood as referring to First Nations or Indians). Policies need to take into account the unique way of life in the Arctic, including geography, the cost of living and of doing business, and institutional capacity issues.

Access to programs and services is a critical issue. In Inuit communities, the federal government should establish “single-window” offices allowing contact with experts from various departments in areas such as passports, economic development assistance and fisheries. Housing programs need program guideline adjustments to respond to the specific needs of Inuit as opposed to First Nations “on and off reserve”; the high cost of renovations, the supply of materials and retrofitting grants. Programs such as Telehealth need more resources to be effective in remote communities and to improve diagnostic services.

An Arctic University would support post-secondary education in the Arctic. A wide range of educational programming is required—for example, for hiring of qualified counsellors, educational assessment tools, and transitional support from high school to post-secondary programming. More access is needed to

successful program models, such as Aboriginal Head Start. Inuit educational institutions should be able to offer satellite learning. Improving access to post-secondary education should include direct attention to family support services (e.g. access to a toll-free line), flexible program delivery (modular delivery, distance learning), program design and funding (Inuit-specific curriculum and long-term funding commitments), services to support motivation and awareness (guest speakers in schools, national database), infrastructure development (daycare and family housing), and transition programming (study and work skills programs). Wellness courses should be offered in schools, with community and family involvement. Programs should be set up for children with special needs.

Also needed are labour market research; database development in areas such as health indicators, skills and academic levels; and needs assessments for special needs students. A mobile trades training unit would support apprenticeship and skills training. Other useful initiatives would be entrepreneurship development, loans to advance business development, and a housing entrepreneurship assistance program for home ownership. Overall, programs and services must be available to Inuit communities locally and regionally, and they must be Inuit-designed and culturally appropriate.

Capacity building

For the Inuit, capacity-building issues have to do with: human resource development; Inuit culture, language and traditions;



education; policies, programs and services; and institutional and infrastructure development. Systemic changes are needed to meet Inuit needs and address wellness issues in general. Also needed are regional addiction centres, leadership accountability, speaking out against family violence, healing programs and adequate housing.

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) human resource development; and (b) education, including culture and language.

a) Human resource development

Capacity development must create greater opportunities for Inuit through skills development programming. Efforts are needed to increase the number of Inuit in educational programs leading to professional careers.

Inuit youth need to have a strong educational foundation on a par with that of other Canadians. Of concern are high school dropout levels, as well as the lack of job and career information and support for students from kindergarten to Grade 12. More skills development is needed for Inuit in the housing sector, with an emphasis on trades certification. To support Inuit staff in policy development and administration, more skills are needed in administration, management and research in all sectors. When considering career paths, Inuit youth should have wider educational and training choices in areas such as the trades and the administrative and management professions. Inuit youth also require life skills training to foster successful transitions into the

workforce. More governance training would support capacity development for local and regional boards and institutions. Multi-year funding will make skills development available on an ongoing basis to Inuit in the Arctic and in the South.

b) Education, including culture and language

Inuit want the authority to design and implement Inuktitut-language curriculum for their local and regional schools. Provincial and territorial support is needed for educational accreditation and transfer of Inuit students. More qualified Inuit teachers are needed in the social, housing, economic development and environment sectors; appropriate cultural teaching should be incorporated into the education system. Consideration should be given to creative and innovative options, including informal learning models and oral testing methods. Literacy programming should include early childhood development with a focus on the role of parents. Best practices in education include the Nunavut Sivuniqsavut Program, as well as role model programs supporting healing among parents and the role of Elders.

Ensuring Inuktitut-language proficiency for all people living in the Arctic and Inuit living elsewhere is imperative. Funding to meet this goal must be secured. Inuktitut and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (traditional knowledge) should be taught at all levels of the school curriculum, and should be mandatory for Arctic students from kindergarten to the post-secondary level. However, making Inuktitut compulsory in



all curriculums should not place a greater physical or mental burden on students/teachers. In addition, care must be taken not to discriminate against Inuit who happen not to be fully bilingual. With all the existing societal pressures, it is vital to avoid any new pressures that might raise the already high suicide rate in the Arctic. Programs should adopt a holistic approach to language development, particularly involving the entire family; this would be in line with traditional Inuit approaches to learning. Inuktitut should be declared an official language of the Arctic.

There is a need to develop more Inuit-specific, culturally based approaches to policy, program and service delivery. More education and sensitivity training on Inuit traditions and values is also needed. This would support cultural development for Inuit and persons working with them (e.g. government representatives and others who come to work in the Arctic). Ongoing education that targets Inuit youth and those working with Inuit will assist in building capacity and understanding of Inuit history and culture. The knowledge can then be incorporated into areas such as health and educational curriculum.

Improving access

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) policies creating access; and (b) funding allocations.

a) Policies creating access

Problems exist with programs and funding policies that do not take geographic location

or cost into account. The federal, provincial and territorial governments do not coordinate their efforts and differ in their policy approaches, creating barriers to access and integration. An Inuit-specific approach could help overcome these barriers. Inuit want full involvement and partnership with all governments to review current policies, with the aim of increasing access and integration in all Inuit-specific programs and services. Roles need to be clarified. For example, legislative and licensing approaches should be consistent, reducing barriers for health professionals, (e.g. registered nurses, Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder strategy).

b) Funding allocations

Lack of funding is a significant barrier to implementing successful strategies. Budget allocations should be increased to correspond to the real needs of Inuit, while taking into account the cost of living and doing business in the Arctic. Stable multi-year funding agreements are essential, with flexible guidelines for access. Funding must be expanded for programs and services, including costs of health transportation, translation services, and improvements to educational programming and supports. Funding must also cover: operations and management; capital and infrastructure development and maintenance; and investment, venture capital and economic start-ups. Core funding in the regions must be comparable to that directed to First Nations and there must be core funding available for the national Inuit organization.



Many programs target only First Nations and/or Inuit living in Inuit communities. Inuit living outside the Arctic must also be able to access programs. Funds for Inuit in urban areas must be allocated separately from funds for First Nations or Métis, and must be administered directly through Inuit organizations, rather than through First Nations organizations.

Accountability

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) shared accountability; and (b) report card concepts.

a) Shared accountability

The Prime Minister's initiative on transformative change, the creation of Inuit-specific policies, and the issue of accountability are all very important to the future of Inuit. Accountability requires the government to live up to its obligations and promises. Accountability structures are needed to measure actions against past commitments. The Government of Canada should take some risks and implement bold initiatives incorporating new approaches to accountability.

To gain community support and acceptance, accountability should be approached from the community perspective rather than the government perspective. Accountability has to embrace Inuit culture and identity to ensure that initiatives are implemented and obligations are met while providing hope. The approach should be on a sliding scale, based on track record and multi-year funding. A two-way reporting system (Inuit

to government, and government to Inuit) would allow progress to be assessed annually and adjustments to be made.

b) Report card concepts

In general, an Aboriginal Report Card would be a welcome development provided that goals, indicators and outcomes are established. The Report Card should be designed in collaboration with Inuit, should incorporate Inuit values and principles, and should involve all departments, including Treasury Board. It would be essential to have an oversight body, such as the Office of the Auditor General or Treasury Board. The aim would be to give the Prime Minister a practical tool for measuring progress on Inuit issues and providing information on that progress.

Application of the "crosscutting lenses"

Common discussion threads identified included: (a) Urban Inuit (Inuit living outside of their own land claim regions); (b) Inuit women; and c) Inuit with disabilities.

a) Urban Inuit

A concern for Inuit is inclusion and support for urban Inuit. For urban Inuit and Inuit women, there should be set-aside funding programs to support health services (both planning and delivery) and housing. Inuit need more access to single-parent units, as well as second-stage housing and shelters.



b) Inuit women

With regard to entrepreneurship, there should be more emphasis on lending programs helping Inuit women to establish businesses. The Pauktuutit Inuit Women's Association should have the same political standing as the Native Women's Association of Canada. Increased funding for urban Inuit should not reduce funds to the Arctic.

c) Inuit with disabilities

In policy and program development, attention must be given to the specific circumstances of all Inuit, including persons with disabilities and urban Inuit.

MÉTIS BREAKOUT GROUPS

The participants of the Métis breakout groups at all seven follow-up sessions produced a combined total of over 160 pages of transcribed flip chart notes. The facilitators' follow-up reports dedicated a combined total of 50 pages to the Métis breakout groups.

Jurisdiction, control and governance

Common discussion threads identified include: (a) defining relationships; (b) establishing authorities; and c) institutional development.

a) Defining relationships

A common theme in the Métis sessions was the need for the Government of Canada to formally acknowledge the Métis as one of the constitutionally recognized Aboriginal

peoples. Métis governments should be recognized with full jurisdiction and control on all matters affecting the Métis. To further define the relationship, the participants spoke about negotiating legal instruments and implementing framework agreements along the lines of the proposed *Canada-Métis Nation Framework Agreement*. Métis want to be a full partner at federal, provincial and territorial negotiation tables and seek to engage in intergovernmental relationships with the federal government, provinces and territories which recognize and respect Métis jurisdiction.

b) Establishing authorities

A consistent theme was that Métis authorities be acknowledged as self-government entities that should have full access to programs such as the self-government processes, such as the comprehensive claims process, within the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, to meet their unique self-government aspirations. Métis stressed they needed expanded jurisdiction in sectors such as housing, health and education.

c) Institutional development

The development and enhancement of institutions designed by Métis for Métis people are essential. Participants acknowledged the importance of support for institutional development flowing through Métis governments. Centres should be established that are mandated to undertake specific Métis research; also needed are a Métis registry and a Métis claims commission.



Building capacity

The common discussion threads identified include: (a) human resource development; (b) strategic planning; and (c) research and development:

a) Human resource development

To increase the numbers of Métis professionals in various careers, a comprehensive education plan is needed leading to increased human resource development efforts. More resources are needed to expand opportunities for Métis in education, employment and training programs. The implementation of the Aboriginal Human Resource Development Strategy for Métis was cited as a best practice model that should be enhanced and built on by other federal departments.

b) Strategic planning

Governments also need to provide capacity that supports Métis strategic planning within all sectors and to invest in long-term sustainable outcomes for the Métis and their communities. More efforts should be made to gain input from Métis community members, using engagement strategies.

c) Research and development

Participants spoke about the need to establish a Métis specific statistical and research agenda that would provide an improved understanding on the unique needs of the Métis. Further, Métis emphasized the need to enhance knowledge on Métis culture for curriculum development and specific

programming, through their own governing institutions. Institutions such as the Gabriel Dumont Institute were cited as successful models and should be provided with greater capacity. At the same time, new institutions are needed to undertake comprehensive research and development for Métis communities.

Improving access

Common discussion threads identified include: (a) access to programs and services; and (b) funding access.

a) Access to programs and services

Participants emphasized the need for a “Métis specific” approach to programs and services rather than the pan-Aboriginal approach is necessary. Aboriginal representatives (who were speaking for non-status Aboriginal people and/or Métis from the east coast) spoke about the need for “status-blind” access points without reverting to a pan-Aboriginal approach in programming and services. Métis highlighted some specific areas where there are real needs for improved access such as economic development, child care, health and justice initiatives. Overall, Métis and Aboriginal participation in policy development and program control through both Métis and Aboriginal governments and authorities is seen as key to the long-term success, stability as well as innovation and efficiency of policies and programs.



b) Funding access

In general it was suggested that the federal, provincial and territorial governments must increase funding levels and allocate funding specifically to Métis governing organizations and structures. Negotiated increased funding levels and multi-year agreements are also seen as factors that will contribute to self-sufficiency.

Accountability/measuring results

Common discussion threads identified include: (a) input to the accountability framework; and (b) report card concepts.

a) Input to the accountability framework

The need to revamp the federal government's approach to accountability, in order to include more consultation and input from the Métis perspective was put forward by participants. Métis values and principles should be reflected in accountability frameworks. Also, more efforts are needed in all sectors to educate and build capacity within Métis communities on the formulation of accountability processes (e.g. appropriate indicators and measurements, reporting requirements, etc.) that meet Métis priorities. Further, participants suggested that accountability frameworks should not omit input and consultations with urban Aboriginal groups, and specific women's organizations, to capture their views and priorities.

b) Report card concepts

For the federal "report card," Métis leaders should provide input and be consulted. The report card could measure or grade aspects of the relationship and partnership between the Métis and the federal government. It should also report on quality-of-life indicators, such as access to services, cultural retention and the overall health of Métis communities.

Application of the crosscutting lenses

Common discussion threads identified include: (a) Métis women; and (b) Métis with disabilities.

a) Métis women

Many of the sessions indicated that Métis women must be present and participating at all levels of governance from leadership to policy/program, development to implementation. Specifically, within the jurisdiction discussions, that a gender analysis be applied to all governance matters.

b) Métis with disabilities

Overall, participants suggest that priority should be given to including issues that affect Métis with disabilities. To ensure that appropriate policies are considered, persons with disabilities need to be included in strategic planning, program design and development.



3. CONCLUSION

In the seven follow-up sessions to the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable, over 750 participants offered valuable comments on ways to change and improve the lives of Aboriginal people in Canada.

The dialogue at the follow-up sessions did not commit governments or organizations to any particular idea or direction at the policy or political level. As noted earlier, this Roll-up Report does not present a consensus of follow-up session participants or Planning Committee members. The session discussions, the seven facilitators' reports and the Roll-up Report do not formally represent the views of any of the participating organizations.

The reports can, however, serve as reference tools for further discussions by stakeholders at all levels of Aboriginal policy and program development in Canada. In addition, the reports support ongoing planning for the next phase of the Roundtable process, including:

- the spring 2005 Policy Retreat to be attended by members of the Cabinet Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and by national Aboriginal leaders; and
- the fall 2005 First Ministers' Meeting on Aboriginal Issues.

For Aboriginal organizations, governments and stakeholders, the Roll-up Report can help further Aboriginal policy development in each of the sectoral areas.

It is expected that participating governments and Aboriginal organizations will conduct their own analysis of the process leading to the follow-up sessions and the discussions held at these conferences. They may also prepare their own reports (outcome statements).

In addition to background papers and the facilitators' reports directly connected to the follow-up sessions, a significant amount of other material has been developed and initiatives have been undertaken. Examples include the Inuit-specific session on the environment, as well as various forums held by national Aboriginal organizations before and after the follow-up sessions. The material can be accessed through the "What's New" page of the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Web site (<http://www.aboriginalroundtable.ca>).

In the facilitators' report for each follow-up session, the "overall summary" section also briefly presents similar themes examined by the three breakout groups in the session. A template for the development of this Final Roll-up Report was approved by the Planning Committee and did not require that any correlation be made between the three breakout groups. Nevertheless, all three groups in all or most of the sessions emphasized the importance of:

- developing and implementing distinctive approaches specifically for First Nations, Inuit or Métis, rather than pan-Aboriginal approaches;



- providing tangible recognition of each Aboriginal group's treaty and land claims settlement agreement rights and jurisdictions;
- transferring control over processes, policies, programs and funding directly to Aboriginal peoples and to existing and new Aboriginal institutions; and
- encouraging and supporting the ability of all partners (First Nations, Inuit and Métis; federal, provincial and territorial governments; Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations and institutions) to be inclusive of all Aboriginal people regardless of their circumstances, status, gender, or geography. This included discussion of residency- and status-blind delivery approaches in urban Aboriginal settings.

As set out at the April 19 2004, Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable, the intent of the Sectoral Follow-up Sessions and the resulting independent facilitators' reports was to explore new and innovative ideas through which the Government of Canada, national Aboriginal organizations and provincial and territorial governments can work together in order to close the quality-of-life gap between Aboriginal people and all Canadians.

Gratitude and acknowledgement is once again extended to the Elders and every individual who graciously dedicated their time, energy and enthusiasm to the Canada-Aboriginal Peoples Roundtable Sectoral Follow-up Sessions.