

# PROJECT REPORT 2000-19

sustainable  
forest  
management  
network

réseau  
sur la  
gestion durable  
des forêts



## The Effectiveness and Potential of the Caribou – Lower Peace Cooperative Forest Management Board

A Network of Centres of Excellence  
Un réseau de centres d'excellence 

Leslie Treseder and Naomi T. Krogman

For copies of this or other SFM publications contact:

Sustainable Forest Management Network  
G208 Biological Sciences Building  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2E9  
Ph: (780) 492 6659  
Fax: (780) 492 8160  
<http://www.ualberta.ca/sfm/>

ISBN 1-55261-079-9

**The Effectiveness and Potential  
of the  
Caribou-Lower Peace Cooperative  
Forest Management Board**

by

**Leslie Treseder**

Department of Renewable Resources  
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

**Naomi T. Krogman**

Department of Rural Economy  
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

July, 2000

## ABSTRACT

This project examined the process associated with establishing a new forest management institution in northern Alberta, intended as a partnership between First Nations, government and industry to promote sustainable forest management. Social scientific methods, including non-participant observation, document review, and semi-structured interviews, were used to document the process and identify opportunities and challenges associated with its implementation. Input was obtained from all of the parties (First Nations, Government and Industry) involved in the cooperative management process.

The cooperative management process in northern Alberta is a variant of “co-management”, with the potential to achieve a fairly high level of authority transfer from government to resource users. There are a large number of potential benefits associated with the process, including relationship building, economic development, conflict avoidance and a voice for First Nations. The process also represents an important opportunity to involve a wider variety of stakeholders in the management of Alberta’s boreal forest and to address issues related to integrated management of natural resources and the cumulative impacts of different land uses on the boreal forest land base.

The definition of sustainability/sustainable forest management (SFM) is a key challenge associated with the implementation of co-management in northern Alberta, due to the need to include sustainability of First Nation land uses as a major element of SFM. Maintenance of First Nation land uses in the context of industrial forestry will be the ultimate test of the process and of definitions of SFM. Other key challenges associated with the process include maintenance of commitment by the parties and improving First Nation participation.

This study highlights the need for organizational development for co-management institutions and identifies potential structural disadvantages for First Nations involved in such institutions. It also demonstrates links between integrated resource management and SFM and confirms the need for further institutional adjustments to implement integrated and sustainable management of the boreal forest. This project also identifies the importance of representation in co-management and provides support for further consideration of representation issues by researchers and co-management practitioners.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was initiated by the Little Red River Cree Nation and the Tallcree First Nation and we thank them for the invitation to conduct this work in their communities. Funding for this project was provided by the Sustainable Forest Management Network and we acknowledge their generous assistance. The Network also assisted in organizing the field work component of this study and we thank Marc Stevenson for his ongoing support and involvement. This study would not have been possible without the cooperation of the parties involved in cooperative management in northern Alberta, including the First Nations, the Government of Alberta, High Level Forest Products and Footner Forest Products Ltd. Participants from all parties took the time to share their views with us in an open and forthright manner. We thank them for their willingness to contribute to furthering understanding of cooperative management. Additional thanks are due to those participants who also provided moral support and access to background documentation.

The Little Red River Cree Nation provided much organizational assistance related to the field work. We thank Little Red River Cree Nation Chief Johnsen Sewepagaham and consulting staff Jim Webb, Vern Neal and Jim Duke. The late Richard Dumaine was instrumental in providing us with unbureaucratic assistance and is greatly missed. The First Nation “liaison people”, Harvey Sewepagaham and Celestan Nanooch, were critical to the success of the community interviews. Harvey and Celestan reviewed the interview questions, introduced the researchers to potential participants, and attended some interviews. Celestan also served as interpreter when required and co-ordinated travel between communities.

Members of the Cooperative Management Planning Board and the Little Red River Cree Nation reviewed preliminary results from this project and provided feedback for inclusion in this Final Report. Project findings were also presented at the Canadian Indigenous and Native Studies Association Conference (Edmonton, May, 2000) and the International Symposium on Society and Resource Management (Bellingham, WA, June, 2000). We appreciate these opportunities to share our findings and hope they offer a positive contribution to the support of alternative forest management institutions in Alberta.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this project was to examine the process associated with establishing a new sustainable forest management institution, the “Cooperative Management Planning Board” for the Caribou-Lower Peace region of Alberta. The Cooperative Management Planning Board (“the Board”) has been established via a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Little Red River Cree Nation, the Tallcree First Nation and the Government of Alberta. The Board is part of a larger process of policy dialogue between the First Nations and the Provincial Government, concerning renewable resource and environmental matters of mutual interest (AEP 1996; Little Red River Cree Nation 2000). The Board is made up of 14 eligible voting representatives. The First Nations and their Economic Development Corporations are entitled to seven seats. The remaining seats on the Board are currently allocated to Alberta (3), the Municipal District of Mackenzie (1), forest industries with tenure in the region (2), and the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (1). The Board has authority to involve other parties and to conduct public consultations related to its mandate.

The Board is charged with conducting a “cooperative renewable natural resource management planning process” focused on “use of renewable natural resources in a responsible manner which will support local and regional, resource based economies” (Little Red River Cree Nation et al. 1999). The process is to begin with development of a “Resource Management Philosophy and Goal Statement”, to be approved by the Alberta Minister of Environment. The Board will then have the mandate to provide advice and recommendations to the Minister on processes, administrative relationships, and amendments to regulations, policies or laws required to implement the process. The planning process applies to a “Special Management Area” (SMA) that includes Forest Management Units (FMUs) F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7 and parts of FMUs F10 and A9 (see Figure 1).

This project was initiated by the Little Red River Cree Nation and the Tallcree First Nation, who were interested in an independent assessment of whether this process was an appropriate vehicle to enable them to influence the management of natural resources within the areas they consider as their traditional territories. Examination of the Board also provided unique opportunities to observe the process of establishing a new forest management institution, document the initial stages of co-management in Alberta, and compare this process to other co-management arrangements in Canada and elsewhere.

The original proposal for this study was submitted to the Sustainable Forest Management Network in April, 1998, with the intention of evaluating an existing institution. Evaluation criteria were to be based on structural and process variables affecting the Board’s operation, and its capacity to address its overall priorities. Approval to proceed was received from the Network in July, 1998, by which time a previous agreement establishing the Board had expired. The First Nations and Government were conducting negotiations on a new agreement, and re-establishment of the Board was expected forthwith.

MAP AVAILABLE IN HARD COPY ONLY

**Figure 1. The Special Management Area; jurisdiction of the Board**

The field work associated with this project, originally scheduled for the summer of 1998, was delayed for one year to allow the completion of negotiations and resumption of Board activity. By April, 1999, however, negotiations related to re-establishment of the Board remained ongoing. Due to the sensitive nature of the negotiations, some of the parties involved in the process indicated a reluctance to participate in the study.

In response to these developments, the study focus shifted from evaluation of an existing structure to assessment of past and future processes. More emphasis was placed on identifying opportunities for the process to succeed and challenges for the parties involved. Potential participants appeared more comfortable discussing previous problems and future solutions than an ongoing process. Thus, what initially appeared as an obstacle to the conduct of this study may actually have served to increase participation by the individuals involved in the cooperative management process in northern Alberta.

This project has the potential to contribute to sustainable management of the boreal forest by providing partners in the Sustainable Forest Management Network with the following types of information:

- Issues involved in establishing and supporting new forest management institutions in Alberta, from the perspectives of different parties involved in the process.
- Issues involved in defining the concept of sustainable forest management in Alberta, and applying the concept under current conditions.
- Means of addressing Aboriginal issues in sustainable forest management and empowering Aboriginal participants within forest management institutions.

## **2.0 METHODS**

A number of standard social scientific methods were used to collect data for this project, including:

- non-participant observation (observation of negotiations and other meetings between the parties to the MOU and the Board);
- review of academic literature and theory;
- review of documentation related to the Board (e.g., previous meeting minutes);
- review of related documentation produced by the parties to the Board (e.g., policy documents, annual reports, planning documents);
- semi-structured interviews with Board members and support staff from the parties on the Board (First Nations, Government of Alberta, Industry).

Interviews were also conducted with community members in four Little Red River Cree Nation and Tallcree First Nation communities. The same methodology was used to interview

both First Nation and non-First Nation participants and it is noted that semi-structured interviews are not considered a standard social science method for research in Aboriginal communities.

“Interview Guides”, consisting of lists of open-ended questions, were developed for the various parties involved in the process (First Nations, Government, Industry). The questions were based on a review of the literature on natural resource co-management, to identify factors influencing success of the process (e.g., Beckley and Korber 1996; Benedickson 1992; Pinkerton 1992; Usher 1993; Witty 1994). Input was also obtained from First Nation leaders, staff and community members. The Interview Guides (see Appendix A) were approved by the Human Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics at the University of Alberta in February, 1999.

The Research Assistant compiled a list of potential study participants based on communication with the parties involved in the process and other sources such previous Board Meeting Minutes. A “Liaison Person” was appointed by the First Nations to assist with this research. The Liaison Person reviewed the list of potential participants and made contact with potential participants in the First Nation communities. The Research Assistant made initial contact with other potential participants by telephone. All prospective participants were offered copies of the Interview Guide for review prior to the interview, along with a Consent Form and Information Sheet (see Appendix B). Once a participant verbally agreed to an interview, a convenient location was chosen. Interviews were conducted in participants’ homes and offices, and in Band Council facilities. Several interviews were conducted out of doors in the boreal forest. All First Nation participants were offered tobacco at the beginning of an interview.

All interviews were conducted face-to-face, except one which was conducted by phone. The Interview Guides were used as the template for conducting interviews. Issues raised by participants were also explored. The Research Assistant was present at all interviews. The Liaison Person was also present at some interviews. All participants signed Consent Forms (see Appendix B) promising confidentiality of interview data and allowing dissemination of the results. Consent included permission to record interviews, which was done with a tape recorder or by taking notes.

Transcripts were made of all interviews and provided the basic data for analysis. Analysis of interview data included looking for similarities and differences among the answers and organizing the interview responses according to themes. All of the interview data were coded according to categories (themes) and sub-themes. A qualitative data analysis program (QSR NUD\*IST, *Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing*) was used to assist in the identification, organization and exploration of themes within the interview data.

Conclusions and advice related to the interview themes were developed with guidance from the academic literature and practical experience. Triangulation of findings was achieved where possible using other sources of information, including observation, review of Board documents and review of documents produced by the parties to the Board. The results and

conclusions of this study were validated via the presentation of findings to the Board and to the First Nations. Draft reports were presented and then distributed in written form to the Board and to the First Nations in June, 2000. Final reports were submitted to the Board, the First Nations and the Sustainable Forest Management Network. A detailed account of the study methodology will be included in the MSc. thesis associated with this project (Treseder in prep.).

### **3.0 FINDINGS**

There are three main types of findings from this project and they are discussed separately below. The context for cooperative management in northern Alberta (section 3.1) is understood with reference to national and international models of co-management and sustainable forest management initiatives involving other First Nations in Canada. Findings related to the operation of the Board are discussed in section 3.2, while issues related to First Nation involvement are covered in section 3.3.

The findings in sections 3.2 and 3.3 are based on sample sizes of 13 for the Board and 10 for the First Nation communities. The separation of interview data into two sub-samples was based on major differences in the issues raised by Board members versus community members. While Board members were concerned with the Board structure, process and related matters, First Nation community members were interested in issues such as conflicts between logging and traditional pursuits, employment for Band members, and sharing of information by Board members. Commonalities between the Board interviews and community interviews are included in section 3.2.

#### **3.1 Context for Cooperative Forest Management in Northern Alberta**

The cooperative natural resource management process in northern Alberta can be considered a variant of “co-management”. Co-management refers to a variety of arrangements for shared management of natural resources (see Berkes 1997) and is a world-wide development in management of natural resources. Co-management is practiced in many different forms, with wide-ranging objectives that may include local involvement, sustainability of alternative forest uses, and/or distribution of costs and benefits of resource development (Benedickson 1992; Borrini-Feyarabend 2000; Notzke 1995; Steins & Edwards 1999).

The co-management process in northern Alberta is a form of “strategic” co-management, described by Notzke (1995) as a way for Aboriginal groups to gain influence over the management of resources and as an expression of a rethinking of rights and relationships by Provincial governments. This process could also be considered an “interim measure”; undertaken pending resolution of larger issues related to the relationship between the Crown and First Nations. It is not uncommon for different parties in co-management to have different objectives for the process (Beckley & Korber 1996) and that is the case here. The parties to the MOU, the First Nations and the Government of Alberta, have different objectives for the process. The First

Nations are seeking influence over natural resource management in their traditional territories, while the Government of Alberta is seeking avenues for consultation and cooperation with First Nations.

A theoretical model of Canadian co-management developed by Berkes (1994) focuses on the degree of authority transfer from government to resource users. The forest co-management process in northern Alberta is currently operating at a fairly low level, but has the potential to reach much higher levels of authority transfer. In the international context, the northern Alberta process is at the mid-point along a spectrum of collaborative management arrangements described by Borrini-Feyerabend (no date). Chambers (1999) suggests that there is too much focus on power sharing as the most critical criterion for evaluation of co-management and this study supports her suggestion. The entire co-management process in northern Alberta is advisory in nature and could receive low marks in an evaluation based on concepts related to power sharing.

Beckley (1998) developed a typology of approaches to forest management in Canada, which included “industrial forestry”, “forest co-management” and “community forests”. Many Canadian First Nations are pursuing industrial forestry and some are involved in forest co-management (Treseder & Krogman 1999). Few, if any, are applying the concept of community forests. The process in northern Alberta is closest to forest co-management, but includes elements of the industrial approach to forest management (see Beckley 1998; Beckley & Korber 1996).

### **3.2 The Co-Management Process in Northern Alberta**

All study participants were supportive of the co-management process and its attempts to involve different parties in management of the forest. Participants identified a large number of potential benefits of the process, including building of relationships, economic development and conflict avoidance. Both Board members and community members said that a “voice for First Nations” was an important benefit. Both groups also identified cultural exchange<sup>1</sup> as a potential benefit. Many First Nation participants saw the Board as an important opportunity for their people to learn how to interact with government and industry in a productive way.

#### ***3.2.1 Opportunities Associated with the Process***

Based on the interview data from this study, it is clear that the co-management process in northern Alberta offers opportunities for collaboration in resource management, economic development in the First Nation communities, and consensus decision-making. The process also represents an important opportunity to solicit input from other regional stakeholders, such as the oil and gas industry and local municipalities, that to date have not participated in forest management decisions. Involvement of other parties is critical to the success of the process and

---

<sup>1</sup> “Cultural exchange” refers to opportunities for the various parties on the Board (First Nations, Government, Industry) to learn about each others’ viewpoints and share ideas.

the achievement of more integrated resource management in the Special Management Area. The interview data suggest that an integrated approach to management of the cumulative effects of multiple activities upon the forest land base is an important objective for First Nation Board members. Government and Industry Board members also support such an approach, but they are more aware of the obstacles to its implementation.

This study found evidence that all parties have demonstrated a commitment to the co-management process, which has been underway for at least six years. Evidence of commitment includes consistent attendance at meetings, awareness of the need for communication, and designation of support staff to assist the Board. Maintaining this commitment will be a challenge for all of the parties involved in future implementation of co-management in northern Alberta.

### ***3.2.2 Challenges to Implementation of the Process***

Although the mandate and responsibility of the Board, as a new institution, is outlined in the MOU establishing the Board, much work remains to be done to clarify its role. A majority of Board members interviewed identified the need for clarification of expectations, definitions, roles and responsibilities as the highest priority for the Board. While the Board members appeared to express a genuine interest in working together, they also identified a need for trust-building among themselves and among the parties on the Board. Non-participant observation conducted as part of this study suggests that the parties do not have a history of working together. Advice provided to the Board by this project (Treseder & Krogman 2000a) therefore included Board development as a high initial priority.

Interview data suggest that the definition of sustainability represents a major challenge associated with implementing co-management in northern Alberta. Carpenter & Kessler (1999) discuss some of the difficulties involved in defining the concept of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and point out that it can be adapted to different ecological, economic, cultural and political conditions. The definition of SFM in northern Alberta will need to incorporate First Nation perspectives, going beyond the statements of policy documents (e.g., AEP 1998; CFS 1998). Most First Nation participants in this study were concerned with the impacts of logging and other industrial activities on First Nation land uses and important forest values. Many suggested that a lower volume of timber harvesting would be necessary in order to ensure sustainability of First Nation land uses within the Special Management Area. Because this viewpoint was not expressed by government and industry participants in the study, this issue was identified as a potential challenge for the Board. It was suggested (Treseder & Krogman 2000a) that the Board undertake a pilot project to investigate methods of reducing the impacts of logging on First Nation forest values, in order to begin addressing this issue.

An unexpected issue that arose during many of the interviews was that of representation. This is an issue that has largely been ignored in the co-management literature. Although some authors (e.g., Benedickson 1992) have pointed out the need for co-management to be judged using externally recognized standards, few (if any) have examined the interests actually represented on co-management boards. Study participants raised some interesting and important

questions about representation on the Board, including representation of non-native interests, interests represented by government Board members, and the need for accountability of representatives. Some of these issues, such as defining the interests represented by government members on co-management Boards, are beyond the scope of this study and the mandate of the Board. These issues need more attention from academics and co-management practitioners. Other representation issues, such as representation of non-native interests on the Board, need to be addressed by the Board as part of its procedures for involvement of other parties (see Treseder & Krogman 2000a).

The parties involved in co-management have already devoted considerable time, human and financial resources to the process. Co-management is known to require huge investments of time and other resources (Beckley & Korber 1996; Borrini-Feyerabend no date) and more resources will be required to implement the process than to negotiate its framework. All parties to the process will need to ensure that they dedicate staff to the process and provide them with the resources required to support the process. The Board is also likely to need the assistance of outside professionals, including facilitators, public involvement specialists, and natural science experts. While the participants in this study agreed on the need for staff support to implement the co-management process, they also reported a shortage of funding to hire extra staff.

### **3.3 First Nation Participation in the Process**

One of the conclusions of this study is that the forest co-management process gives the First Nations a potentially powerful voice in management of natural resources in their traditional territories (Treseder & Krogman 2000b). The structure of the Board, with an equal number of First Nation and non-First Nation members, gives the First Nation Board members a major opportunity to influence the conduct of the Board. The mandate of the Board (see Section 1.0) reflects First Nation perspectives on resource management and provides the Board with the potential to have a real impact on forest management practices within the Special Management Area. However, the First Nations will need to participate more actively in the Board in order to realize more of its potential benefits.

Results from the interviews and non-participant observation indicate that the First Nations have not taken advantage of their opportunity to send a full complement of voting members to the Board. Only a few First Nation Board members have been appointed and most of them are not members of the First Nations. The community members interviewed for this study had little knowledge of the Board or the co-management process. While they were supportive of the First Nation participating in the process, they also reported a shortage of community members with the skills needed to participate. Because the Board operates like any other mainstream institution, the process is viewed as intimidating for First Nation people with no experience in matters such as negotiation and the conduct of mainstream business meetings.

Results from the interviews and literature review suggest that a large number of skills are required in order for individuals to be effective participants on co-management boards. Board

members from different parties also need roughly equivalent skills sets, in order to work together effectively and avoid disadvantaging parties with lower skill levels. In this particular case, desired skills for Board members include technical knowledge of forest management issues, communication skills, an ability to work with others, and an openness to other perspectives and other ways of making decisions. While these skills are necessary for Board members from all of the parties to the Board, they are especially difficult for the First Nations to access. To date, the First Nations have relied heavily on non-native consultants to represent them on the Board.

While non-natives could theoretically serve as effective representatives of First Nation interests, the low rate of participation by First Nation members in the process to date has done little to contribute to community empowerment. Rather, it has perpetuated the status quo with respect to exclusion of First Nation people from resource management decision-making in Alberta. Interviews with community members suggest there is a great deal of interest in the activities of the Board and in representation of the First Nation by First Nation members. Advice from this study to the First Nations, intended to encourage a stronger First Nation presence on the Board (Treseder & Krogman 2000b), included recommendations related to levels of representation, qualifications of First Nation Board members, and consultation with community members. It was also recommended that the First Nation consider a Mentoring Program for Board members, as a way of increasing the number of First Nation members on the Board.

### ***3.3.1 Cultural Sustainability as an Element of Sustainable Forest Management***

All of the First Nation community members interviewed suggested that the Board's highest priority should be to minimize or reduce impacts of logging on First Nation uses of the forest. Participants reported that logging activities had blocked their travel routes, decreased the availability of fur on traplines, and damaged or destroyed medicinal plants. Various areas of forest needing protection were identified, including campsites, spiritual sites, travel routes and traplines. Most participants suggested that the Board needed to look at different ways of logging, in order to reduce impacts on First Nations people. These community priorities will need to be addressed by the Board as it implements the co-management process.

## **4.0 MANAGEMENT APPLICATIONS**

This study has identified some of the issues involved in establishing and supporting new sustainable forest management institutions in Alberta. Participation from all parties involved in the co-management process enabled the identification of broad issues and comparison to issues documented in the literature. This study confirms the importance of trust among the parties in co-management, the need for agreement on definitions and objectives, and the need for substantial commitments of time and resources. The results of this study also suggest that participants in co-management may need to learn how to work together and point out the importance of organizational development for co-management institutions.

This study identified a large number of skills required to implement co-management and a particular disadvantage for First Nations in accessing these skills. Community interviews identified a desire among First Nations to learn the skills required to be effective participants in co-management. These results suggest that all participants in co-management need to be aware of the skills needed to implement co-management and take appropriate steps to ensure that people with these skills are available to the process. Participants in co-management also need an awareness of the potential structural disadvantages for First Nations, and a willingness to assist First Nations to overcome these disadvantages and participate as equal partners in the process.

This study demonstrates clear links between the concepts of integrated resource management (IRM) and sustainable forest management (SFM). The concept of IRM was strongly supported by the First Nation participants in this study. The need for IRM was also supported by government and industry participants, despite major institutional barriers to its implementation under current conditions. Participation in the co-management process is an institutional adaptation for all of the parties to the Board. This study suggests that further institutional adjustments will be necessary among all of the parties to the Board, as the co-management process moves from conception to implementation. Institutional adaptation is both a challenge and an opportunity for all of the parties involved.

This project has identified IRM as a key component in the development of an operational definition of SFM. To be acceptable to the First Nations involved in the process, the definition of SFM for northern Alberta will need to include cultural sustainability of the forest for First Nations people. The challenges of understanding cultural sustainability are numerous and include: cross-cultural communication between Board members; development of protocols for sharing of sensitive information; and coming to agreement on ways of protecting / preserving First Nation forest values. Despite these and other challenges, the inclusion of cultural sustainability as an element of SFM is an important opportunity to incorporate Aboriginal perspectives in a meaningful way, moving beyond the eloquent but sometimes meaningless statements included in policy documents.

In addition to practical applications, this project makes a contribution to the academic literature by highlighting the importance of representation issues in alternative resource management institutions. Issues such as qualifications and accountability of Board members are recognized in the literature, but larger issues of representation need further consideration. Of particular concern is identification of the interests actually represented on co-management institutions, and their relationship to the larger societal context. The results of this study indicate concerns regarding representation of interests among all parties on the Board, and provide strong support for future research in this area.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates the potential for forest co-management in northern Alberta to contribute to SFM by increasing the number of parties involved in management, building relationships among the different parties involved, resolving conflicts between different uses and users of the forest, and moving toward more integrated management of land use activities and their cumulative impacts on the boreal forest landscape. This study also identifies a number of challenges to implementing both co-management and SFM in northern Alberta.

These challenges include sustaining commitment by all parties and overcoming potential structural barriers to equitable involvement by First Nations. Including First Nation cultural sustainability as a key component of SFM is a major challenge with implications for all of the parties involved, for other co-management processes, and for policy makers. The key test of this process for the First Nations will be their ability to maintain their land uses in the context of industrial forestry. Meeting this test will require new definitions of SFM, institutional adjustments by all parties involved and, ultimately, changes to logging practices in the boreal forest.

## 6.0 REFERENCES

- Alberta Environmental Protection (AEP). 1998. The Alberta Forest Legacy – Implementation Framework for Sustainable Forest Management. ([www.gov.ab.ca](http://www.gov.ab.ca)).
- AEP. 1996. Environmental Protection Cooperative Management Framework. Policy document approved November, 1996.
- Beckley, T.M. 1998. Moving toward consensus-based forest management: A comparison of industrial, co-managed, community and small private forests in Canada. *Forestry Chronicle*. 74(5): 736-744.
- Beckley, T.M. and D. Korber. 1996. Clearcuts, conflict and co-management: experiments in consensus forest management in Northwest Saskatchewan. Canadian Forest Service, Northern Forestry Centre, Edmonton. Information Report NOR-X-349.
- Benedickson, Jamie. 1992. Co-Management Issues in the Forest Wilderness: A Stewardship Council for Temagami. In *Essays from the Fifth Institute Conference on Natural Resources Law: Growing Demands on a Shrinking Heritage: Managing Resource-Use Conflicts*. Edited by Monique Ross and J. Owen Saunders. Canadian Institute of Resources Law, Calgary, Alta. pp. 256-275.
- Berkes, Fikret. 1997. New and Not-So-New Directions in the Use of the Commons: Co-Management. *Common Property Resource Digest*. 42: 5-7.

- Berkes, Fikret. 1994. Co-management: Bridging the Two Solitudes. *Northern Perspectives*. 22 (2-3): 18-20.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, Grazia. No date. Collaborative Management of Protected Areas: Tailoring the Approach to the Context. Social Policy Group, IUCN (World Conservation Union), Switzerland. Available on the internet at [www.iucn.org/themes/spg/Tailor/Tailor.html](http://www.iucn.org/themes/spg/Tailor/Tailor.html).
- Canadian Forest Service. 1998. Canada Forest Accord. Ottawa, May 1, 1998. ([www.nrcan.gc.ca/cfs/nfs/strateg/accord\\_e.html](http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/cfs/nfs/strateg/accord_e.html)).
- Carpenter, Andrew M. and Winnifred B. Kessler. 1999. *FORESTCARE: Evaluating progress toward sustainable forest management in Alberta*. *Forestry Chronicle*. 75 (5): 811-820.
- Chambers, Fiona G. 1999. Co-Management of Forest Resources in the NorSask Forest management License Area, Saskatchewan: A Case Study. Master's Degree Project, Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary.
- Little Red River Cree Nation. 2000. First Nations, Forest and Wildlife/ Strategic Actions in Support of Cooperative Management. Presentation by Chief Johnsen Sewepagaham to the Canadian Indigenous and Native Studies Association Conference, May 30, 2000.
- Little Red River Cree Nation, Tallcree First Nation and Government of Alberta. 1999. Memorandum of Understanding. September 1, 1999.
- Notzke, Claudia. 1995. Aboriginal Peoples and Natural Resources: Co-management, the Way of the Future? *National Geographic Research & Exploration*. 9(4): 395-397.
- Pinkerton, Evelyn. 1992. Translating Legal Rights into Management Practice: Overcoming Barriers to the Exercise of Co-Management. *Human Organization*. 51 (4): 330 - 341.
- Treseder, Leslie. In prep. Forest Co-Management in Northern Alberta: Prospects and Pitfalls. MSc. Thesis, Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.
- Treseder, Leslie and Naomi T. Krogman. 2000a. The Potential of the Cooperative Natural Resource Management Process in Northern Alberta and Challenges for Implementation. Final report to the cooperative Renewable Natural Resource Planning Board. Departments of Renewable Resources and Rural Economy, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alta. 26 pages.
- Treseder, Leslie and Naomi T. Krogman. 2000b. Cooperative Management in the First Nation Traditional Territories: Community Perspectives and Participation. Final report to the Little Red River Cree Nation and Tallcree First Nation. Departments of Renewable Resources and Rural Economy, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alta. 10 pages.
- Treseder, Leslie and Naomi T. Krogman. 1999. Features of First Nation forest management institutions and implications for sustainability. *Forestry Chronicle*. 75 (5): 793-798.

- Usher, P.J. 1993. The Beverly-Kaminuriak caribou management board: an experience in co-management. In *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. Edited by J. T. Inglis. Canadian Museum of Nature and International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Ont. Pp. 111-120.
- Witty, Dave. 1994. *The Practice Behind the Theory: Co-management as a Community Development Tool*. Plan Canada. January, 1994: 22-27.

## **APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDES**

### **Interview Guide for Members of the Caribou-Lower Peace Cooperative Forest Management Planning Board**

1. What do you think are the most important benefits of the MOU for your organization?
2. What do you see as the most important benefits for the other participants?
3. What do you see as the Board's immediate priorities?
4. The MOU directs the Board to establish procedures to involve other parties. Do you have any suggestions for ways you would like to see the Board work with each of the following:
  - a) for stakeholders to interact with the Board?
  - b) For (general) public review and comment?
  - c) for consulting with or seconding experts?
5. The MOU allows the Board to invite participation from the oil & gas and mine and mineral industries and the Alberta Department of Energy. How do you think their involvement could help the Board to achieve its objectives?
6. Do you see any challenges for the Board for involving the oil & gas & mining industries and Alberta Energy?
7. The MOU also allows the Board to involve environmental groups. How do you think their involvement could help the Board to achieve its objectives?
8. Do you see any challenges for the Board related to involving environmental groups?
9. How do you think the Technical Planning Committee can assist the Board to develop and conduct a cooperative forest management planning process?
10. What challenges do you see for the Board in developing its Resource Management Philosophy and Goal Statement?
11. Are there any organizations that the Board should be partnering with to achieve its objectives? Do you see any advantages or disadvantages that the Board may have in obtaining resources from other programs to meet its objectives?
12. Does the Board have enough staff and funding support to function effectively? Does your organization have enough staff and funding to support your Board members in their work?
13. Are you satisfied with the way the Board sets its agenda and organizes meetings? Are there any procedures you would like to see the Board adopt to accommodate (respect) the needs of your organization?
14. Are you able to maintain open communication with other Board members? Do you have any suggestions for improving communication among Board members?
15. Do you think other members of your organization are satisfied with the Board's progress?
16. What mechanisms do you use to get input from other members of your organization?
17. What mechanisms do you use to keep other members informed of Board decisions?
18. Do you think there is adequate awareness of the Board and its role in the First Nation communities? Do you have any opinion on the level of awareness among the other parties to the agreement?
19. Do you think the First Nation communities have meaningful involvement in the Board's decisions?

20. Are you satisfied that the Board is using consensus-based practices, procedures and processes?

Has the Board faced any challenges in developing consensus-based practices, procedures and

22.

23.

areas. What do you think would be the best ways for the Board to address its overall priorities in the following areas:

Enhancing First Nations use of the forest?

Improving First Nation employment in the forest industry?

Ensuring a sustainable supply of timber for forestry corporations?

## **Interview Guide for First Nation Community Members & Staff**

1. Do you think people in the community (First Nations communities) are well informed about the Cooperative Forest Management Planning Board that is being set up by the First Nations, Government and Industry?
2. What do you see as the benefits of cooperative (shared) forest management for your community (the First Nations communities)?
3. What do you think the Board's immediate priorities should be (most important issues they should be addressing)?
4. Do you think the Board sets its agenda and organizes meetings in a way that is appropriate for the First Nations? Are there any procedures that the Board needs to observe to show respect for the First Nation Board members?
5. Are there any community groups or organizations that the Board needs to partner with to achieve its objectives? Do you know of any government programs that the Board should be looking at to support its work?
6. Do you think the First Nation has enough staff and funding to support its Board members in their work?
7. Can you think of any other challenges First Nation Board members might face in doing their work?
8. Can you think of any challenges for your community (the First Nation communities) in reaching decisions to take to the Board?
9. Can you think of challenges for the community (the First Nations communities) in acting on decisions made by the Board?
10. How do First Nation Board members get input from community members?
11. How do First Nation Board members keep community members informed of Board decisions?
12. Do you know if other members of the community (the First Nations communities) are satisfied with the Board's progress?
13. Do you think your community (the First Nations communities) has (have) meaningful involvement in the Board's decisions? Does the Board's decision-making process include appropriate ways of resolving conflict?
14. According to previous MOUs and Letters of Intent, the Board has three major priority areas What do you think would be the best ways for the Board to address its overall priorities in the following areas:
  - a) Enhancing First Nations use of the forest?
  - b) Improving First Nation employment in the forest industry?
  - c) Ensuring a sustainable supply of timber for forestry corporations?

1.                   staff in your department (agency) are well-informed about the Caribou-Lower Peace Cooperative Forest Management Planning Board and its role?  
What do you see as the benefits of cooperative forest management for your department (agency)?  
What do you think the Board's immediate priorities should be?  
Do you think the Board sets its agenda and organizes meetings in a way that is appropriate for  
  
accommodate your department's (agency's) participation on the Board?
5. Are there any other groups or organizations that the Board needs to partner with to achieve its objectives? Are there any governmental programs that the Board should be looking at to support
6.  
government Board members in their work?
7. Can you think of any other challenges the government Board members might face in doing their work?  
Can you think of any challenges your department (agency) might face in reaching decisions to
9.  
Board?
10. Is there communication between Board members and department (agency) staff? What mechanisms do the government Board members use to obtain input from other staff in your
11.  
Board decisions?
12. Do you know if other members of your department (agency) are satisfied with the Board's progress?

## Interview Guide for Industry Staff

1. Do you think staff in your company are well-informed about the Caribou-Lower Peace Cooperative Forest Management Planning Board and its role?
2. What do you see as the benefits of cooperative forest management for your company?
3. What do you think the Board's immediate priorities should be?
4. Do you think the Board sets its agenda and organizes meetings in a way that is appropriate for your company? Are there any procedures that the Board needs to observe to accommodate your company's participation on the Board?
5. Are there any other groups or organizations that the Board needs to partner with to achieve its objectives? Are there any government or industry programs that the Board should be looking at to support its work?
6. Do you think your company has committed enough staff and funding to support government Board members in their work?
7. Can you think of any other challenges the industry Board members might face in doing their work?
8. Can you think of any challenges your company (?or the industry?) might face in reaching decisions to take to the Board?
9. Can you think of challenges for your company (?or the industry?) in acting on decisions made by the Board?
10. Is there communication between Board members and company staff? What mechanisms do the industry Board members use to obtain input from staff?
11. What mechanisms do the industry Board members use to keep staff informed of Board decisions?
12. Do you know if other members of your company are satisfied with the Board's progress?
13. Do you think your company has meaningful involvement in the Board's decisions? Does the Board's decision-making process include appropriate ways of resolving conflict?
14. What do you think would be the best ways for the Board to address its overall priorities in the following areas:
  - a) Enhancing First Nations use of the forest?
  - b) Improving First Nation employment in the forest industry?
  - c) Ensuring a sustainable supply of timber for forestry corporations?

**TITLE OF PROJECT:** An Assessment of the Effectiveness and Potential of the Caribou-Lower  
Research funded by the Sustainable Forest Management Network

**CONSENT:** Sheet (attached) have been explained to me and that I have received a copy of these procedures. Any questions I have asked have been people designated on this form if I have more questions, either now or in the future. I have been assured that personal records relating to this study be shared with other participants in this project. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time. I also understand that the

The people who may be contacted about the

\_\_\_\_\_

Leslie Treseder  
Phone (780) 492-2111

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Participant)

Phone (780) 492-4178

(Name of Witness)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Witness)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Investigator)

## INFORMATION SHEET, EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS STUDY

**TITLE OF PROJECT:** An Assessment of the Effectiveness and Potential of the Caribou-Lower Peace Cooperative Forest Management Board

**INVESTIGATORS:** Ms. Leslie Treseder, Department of Renewable Resources, University of Alberta, General Services Building Room 751, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2H1  
Phone (780) 492-2111

Dr. Naomi Krogman, Department of Rural Economy, University of Alberta, General Services Building Room 515, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2H1  
Phone (780) 492-4178

**DESCRIPTION  
OF PROJECT:**

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Caribou-Lower Peace Cooperative Forest Management Board. We are interviewing people from each of the parties to the Board to ask their opinions about the Board and the cooperative forest management planning process. We are requesting one to two hours of your time to ask your opinions about the Board's structure and processes, and its potential to achieve its goals.

With your permission, we will record the interviews by audio-tape or by taking notes. We will then analyze the responses and identify common themes from the interviews. All interview data will be kept confidential and will not be made available to anyone other than the project investigators. We will use a coding system to keep your identity anonymous. The coding system and any reports from this study will not identify any of the participants by name. We may identify participants by their affiliations (e.g., First Nations, Government, Industry).

Your participation in this study may be of no personal benefit to you, but we hope that your participation will assist the parties to the Board in supporting the Board to achieve its potential. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you agree to be interviewed, you may choose not to answer any of the questions or stop the interview at any time. If you have any questions about the interview or the study in general, you may contact the investigators at the addresses and telephone numbers listed above.