

IMPACT ASSESSMENT WEBINAR SERIES

SUMMARY REPORT

Overview of Webinar Series

The Assembly of First Nations (AFN) Environment Sector hosted a 5-part webinar series from August 27, 2024, to September 24, 2024, on various impact assessment policy issues to share information with First Nations and First Nation organizations and collect feedback to inform AFN's recommendations. These recommendations will be incorporated into advocacy materials, including technical submissions

The three subject-matter specific sessions in the series covered the 5-year review of the federal impact assessment "Project List," requirements for impact assessment on federal lands (including reserves and certain protected areas), and Indigenous Co-Administration of impact assessments. During each session, representatives from the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC) presented proposals contained within engagement materials listed below and AFN facilitated discussion to identify issues and develop recommendations.

There was a lot of interest in learning more about First Nation led impact assessment processes. AFN Environment Sector is proposing to action this by planning and hosting a Part 2 of the webinar series with a session on First Nation led impact assessment on November 28, 2024 1-3pm EST.

AFN Mandate

The intention of the webinar series was to share information to support First Nations, regional organizations, and provincial/territorial organizations full and effective participation in regulatory and policy development related to federal impact assessment. This and other ongoing advocacy work is directed by First Nations in Assembly through Resolutions 73/2017, 07/2018, 69/2018, and 06/2019. AFN is directed to:

- Call on Canada to ensure that regulatory and policy development fully respects the constitutional and other legal obligations of the Crown to First Nations and standards set by the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Resolution 69/2018)*.
- Call on Canada to engage in focused dialogue with First Nations to substantively identify, recognize, and engage the protocols, elements, and processes to conduct joint regulatory and policy drafting (Resolutions 69/2018, 06/2019).
- Call upon Canada to meet or exceed precedent set in development and eventual passage of the Species at Risk Act – full, direct, and unfettered participation of First Nations (Resolution 73/2017).

- Continue to support and coordinate interventions and participation of First Nations, regional organizations, and provincial territorial organizations in the co-development process, including creating regionally specific processes to address specific concerns and support provisions as part of nation-to-nation relationships (Resolutions 73/2017, 07/2018, 69/2018).
- Advocate for adequate funding directly to First Nations for their full and effective participation (Resolutions 73/2017, 07/2018, 69/2018, 06/2019).
- Conduct regional information sessions to support First Nations, regional organizations, and provincial/territorial organizations in the process (Resolutions 73/2017, 07/2018, 69/2018).

Link to Session Recordings

Date	Topic	Recording Link
August 27, 2024	Introduction	English: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0usHD9rtegU French: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IIIVVD1SGP0
September 3, 2024	5 Year Review of the Project List	English: https://youtu.be/WJDltdXyJe8 French: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R_-3-Fmx-jc
September 10, 2024	Impact Assessment on Reserves and Other Federal Lands	English: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yw4D8KuqHqg French: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kdRaVHwP1ws&feature=youtu.be
September 17, 2024	Indigenous Co-Administration of Federal Impact Assessment	English: https://youtu.be/ru_V1iKmy18 French: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pJbjrBMdFEA
September 24, 2024	What We Heard	English: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CcYu69fjQcE French: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4FhPLBw7Qpc

Introduction

On August 27, 2024, representatives from IAAC presented a background on the *Impact Assessment Act* (IAA), the recent amendments, and the regulatory initiatives being conducted.

First Nations have exercised jurisdiction over the use and stewardship their lands and waters since time immemorial. The imposition of Crown sovereignty and the displacement of First Nations from their lands and waters have limited many First Nations' capacity to uphold stewardship responsibilities. Despite these challenges, these responsibilities and the Inherent jurisdiction required to fulfill them, persist. First Nations remain actively engaged in the protection and caretaking their lands and waters in accordance with Inherent rights, responsibilities, and Indigenous legal systems.

The IAA became law on June 21, 2019, replacing the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) and establishing a new process to assess the impacts of major projects on matters falling within "federal jurisdiction." First Nations overwhelmingly participated in parliamentary and other forms of advocacy related to Bill C-69, *An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, demonstrating the importance of this legislation for First Nations.

Key provisions of the IAA that relate to First Nations' involvement in federal impact assessment include: mandatory consideration of the impacts of a project on Indigenous rights, both as part of the assessment and at the decision-making stage; mandatory consideration and protection of Indigenous Knowledge; recognition of Indigenous Governing Bodies as "jurisdictions"; new opportunities for Indigenous-led assessments; prohibition on designated projects proceeding without approval under the IAA if they will have effect on Indigenous rights or interests; and mandatory establishment of an Indigenous Advisory Committee.

SCC Declaration of Unconstitutionality and Amendments

On October 13, 2023, the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) issued an opinion in *Reference re Impact Assessment Act* ("SCC Opinion"). A majority of the Court found most of the IAA and the underlying regulations to be unconstitutional because it was outside the scope of federal jurisdiction. In response to the SCC's Opinion, the Government amended the IAA through the *Budget Implementation Act, 2024*. Changes were made to sections of the IAA related to project designation, screening decisions, public interest decisions, definition of federal effects, substitution, and assessment by integrated panels.

Webinar participants were concerned with the potential classification of effects to First Nations rights as "negligible" or "non-negligible." AFN has consistently raised, and webinar participants concurred, that no potential for impact on First Nations rights should be considered "negligible." Further, any analysis of potential impact to First Nations rights, even at initial screening decisions, must be done in partnership with First Nations.

The IAA amendments enable the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) and IAAC to substitute federal impact assessment with a province, territory, or Indigenous Governing Body's assessments or "processes". This was concerning to

webinar participants, given that not all provincial/territorial assessment or regulatory regimes are equal, particularly when it comes to how each may consider First Nations' Inherent and Treaty rights and Title. First Nations should consider whether potential project effects can be effectively assessed and managed by provincial/territorial regulators and whether these processes adequately trigger and fulfil the Crown's duty to consult with First Nations towards free, prior and informed consent.

Indigenous Rights and UN Declaration

In 2021, Parliament passed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act (UNDRIPA) affirming the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN Declaration) as a universal international human rights instrument with application in Canadian law and providing a framework for the Government of Canada's implementation of the UN Declaration. The SCC later affirmed that the UNDRIPA incorporated the UN Declaration into the positive law of Canada. UNDRIPA requires the Government of Canada, in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous Peoples, to take all measures necessary to ensure that federal laws are consistent with the UN Declaration.

The IAA came into force in 2019 (before UNDRIPA) and references the commitment of the Government of Canada to implement the UN Declaration in the preamble of the legislation. IAAC has expressed its commitment to implementing the objectives of the UN Declaration through the IAA, noting that it was written with the implementation of the UN Declaration and supporting policies and procedures in mind.

IAAC's website states as follows:

“As a result, the *Impact Assessment Act* already establishes a legislative and policy framework that align with the Declaration and does not need to be changed in light of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act*.”

However, the AFN disagrees with IAAC's position that the IAA is aligned with the minimum standards articulated in the UN Declaration. In particular, the IAA is inconsistent with Articles 26, 32 and 37. IAA is inconsistent with the UN Declaration Article 26 because it fails to give legal recognition and protection to First Nations lands, territories and resources in accordance with the laws, customs, traditions and land tenure systems of First Nations. IAA is inconsistent with Article 32 because it does not require free, prior or informed consent of impacted First Nations in order for the Government of Canada to approve a project. Further, the IAA is inconsistent with Article 37 because it provides mechanisms for cooperation and shared decision-making, but the fails to effectively implement those powers and share decision-making with First Nations, including in treaty territories.

There is a need for independent analysis of alignment of the IAA, its regulations and policies with the UN Declaration and UNDRIPA, given IAAC has not listened to critiques

in the past. The Government of Canada must fund an independent First Nations led study in this regard.

Webinar participants indicated they would like to understand how the Calls for Justice articulated in the *Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls* have directed and informed development of law, regulation and policy regarding assessment of major projects in First Nations territories. What steps have been taken to ensure that projects that will contribute to ongoing cumulative impacts on First Nations, including those related to socioeconomic wellbeing, health, culture, etc., are rejected? What steps are being taken to ensure that the federal impact assessment regime is not just working towards issuing permits and approvals to pollute? These questions would be a good starting point for an independent study on consistency of federal impact assessment with the UN Declaration.

Project List 5 Year Review

On September 3, 2024, the webinar focused on the 5-year review of the *Physical Activities Regulation*. IAAC representatives presented the content of the [Discussion Paper on the Project List Review](#). Anyone looking to provide written feedback on the Discussion Paper can provide comment or upload a submission at the same website location or by email to regulations-reglements@iaac-aeic.gc.ca by September 27, 2024. AFN has urged IAAC to be flexible in receiving submissions from First Nations and First Nation organizations.

The *Physical Activities Regulations*, also known as the Project List, is a regulation that sets out classes of “designated projects” that are subject to the IAA and may require a federal impact assessment. IAAC is required to review the Project List five years after it is adopted and submit a report setting out conclusions and recommendations to the Minister of ECCC.

The current Project List (adopted in 2019) includes 61 entries that cover 10 different sectors: national parks and protected areas; defence; mines and mills; nuclear facilities; oil and gas; power lines and pipelines; renewable energy; transportation; hazardous waste; and water projects. Thresholds (many are related to their “production capacity”) for each project category are employed; projects are only captured by the entry if they are at or above the threshold. AFN has consistently raised the point that removing classes of projects from the Project List or increasing thresholds leads to fewer opportunities for First Nations to influence decision making about projects in their territories.

First Nations took issue with the original approach to the Project List and made many suggestions for project categories that should be included on the Project List. The use of thresholds in the Project List encourages “project splitting” and contributes to a failure to identify, assess, prevent or mitigate cumulative impacts from multiple projects that

may individually fall below the threshold. First Nations have made many recommendations for crafting the Project List in a manner that would better capture projects with potential impact to First Nations and combat project splitting: require assessment for several smaller projects proposed by the same proponent if they reach a threshold when taken together; require assessment of more than one project proposed within a geographic or space in a certain time period, even if they do not individually meet the Project List threshold; adopt multiple types of thresholds to capture impacts through more than one set of criteria; require projects nearing thresholds to notify IAAC, that the notification trigger preliminary review by IAAC and First Nations, formal consultation, and formal decision on whether the IA is needed; or adopt an Indigenous agreed-upon joint review mechanism to ensure that “near-threshold” projects are captured for IA requirements.

The Discussion Paper introduces a new lens for the review, responding to the Government of Canada’s initiatives to “improve the efficiency” of the impact assessment and permitting processes for major projects set out by the Ministerial Working Group on Regulatory Efficiency for Clean Growth Projects. Their vision is outlined further in the report entitled “Building Canada’s Clean Future: A Plan to Modernize Federal Assessment and Permitting Processes to Get Clean Growth Projects Built Faster.” IAAC’s Discussion Paper does not include the Inherent and Treaty rights and Title of First Nations or the UN Declaration as a lens, guide, or consideration for the review. In fact, neither the Declaration nor the Un Declaration Act are mentioned in the Discussion Paper. Further, IAAC has not articulated exactly how the frameworks for review were weighed or how tensions between these two frameworks for review have or have not been addressed. IAAC must articulate how Indigenous rights have been used a lens to guide proposed changes and/or how impact to Indigenous rights from additions/deletions/changes to the project list have been considered or addressed.

Nuclear Projects

In its Discussion Paper, IAAC proposed to exempt single small modular reactors (SMRs) and increase thresholds for multiple SMRs or, alternatively, remove all SMRs as well as large-scale nuclear reactors using known technologies. IAAC is also considering exempting or scoping down assessments of nuclear projects using known technologies on brownfield fossil-fuel electricity generating sites (Discussion Paper p. 38). Webinar participants vehemently disagreed with the proposal that SMRs or large scale nuclear reactors be removed from the Project List. There is grave concern about the safety of nuclear technology and long lasting impacts of materials and waste from both SMRs and large scale nuclear projects. Further, the suggestion that nuclear facilities would not require federal impact assessment because they are located on “brownfield” sites fails to acknowledge that activities on those sites may not have received the free, prior and informed consent of First Nations on whose territory it is located and the continued or expanded operation of any activity may undermine the First Nations’ long term vision or exercise of stewardship responsibilities.

In Situ Oil Sands and Fossil Fuel Power Generating Facilities

The current Project List covers new or expansion of in situ oil sands extraction facilities with a bitumen production capacity of 2 000 m³/day or more, in a province without provincial legislation to limit greenhouse gas emissions from oil sands or limit has been reached. Because of the provincial emissions cap where projects are proposed, no in situ oil sands facilities have been captured for federal IA since 2019. For this reason, IAAC has proposed to remove new in situ oil sands facilities and remove expansions of in situ oil sands facilities (Discussion Paper p. 40). However, AFN Resolution 06/2019 specifically calls for the inclusion of in situ oil sands facilities on the Project List.

The current Project List includes new or expanded fossil fuel-fired power generating facility 200MW or more. However, since 2019, 5 have entered the IA process and 3 have been screened out. All 6 that entered the process under CEAA, 2012 were also screened out. For this reason, IAAC has proposed removing fossil fuel-fired power generating facilities from the Project List. However, fossil fuel power generating facilities should receive federal impact assessment due to their potential impact to First Nations, which falls squarely into federal jurisdiction.

In addition, webinar participants were particularly concerned about the mining and use of lithium for battery technology and other uses and recommend these activities be added to the Project List. Additionally, webinar participants were gravely concerned about any potential impact to water, including threats to water quality and quantity. One suggestion may be to craft a Project List entry that would capture any project on the basis of its potential impact to water.

Assessment of Projects on Federal Lands and Exemptions

On September 10, 2024, representatives from IAAC and Indigenous Services Canada (ISC) presented background on ISC's Environmental Review Process and the Proposed Amendments to the *Designated Classes of Projects Order* (Ministerial Exclusion Order). Anyone looking to provide input to the Ministerial Exclusion Order was asked to do so using the online forum before October 10, 2024. IAAC indicated that even if it received feedback via email at regulations-reglements@iaac-aeic.gc.ca, they have been directed to ask commentors to enter input into the online form. AFN urged IAAC to be flexible in how it receives information from First Nations and First Nation organizations, as the use of such online forum is a potential barrier to meaningful involvement. Further, ISC indicated it is currently reviewing their Environmental Review Process and anyone who wishes to provide recommendations on the ERP can reach out to Yasmine Boctor-Moghaddam at yasmine.boctor-moghaddam@sac-isc.gc.ca.

Requirements for assessment of non-designated projects (not in the Project List) on "federal lands," including reserves and protected areas, are set out in the IAA. Federal authorities must determine that "the project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects" or that those significant adverse environmental effects are

justified in the circumstances. Projects can be exempted from the “environmental effects determination” requirements if they are listed in the *Designated Classes of Projects Order* (Ministerial Order).

Indigenous Services Canada administers the environmental effects assessments on reserve lands through the Environmental Review Process. ISC is in the process of reviewing their Environmental Review Process. The AFN is also considering how to facilitate feedback and recommendations from First Nations regarding the ERP. Options include preparing and circulating a questionnaire.

Webinar participants expressed concern with the potential for cumulative effects of the “small” projects that IAAC proposes to exempt. IAAC must articulate how cumulative effects assessment informed their proposals for projects to exempt from environmental effects determinations, including ISC’s ERP.

Webinar participants also expressed concern with unintended consequences of exempted projects on reserves and other federal lands and how these would be identified or addressed if the project was exempt from the environmental review. The Government of Canada must invest in First Nations-led environmental monitoring programs so that First Nations could identify if projects that did not undergo an ERP did not have any intended consequences that should have qualified it for the ERP. Further, the First Nation led monitoring could identify whether projects that did receive the ERP were constructed in a manner consistent with the parameters identified in the ERP and adhered to any conditions. We note the substantial data gaps and capacity issues for environmental baselines and monitoring on First Nation reserves and call for substantial investment to support communities in enhancing these capabilities.

Co-Administration of Federal IA

On September 17, 2024, representatives from IAAC and the Circle of Experts (CoE) co-presented contents of the [Discussion Paper on Indigenous Impact Assessment Co-Administration Agreements](#). Webinar participants were invited to provide written feedback via the online forum found at the same link above or to email indigenouspolicy-politiquesautochtone@iaac-aeic.gc.ca before October 28, 2024. Both IAAC and the CoE members acknowledged that the Discussion Paper and comment period are intended to be starting points for discussions on Indigenous co-administration of federal impact assessment and IAAC is open to coordinating bilateral discussions with First Nations and First Nation organizations. Anyone interested in such meetings can reach out to the email address listed above. AFN thanks the CoE for their dedication to discussions around Indigenous co-administration and for their time in contributing to the webinar.

The IAA empowers the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to enter into agreements with Indigenous Governing Bodies to authorize those entities to exercise powers or perform duties or functions in relation to impact assessments under the IAA.

These agreements will enable Canada and First Nations to formally share governance and decision-making at key points throughout the impact assessment process.

Before entering into a co-administration agreement, regulations must first be in place. IAAC has released a Discussion Paper co-developed by IAAC and the CoE, a sub-committee of the Agency's Indigenous Advisory Committee, to open dialogue in relation to these new tools. First Nations will have the opportunity to comment on the Discussion Paper and offer input into the development of future Indigenous Co-Administration Agreement Regulations.

Co-administration agreements will have to uphold Canadian laws and will only authorize the exercise of federal powers, duties and functions that already exist in the legislation. The assessments, or parts of assessments, that may be conducted under a co-administration agreement will have to align with the requirements of the Impact Assessment Act, including meeting both the process and timelines. The agreements must also specify the lands over which the agreements would apply and set out the specific powers, duties and functions that may be exercised by First Nations.

Webinar participants expressed concern with impact assessment timelines being too short to allow for meaningful First Nation participation and the fact that an Indigenous Governing Body could not extend timelines more than the IAA allows to allow time for community processes such as protocols and ceremony.

Webinar participants were concerned that negotiations or agreements with the Government of Canada threaten historic Treaties. IAAC confirmed that nothing in regulation, policy, or agreements regarding Indigenous Co-Administration of federal impact assessment would infringe Treaty. Treaties are constitutionally entrenched and would prevail over agreements related to impact assessment.

Webinar participants expressed concern that First Nations are being turned into municipalities by the Government of Canada. Members of the CoE indicated they have similar concerns in general but that they do not necessarily view the potential for co-administration of federal impact assessment as contributing to that issue.

Webinar participants raised the question of what would happen to a co-administration agreement in the event the First Nation is dissatisfied with its implementation. IAAC and the CoE indicated that this hadn't yet been considered in development of the Discussion Paper and that it was the sort of thing they would be happy to receive guidance on in technical submissions.

Another issue to further consider is processes for dispute resolution. In the regular course of impact assessment currently, if a First Nation or other group is dissatisfied with the Minister's final decision regarding project approval, their course of action is through judicial review. Members of the CoE noted that in the context of a co-administration agreement where the Indigenous Governing Body has exercised authorities or made decisions, this could open them up to being the subject of the

judicial review – i.e. they could be implicated in lawsuits following their decision. Webinar participants opined that perhaps the co-administration agreement itself could identify a process for alternative dispute resolution that would provide an alternative route to litigation in resolving disputes that arise between the parties to the agreement (the Government of Canada and the Indigenous Governing Body) or external parties. IAAC and the CoE members said that this was a helpful suggestion and one that they would be open to analyzing further in future discussions.

Generally, webinar participants felt strongly that First Nations should be the ones making final determinations about project approvals and conditions. This indicates that many communities looking to negotiate co-administration agreements would want the final determination to be one of the powers covered by the agreement for the Indigenous Governing Body to exercise. IAAC should not narrow the powers, duties or functions to be exercised by the Indigenous Governing Body to exclude the final determination; this may lead to a rejection of the concept of co-administration agreements.

In reviewing the Discussion Paper and considering recommendations, First Nations should consider how they view the suggestion of committee to oversee eligibility determinations and how territorial “overlaps” or areas of shared use should be addressed. These are two issues that need to be addressed by First Nations themselves in a manner that is aligned with their governance structures and self-determined.

In considering feedback from webinar participants, the AFN is considering recommendations related to the regulation that would enable negotiation of co-administration agreements. It is important that progress to enable optional negotiation of these agreements is not lost in the event of a change in government. For this reason, the AFN is considering recommending that enabling framework regulations be adopted in an expeditious manner. It is important that even these regulations would protect First Nations in negotiations; in particular there must be a provision speaking to precedence of constitutionally protected Inherent and Treaty rights.

Outstanding Inquiries

Additionally, while we recognise that the UN Declaration Act National Action Plan indicates that the enabling, negotiation and ostensibly, implementation, of co-administration agreements is one means of implementing federal impact assessment in line with the UN Declaration and UN Declaration Act, the Government of Canada and IAAC cannot forgo support for First Nation led assessments of projects in favour of these agreements. First Nations must not be forced to administer the federal impact assessment regime rather than adopt their own environmental/impact assessment laws or processes, outright or in effect through lack of funding/support/enforcement. All avenues of self-determined involvement in the assessment, approval, and conditioning

of projects in First Nations territories must be open and available to them. See below section on First Nation Led Assessments for more on this subject.

The AFN has outstanding questions that have been shared with IAAC, and at the time of drafting this summary report we were waiting on responses. These are related to substitution of federal impact assessment for Indigenous/provincial/territorial impact/environmental assessment processes or regulatory processes:

Indigenous co-administration agreements will only apply to specified lands. If an Indigenous Governing Body were to be recognized as a “jurisdiction” under the Impact Assessment Act pursuant to an Indigenous co-administration agreement, would a proposed project have to be entirely within the specified lands in order for that Indigenous jurisdiction to be a candidate for substitution? What happens if there is a co-administration agreement in place and the Province wants its process substituted for the federal IA?

First Nation Led Assessments

Webinar participants were vocal in their view that we collectively have a responsibility to future generations and the non-human world to protect and enhance the natural world, particularly the Water. First Nations across Canada are strengthening their capacity to participate in and lead impact assessments. The greater the capacity of First Nations to understand and respond to proposed projects, as interested parties, jurisdictions or co-administrators of the IAA, the more effective and efficient the regulatory process will be. Current deficiencies in the internal capacity of many First Nations places a significant strain on First Nations, project proponents and regulators because it is harder for First Nations to do the work necessary to evaluate whether a project should receive their free, prior and informed consent.

There are a growing number of First Nations leading their own assessments of major projects in their territories. Many First Nations are looking to exercise Inherent authority over Lands, Waters, and Air in a manner consistent with their legal orders, customs, traditions, etc. First Nation-led assessments can inform whether a community provides or withholds free, prior and informed consent for a project and demand conditions on a project. The IAA requires the federal impact assessment to consider First Nation-led assessments along with other factors and so they must inform the Minister of Environment’s decision on a project. Examples of First Nation-led assessments have been well documented and lessons articulated, but there continues to be a need for dialogue amongst First Nations to share lessons learned from these processes. The AFN is looking to support First Nations in learning about previous or ongoing First Nation led assessments to identify lessons learned by hosting a webinar on First Nation led assessments on November 28, 2024 1-3pm EST.

One outstanding issue to be addressed is to need for adequate funding for First Nations to develop their own impact assessment laws or processes and the application of these to First Nation-led assessments. IAAC has indicated there is currently a small amount of

funding available for First Nation-led assessments through an Indigenous Leadership in Impact Assessment Pilot Project. The Government of Canada must allocate a specific funding portfolio to support the development of First Nations own impact assessment laws or processes and also fund the application of these laws/processes to projects proposed in First Nations territories.

Another outstanding issue to be addressed is how decisions and conditions made by First Nations through their assessment processes are applied and enforced by federal government counterparts and adhered to by proponents. Webinar participants were clear that the Government of Canada needs to respect, implement, and enforce First Nations decisions and conditions that come from these First Nation-led assessment process.

AFN and webinar participants identified a need for a working group or network of representatives from First Nations with experience in First Nation led assessments to share experiences and lessons learned and, perhaps, inform the development of a toolkit to guide the development of First Nations own assessment laws or processes.

What We Heard

On September 24, 2024, AFN staff facilitated a wrap-up webinar series and presented a summary of information received throughout the webinar series. Participants were supportive of continuing the webinar series to share information on development of impact assessment law/regulation and policy and share experiences between First Nations. Participants were keen to network and discuss issues with one another to strengthen relationships across Nations. The AFN is planning a Part 2 to the webinar series and also considering how to create a network of First Nations and First Nations organizations to share experiences and lessons learned regarding projects in their territories and impact assessments related to these projects.