

How can socio-economic effects assessment contribute to resilient Yukon communities?

- predictive process – can help and be part of the road to get there but is not the solution
- not a one time thing – need continuing dialogue, follow-up, monitoring, readjustment and fine tuning
- increases baseline knowledge
- gives better ability to plan for the community
- prepare for the bust after the boom
- deals with the uniqueness of each community
- re-evaluating projects over time (mechanism must be in place)
- breaking down barriers, building trust in information sources and processes
- can ensure that benefits are spread over a longer period of time
- the option of no development should be discussed
- on going participation and opportunity for new involvement and renewal – increase capacity
- if participation is reflected in outcome in project design, people are more likely to participate in process, and that increases capacity
- is the approach different for small and large projects
- lead to and understanding of the current community capacity for resilience
- help understand the impacts on the community
- help determine mitigation
- determine the capacity values of the community
- allows us to attempt to deal with and understand and potentially prepare for before they happen
- allows us to learn from past present and future mistakes by continually monitoring results (develop mechanisms)
- jurisdiction identified
- build in mechanisms for recourse if the public doesn't like how things are working out as the project proceeds – surprised to hear this is lacking
- could help ensure the resilient community stays or becomes more resilient
- help ensure communities know and understand the positives and negatives of the project
- help ensure a net benefit to communities
- community involvement
- incorporate wide range of values so they know what is important
- two way communication
- ability to renegotiate
- return info to the community
- recognition of family breakdown, lack of opportunities
- community planning
- provide framework for communities to revisit decisions and allow for change
- using historical information regarding community experience with development. Communication with residents is essential. Allow them to define meaningful benefits (eg meaningful employment). Industry should take this initiative
- community involvement in defining meaningful adverse impacts
- assessment of social infrastructure in place between booms
- addressing capacity issues to contribute to capacity building. Often communities do not have the ability to meaningfully participate in capacity building initiatives
- two way communication, adaptive management as the project proceeds
- having a social impact assessment that allows for a reduction in negative impacts on the community will ultimately improve community resiliency
- the problem is whether the recommendations are enforceable
- who deals with the impacts after the company is gone? Can there be a “bond” posted by the company to ensure that any social impacts can be dealt with in the future?
- need legal levers for enforcement

- communities need to be diversified enough to maintain population after the project ends
- diversification of the communities economy improves the communities resilience
- public accountability mechanisms should be set up
- problem with giving company long term tenure as it reduces flexibility and accountability to deal with impacts
- provides an opportunity for dialogue
- informed communities are more prepared to accept changes brought on by development
- assessment should result in better projects – opportunity to balance the interests of a proponent with those of a community
- over time assessments develop community capacity to participate in further development
- capacity of community is critical
- how do you reproduce the good things
- create forums to determine vision of good things
- ensure that legal mechanisms to provide mitigation are in place
- build on successes of communities like Old Crow, Faro in how they adapted to change
- value of comparative work – case studies can help understand what might happen
- SEA is anticipatory process and done right can help decision makers in a community adapt
- challenge of bureaucratic slippage
- door-to-door contact
- takes time to get a good understanding
- many communities are small and significant proportions of FN beneficiaries may leave the community
- well thought process to help the community feel empowered
- early involvement of community at proposal stage
- proponent working with community to build capacity, genuinely interested in the well-being of the community
- appropriate use of traditional knowledge
- long term investment and a good legacy of development
- build community support, not just jobs
- education of proponents
- anticipatory training needs
- understanding of the development assessment process by all stakeholders
- by identifying problems that need to be addressed to increase the health of the community and ensuring that developments address these problems in a positive manner (where appropriate given the scale of the undertaking)
- by identifying the areas of the community that will need support
- specific assistance – teaching people how to manage new wealth
- the communication and participation will help cement the ties and feed into the resilience
- provides a baseline, a starting point from which mechanisms for continued dialogue/input may add
- process will offer transparency, a clear agenda to all parties involved
- increased public involvement
- people feel they control what is happening in their communities
- make sure communities have the resources to participate
- historical data and historical experiences are reliable
- decisions made reflect community involvement –with feedback to communities for a new assessment
- need to embrace SEA that has been going on
- recognize intrinsic value of the natural world
- make sure we capture and share what actually happens with projects
- will identify community strengths to be protected
- if a process is carried out right it should allow for relationship building
- ensure stability
- good and effective land use planning
- communications to grass roots people up
- need to provide time, financial and human resources adequate to allow community individuals to express what their needs are, what they need to be resilient
- supporting a diversity of opportunities to community rather than just wage earners
- scoping stage is critical. The community needs to fully understand what the project is going to involve

- resilient communities should also show signs of long term improvement, well after the project has been completed
- mitigate historic pitfalls upfront
- identify all issues early in the process
- through mitigation improve benefits and reduce negative impacts
- taking into account traditional values
- empowering communities through communications
- builds good self-esteem in the community
- protects important landmarks, traditions, cultures etc.
- brings in dollars while keeping the negative impacts to a minimum
- builds trust between those involved
- continue dialogue with communities once project is developed
- cycle of action/reflection
- the community plan should contribute to SIA
- legal recourse if agreements aren't honored (bonds need to be posted up front)
- monitoring commitments must be honored, government must have capacity for them
- how about info that the community feels is important leading to the community's own projects, not just projects from outside proponents (micro loans for small projects?)
- D.O.s should start collecting info before big projects are proposed
- communities should develop regional economic strategies so proponents will know whether a project will or won't be acceptable up front – communities need to be proactive
- Yukon College could become a central source of expertise (social science, traditional languages and education and outreach) – help communities talk to each other
- Follow-up on implementation agreements/compliance monitoring involving public is important, and there should be opportunities to renegotiate
- public involvement, especially those who are impacted throughout the whole process of DAP
- instituted adaptive management
- identify community issues that may not come out
- Power to the People!
- knowledge of changes in comparable communities that gives the affects community something to compare to
- the “sudden change” is more important the boom/bust. The way the community responds to sudden change is critical
- People are more resilient if the have input into the decisions. Input refined as influence in the process
- process can provide opportunities for relationship building, conflict resolution
- resilient communities can be fostered perhaps, by retaining some flexibility and timing of benefit and access agreements