

**CO-MANAGING
NATURAL RESOURCES
WITH FIRST NATIONS**

**GUIDELINES TO
REACHING AGREEMENTS
AND MAKING THEM WORK**

SASKATCHEWAN INDIAN FEDERATED COLLEGE

CONTRACT #95-0184

APRIL 1996

**Prepared for: Research and Analysis Directorate
Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development**

For additional copies call
(819) 994-7594

The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily held by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Table of Contents

A	Introduction	
I	The Definition of Co-Management	1
II	Methodology	2
III	Other Issues	2
IV	Organization of this Report	3
B	Phases of Co-Management Agreements	5
I	Before the Negotiation Stage	5
II	The Negotiation Stage	6
III	Implementation	8
IV	Monitoring	10
V	Evaluation	12
C	Community Involvement Strategies	13
I	How to Get People Participating	14
	a) The Public/Large Group Meeting	14
	b) Small Group Meetings	15
	c) Planning Meetings	16
II	Involving Community Elders, Hunters and Trappers and Other Resource Users	17
	a) Be Clear About the Purpose of Meetings	18
	b) Why Resource Co-Management?	19
	c) Defining 'Co-Management'	19
	d) The Advice of Elders	20
	e) Participation of Elders, Hunters and Trappers in Activities	20
III	Involving Schoolchildren and Youths	24
	a) Permission to Work with the Children	25
	b) Involving Others	25
	c) Public Meetings with Special Invitations to Parents	25
	d) Participation of Schoolchildren and Youths in Activities	26
IV	Involving the Community as a Whole	29
	a) Semi-Structured Interviews	30
	b) Environmental Assessment	31

D	Preparing for Negotiations: What to Expect	33
I	Background on the Knowledge Bases for Negotiations	33
II	Background on Land Use, Occupancy and Ownership	34
III	Knowing the Issues	38
IV	Other Issues Before Negotiations	39
V	Co-Management Structures	41
	a) Advisory Boards	42
	b) Management Boards	43
	c) Joint Decision-Making Boards	43
E	Hints and Guidelines towards a Negotiating Strategy	
I	The Basic Aims	45
II	Developing Interest-Based Negotiations	48
	a) How <u>not</u> to Negotiate	49
	b) How to Negotiate Effectively	51
III	Dispute Resolution	52
IV	Stakeholder Interests	55
V	The Financing of Co-Management	58
VI	Using Consultants and Resource People	60

APPENDICES:

F	Appendix I - Aboriginal Co-Management Bibliographies	
	a) Canada and the United States	i
	b) Indigenous International	xxi
	c) Other Relevant Reading	xxxii
G	Appendix II - Annotated Co-Management Bibliography	x 1

A. INTRODUCTION

I The Definition of Co-Management

Resource co-management is a process and a tool used more and more by First Nations and federal, provincial, and territorial governments to address problems, opportunities and shared interests in managing natural resources. Parties to co-management agreements and arrangements share in the control and administration of natural resources, and together they define the scope, mandate and function of the arrangements to be used.

As the numbers of resource co-management agreements with First Nations increase, it is evident that some processes work better than others. The guidelines or ‘best practices’ contained in these pages are designed to help a range of players - First Nations, federal negotiators, other public officials etc. - reach co-management agreements by keeping communities involved in the process.

Co-management is a concept that is hard to define, since it means different things to different people in different cultures. The ‘best practices’ outlined in these pages use the following definition of co-management, which arose from a number of different jurisdictions representing various cultures:

Co-management involves stakeholders working together to manage a resource in a sustainable way that achieves the goals of all parties consistent with their roles. Co-management does not imply legislative authority, jurisdiction, or devolution.

II Methodology

Several sources were used to develop the following ‘best practices’ in co-management. These include the relevant literature, existing agreements, national and international case studies, the researchers’ experience, and consultations with experts. Co-management exists throughout the world, not only in Canada. Even so, there is no easy ‘cookbook’ approach to co-management. The best that can be done for people engaged in making co-management arrangements is to provide guidelines such as those in this book. Good judgement will still be needed to apply them to appropriate situations.

This publication’s guidelines have been reviewed for validity, accuracy and to check their practical applicability by First Nations representatives and resource users, and by officials of federal and provincial levels of government.

III Other Issues

One important issue that is only partly addressed in this report and its guidelines is the role of women in co-management. This subject is only raised in connection with discussions about community involvement, and in one or two other areas. It needs to be pointed out that it is not only the men who live in First Nations communities who are affected by issues of ownership, control, economic development, resource management, and more effective management. Also, important value differences can exist in how men and women view resources.

Often, by looking at the perceptions and values of *both* men and women, it is possible to develop more effective and efficient management regimes that are creative and unique to the resource-users involved. For example, many women in First Nations communities are more familiar with the berry patches and medicine than the men. As a result, the women would have a better understanding of the need to protect these areas from resource extraction activities. First Nations communities across

Canada are beginning to deal with these issues, including value differences. We need to find ways to further address these issues in some broad manner.

IV Organization of this Report

This report begins with a preliminary discussion of all the phases of co-management agreements, namely: pre-negotiation, negotiation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Strategies for community involvement are then discussed, including how to get people to participate, planning meetings, the groups to specifically invite into co-management processes, the processes involved in successful meetings, and various activities to be undertaken—including the role of people in various age-groups, such as schoolchildren, youths and Elders.

The development of what needs to be considered at the pre-negotiating stage then follows, including a few points about the involvement of consultants and some of the structures involved in co-management (advisory boards, management boards, joint decision-making boards).

The next section provides guidelines and hints on a range of issues related to co-management negotiations themselves, including some thoughts about stakeholder issues, financing, and more on the role of outside consultants.

The report closes with two bibliographical Appendices. The first is devoted to Aboriginal co-management principles and practices, and it looks at some important recent literature on co-management in Canada, the United States and elsewhere around the world.

The second Appendix has been put together for those who may need to look beyond these pages for material for a variety of reasons. This long piece sifts through what has been researched on subjects

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

as varied as interpersonal conflicts at the negotiating table and pilot projects in watershed management. Its main advantage to negotiators is in its brief summaries that will quickly familiarize those looking for further guidance on discussion strategies or even to back up some point on a specific area of resource co-management. Readers are advised to glance through this last Appendix at the outset for a sense of the literature this publication is partly based on, and to get an idea of what other support they can get through libraries.

B. PHASES OF A CO-MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

There are various stages to co-management agreements, beginning long before negotiations start to well after they are over. All of these stages are essential, and they need the attention and work of negotiation teams and volunteer helpers. As these pages show, every stage also requires some involvement from the whole community.

This section deals with every stage in co-management agreements except the negotiation process itself, which requires a section of its own. But it is very important to bear in mind that no negotiation is likely to succeed unless proper attention is paid to the other stages, and without carrying out the work that these other stages require.

I Before the Negotiation Stage

The co-management process usually comes after one of the following things happens, or after a combination of them takes place:

1. A management problem is identified, and the people concerned, or '*stakeholders*,' agree that there is a problem. The problem may result from a real or perceived shortage in some resource, the extraction of resources by organizations with little or no community involvement, a territory dispute between user groups, a change in land ownership, or some other factor;
2. discussions or negotiations about land claims/self-government determine that some resource will be co-managed; or
3. an agreement is reached that settles a question about treaty land entitlement, a land claim, and/or self government

The land base under discussion may be on reserve/settlement land, or it may include lands that are off-reserve/settlement that are treated by Aboriginal people as traditional territory or some category of Crown land, such as provincial crown land.

Once such a problem is recognized, Aboriginal people may become involved with the other stakeholders to discuss or negotiate some solution to the problem.

II The Negotiation Stage

The negotiation process is the business of a negotiation team that is put together for the purpose. This stage is complex and it sometimes requires the use of special strategies, research, some professionals, etc. As indicated, another section of this publication will deal with this stage in detail. However, some important points of general significance will be raised here.

Open communications with the community The stage before negotiations requires that full and open communication exist between: chief and council; the elected leadership and community stakeholders such as the Elders and hunters/trappers; and community residents themselves.

In many cases in the past, the views of community leaders have not been based on what community residents themselves wanted. *Community resentment has often resulted when leadership has been influenced by outsiders, as well as when the community's opinion does not influence the representatives who are negotiating.*

This has often led to breakdowns in negotiations between First Nations and government/industry stakeholders, as representatives lost the confidence of the people they were representing. Steps should be taken to make sure that, if at all possible, this is avoided.

‘Sounding out’ the community *It is necessary to go back repeatedly to the community and the people to verify the positions taken at the negotiating table, and to share new information the negotiators get.* If there is two-way feedback with community residents—such as Elders, hunters and trappers, and others who wish to participate—there is less chance that positions will be taken that may not get the support of the community.

This verification, or two-way communication, does not have to slow down negotiations; it can be built into the negotiation timetable—and it always should be factored into the process.

Community involvement can help Besides, community discussions can be very helpful to negotiations. Efforts to common areas of agreement that are common to all the stakeholders (an essential aspect of negotiating strategy, as we will see later) can benefit from the input of the community. Negotiators can get caught up in the detail of the discussions, and it sometimes takes outsiders to the process to be able to see both the trees and the forest.

In one negotiations process in the Yukon involving First Nations people and resource users (outfitters, agriculturalists and fishermen), the Elders helped by insisting that everyone work together, in ways that were not confrontational. This was hard at first, but an agreement was reached that satisfied everyone. The resources are now protected and used sustainably, the integrity of the stakeholders has been kept and developed, and all stakeholders now work together comfortably.

Where to hold negotiations It is very useful to have co-management discussions and negotiations located in communities, rather than in urban centres. This allows for effective community involvement processes, and it gives the other stakeholders, such as government and industry, a special opportunity to work in the community and see how resources are used.

III Implementation

Once an agreement is signed, it is not the end of the co-management process. An agreement is only as good as the paper it is written on if it is not implemented properly.

One way to ensure a good chance of success is to keep the community involved in the implementation of co-management agreements. It is just as important as keeping residents involved during the discussion and negotiation phases. It is never possible to negotiate a *perfect* agreement, and various problems can arise during implementation. Creative solutions to problems can be reached if the community has been kept involved, is up to date on what is going on, is consulted, and is able to contribute to solutions.

- ! *Keep the Elders involved at all stages.* The intensity of involvement during implementation will not be as great as it was during discussions and negotiations, but it is important to keep Elders informed and to ask for their opinions. (More on this later)

- ! *Hunters, trappers and fishermen will, in all likelihood, remain involved and be part of the implementation process.* This is because they are very likely to have a direct role in the management of fish and wildlife, for example. They may also have a role in forest management, as logging activity has a direct impact on traplines.

- ! Resource management must be thought of in terms of an integrated or holistic framework that considers other resources, not as the management of resources considered in isolation.

In the past, governments have done a substantial amount of data gathering and analysis on behalf of both government(s) and First Nations. A tremendous amount of work has also been done by industry in terms of working on plans for the development of mines, exploration, hydro electric and other development activities. The implementation phase of the co-management agreement could provide

for much of this data collection to be done cooperatively by First Nations, government, and industry.

From time to time, First Nations will also need technical assistance to review material that is obtained from government and industry. The co-management agreement should make provisions for this.

! *How implementation is done will be determined through the co-management agreement itself.* As a rule, agreements will include the following components:

- | | |
|--|--|
| ➤ the area to be managed; | ➤ resources to be managed; |
| ➤ financing of the agreement; | ➤ enforcement; |
| ➤ monitoring and evaluation; | ➤ board and committee structures; |
| ➤ roles and responsibilities of boards and committees; | ➤ membership of boards and committees; |
| ➤ training procedures and requirements; | ➤ annual allowable harvests; |
| ➤ planning for special areas (e.g., heritage sites); | ➤ protecting conservation areas; |
| ➤ protecting traditional areas; and | ➤ permits and licensing. |

The elements or components of every agreement depend on the area and the resource(s) that will be managed. No matter how many components there are in an agreement, or precisely what they are about, some attention must also be given at the negotiation phase to worksheets:

! *Implementation worksheets should be part of negotiations toward the co-management agreement.* Such worksheets, for example, should deal with the following information: the subject; the activity/project; the participants; the activities themselves broken down into components, including the timing; planning assumptions and funding.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- ! These worksheets also provide a framework to monitor the progress of the agreement's implementation, and to evaluate the co-management itself. While this sounds like a lot of information to consider at the negotiating stage, it is much easier to work these things out before the agreement is in place and problems have come up.

IV Monitoring

The co-management agreement needs to be monitored to make sure that it is effective, and for a number of other reasons, such as that the terms negotiated are being carried out, that funding is sufficient to implement the agreement, to bring problems forward before they worsen or lead to the collapse of the agreement, etc. This includes not only monitoring the use of the resource, but internal monitoring of information flow and availability.

These are some examples of how monitoring can be done:

- ! Stakeholders should think about the monitoring process before finalizing the agreement.
- ! Keeping proper records and setting up an infrastructure at the community level to handle the information coming in is key to every successful monitoring process.

This can be as simple as keeping a filing cabinet for incoming co-management material, and setting up a system to divide issues into categories such as forestry, watersheds, and so forth. Cross-referencing—where files that fit into more than one category are noted more than once—is also very helpful. Since resource co-management is based on principles of integration, it does not make sense to try to keep activities in one file without noting them in another.

- ! A computer data base can be useful for monitoring activities.

When you mention computers, people often think: this is going to be costly and complicated. Not so: Keeping track of what is going on in co-management does not have to be expensive or difficult. It is *not* keeping good track of what is going on that is likely to end up being extremely costly and difficult to repair.

Initially, a system set up to regulate licenses and permits could use existing government systems. From an administrative point of view, traplines can be managed with the same system that handles community-based information such as registration, harvest numbers, and so on. Failing that, rather than starting up new systems, those existing systems can often be expanded or adapted for the new purpose. Logging and other forestry activities could also be adapted for the purposes of trapline conservation and compensation.

Forest management planning can benefit if the person responsible for monitoring posts harvest reports that note the condition of the logging site, if operating conditions have been fulfilled, and any other comments that can be easily kept on community computers.

! *An individual at the local level who is dedicated to the management of files, reports, correspondence, and so forth, can be extremely helpful.*

This is important since it is easy to misplace files—and that can be very costly. Also, as more than one individual will implement the co-management agreement, it is important to keep a set of files that is simple to understand; otherwise, people needing the information will not be able to get it.

! Monitoring resources such as wildlife should be negotiated through the co-management agreement itself. Depending on the activity and the area to be covered, costs associated with this may vary greatly.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- ! *Co-management agreements often overlook enforcement, although this is a major aspect of monitoring.* Enforcement costs vary according to the area to be covered and the resource to be monitored. For example, helicopter time to cover a large area can be very expensive. First Nations must make sure that the enforcement provisions spelled out in a co-management agreement can actually be carried out, and that adequate funds are set down for the job.

- ! *Licensing, granting permits, and tagging are also ways of monitoring agreements.* It is important to keep records that provide data over time on wildlife, individuals hunting, total harvests, and so on. These records should be available as required, by computer or paper copies.

V Evaluation

Targets for evaluation can be built right into the co-management agreement. They should be carefully reviewed to determine if the objectives and goals of the agreement can be met.

Targets for evaluation should be the parts of the agreement that are likely to benefit the stakeholders, and whether expected outcomes have been met. Examples of this include: the effectiveness of board management structures with measurable indicators; financial cost-effectiveness and -efficiency; time lines for completing tasks, etc. Evaluations should be undertaken periodically—perhaps every three to five years. They should be done by an outside professional who is has nothing to do with implementing the co-management agreement.

C. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT STRATEGIES

This section suggests some activities that may help get co-management negotiations underway. They should not be read as a simple list of ingredients: The recipe also calls for some good judgement and appropriate ideas. Each particular co-management situation will reveal how and to what extent these guidelines apply. These suggestions can be taken apart and used individually, as needed.

It is very important to make sure that the whole community is involved in the co-management process. This point cannot be made too often, as it is key to success. This includes making sure the community is involved in: pre-negotiation discussions; negotiation processes and discussions; implementation; and monitoring.¹

All sectors of a community must be consulted and considered in discussions about co-management negotiations.

Aboriginal political leaders clearly represent their constituencies. But it has been shown time and time again that when those leaders move forward and develop agreements without the ongoing support of their people, there is a strong chance that those agreements will fail for lack of support at the local level.

Another thing that is very important is to accept that not everyone will agree with every solution proposed, decision made, nor course of action taken. Even so, it is reasonable to expect cooperation and compromise.

¹ Many documents in print talk about community involvement and ways to involve community residents in development. Several are listed in the bibliographies at the end of this report, and they should also be consulted. Some examples are: Baldwin and Cervinkas 1991; Davis Case 1989, 1990; Freudenberger 1994; Messerschmidt 1993; Molnar 1989; Thomson 1992.

It must also be recognized that many people may seem uninterested until they are actively brought into discussions, and it may take some effort to do this. For those who plan to prepare meetings related to resource co-management, the following pages suggest ways to help get the community involved.

I How to Get People Participating in Co-Management Discussions

At the start, it may be very hard to get people to come to meetings and to talk about resource management in a large, wide-open community meeting. There are a few ways to encourage them to show up and take part; whether they are suitable depends on the community and its special circumstances:

a) The Public/Large-Group Meeting

In some communities, the best approach to start a project is to hold a large public meeting. It does not matter if the meeting is called for practical reasons or to satisfy political requirements (for example, because some rule says it has to be held at some particular stage). If a meeting needs to take place, hold it.

The best way to make sure that a meeting will be useful is to be sure you make it clear what it is all about, and do this well ahead of time. There are many ways to do this: community radio announcements, posters, and even asking a few key people to spread the word to others about the coming meeting. Use every way you can to advertise the meeting and its purpose.

By clearly advertising the purpose of a meeting ahead of time, the focus will stay on the issue of resource co-management. Depending on the stage of negotiations, there might be several

reasons why a community needs to be gathered in a large group to talk about co-management. Meetings are often called to:

- M give and receive information;
- M discuss co-management and resource sharing issues that are of relevance to the community;
- M attempt some community consensus of the issues;
- M help to identify problems and solutions; and
- M plan future activities.

There are many benefits to holding a large public meeting, including:

- ✓ a large number of people can be reached at one time—to announce some development, get their opinions, or for any other reason—and several goals can be achieved relatively quickly;
- ✓ anyone who wants to participate is being invited, and can join in; and
- ✓ small group meetings can be arranged for later, in order to gather together people who want to discuss a particular problem, or those who have trouble speaking up at large meetings.

b) Small Group Meetings

Small group meetings may be useful for various special sectors of community populations. Age sectors, for example, including Elders, schoolchildren, youths, etc. They may also be useful to community organizations such as: local education committees, hunters and trappers committees, fishermen, women's support groups, health and social development committees, councils, and others. It can be helpful, for the purposes of co-management discussions, to break down a community and to assemble in smaller gatherings. It makes the job of community involvement in resource management more manageable, and participation is made easier for those who are not likely to speak up in a big meeting. All community residents are likelier to get involved in the decision-making, and that they can provide very relevant information to negotiators. Small group meetings often help negotiators to get the best information in support of the positions they will take during co-management negotiations.

c) Planning Meetings

People planning a meeting should ask themselves:

- ✓ **What is the best time and place for it?** Arrange a good time and place for your meeting. Consider the time-frames of those who may attend. For example, a mid-afternoon meeting on a weekday will probably not suit those with 9-5 jobs, with small children, etc.
- ✓ **Is everyone being given enough warning?** Once a time and place for the meeting have been established, provide notice without delay. Make sure it is well ahead of time.
- ✓ **How to get discussions rolling?** Some strategy to encourage discussions should be in place. This can be done through a very short slide show—for example, pictures of relevant logging activities, hunting activities, etc.—about the resource being discussed, or on co-management generally. Make sure to make this a two-way communication. It does not work very well if one individual stands at the front of a group of people to ‘lecture’ them about the issues.
- ✓ **Who is the best person to manage the meeting?** Someone with experience in working with meetings could ‘facilitate’ its progress. This is very important, as there may be factions in communities (for example, women) who may not want to speak up. Good facilitators will know how to help. For instance, the people in these ‘factions’ might be gathered for discussions in smaller groups, and their opinions could be brought back to the larger meeting.
- ✓ **How to make sure the discussion stays on track?** People with agendas that have nothing to do with co-management may want to bring forward those other concerns. This is another good reason for a strong facilitator who can suggest that these individuals may want to call another meeting on their particular issues. This requires a balance of sensitivity and strength.

- ✓ **What mechanism will be used to record the results of the meeting?** Some planning should be devoted to how input from the meeting will be registered or recorded. Will votes be taken on motions? How will votes be counted? Will results be registered more informally? How? Who will act as secretary? Some mechanisms should be in place to take care of these considerations. This will make people in the audience feel that their time has been well spent, their input is appreciated, and that it may influence the co-management proceedings. Otherwise, they may not attend the next meeting .

- ✓ **How comfortable will people be?** For example, serving coffee and tea might make things less formal, encouraging people to feel that the meeting is geared for them, and that they should volunteer their opinions, offer to help, etc. Also, getting volunteers to arrange some day care service (which should be advertised) can also help you to end up with a successful meeting.

II Involving Community Elders, Hunters/Trappers, Fishermen, and Other Resource Users

In some communities, it might be best to begin co-management meetings with the participation of community Elders, hunters and trappers, or with a community’s council of Elders or the local

When Elders and hunters and trappers take part in meetings, there is a greater chance of success with discussions—both practically and politically. They are likely to raise the level of meetings with well-informed opinions on issues, and with knowledge about resource and land use that might help to co-manage them effectively.

hunters/trappers’ council, if these exist. The contributions of Elders should be valued, since these people are familiar with the history of land use and occupancy, and they have seen changes happen over the years. For their part, hunters and trappers of any age have a unique and current knowledge of the land, as well as a knowledge of the past. Elders, hunters and trappers also usually

provide special information to help protect and manage areas of special significance.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Both groups have an ‘edge’ that few others have, and they should be consulted for their rich backgrounds.

Experienced negotiators suggest that it might help to start talking to a core group of Elders and hunters/trappers. After that, arrangements should be made to include *all* Elders and hunters/trappers.

In some communities, there is a large gap between the activities of political leadership and the role of Elders to begin projects with the Elders. This gap often has to do with economic development initiatives that involve resource extraction. In some cases, the Elders view Chiefs and Councils as moving too fast into economic development and business enterprises. Whether this is true or not, the feeling often becomes the reality. In either case, it is best to solicit the advice of the political leadership and other interested community members to determine the best approach to take.

The following general ideas may help get your community Elders, hunters/trappers and ordinary people from the community involved in co-management discussion meetings:

a) Be Clear about the Purpose of Meetings

- ✓ Meetings should always be called for a specific purpose. One important purpose at the very beginning of negotiations is to discuss why a co-management agreement to manage resources is needed in the first place. This may be clear to the people involved, but the community probably does not know ...and it needs to.
- ✓ These meetings can involve a large number of people, or a smaller, select group that wants to focus specifically on resource management.
- ✓ Meetings should be designed to share common problems and a common purpose. Managing resources in ways that are sustainable may be the common problem or issue. The common

purpose or goal may be to protect the environment and resources for future generations, and so to provide for long-term economic development.

b) Why Resource co-Management?

- ✓ Begin by discussing the importance of co-managing resources in the current political and economic scene.
- ✓ Provide time for Elders to take the opportunity to express their views on what the community faces.

c) Defining ‘Co-Management’

- ✓ A good starting point is to ask the people participating to give their own definitions of ‘co-management’ and the ‘management of resources.’
- ✓ It may help to return to the issue of defining co-management throughout the discussion process.
- ✓ Questions of language may become important. Many Elders, hunters and trappers may not consider that words such as ‘management’ and ‘harvesting’ are appropriate to their relationship with the land and resources.
- ✓ People should have the opportunity to express their concerns. These discussions will help sharpen the community’s understanding of what they consider to be ‘co-management.’ That, in turn, should help negotiators take some of the community’s views to the negotiating table.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- ✓ Sometimes people do not want to speak their minds in front of others. It may help to have discussions in small groups of Elders, hunters/trappers, and other people from the community. The results may then be shared by re-assembling in the larger group.

d) The Advice of Elders

- ✓ Get advice from Elders, parents and others with experience on how best to approach other factions of the community—for example, school-age children and youths—on issues of resource management and resource sharing.
- ✓ Often the Elders really enjoy working directly with the children. Recruit Elders to help with the tasks the community will need to get done.
- ✓ The involvement of Elders to reach the community's children will help bridge the age gap between them, promoting a better understanding and appreciation of each other.
- ✓ If Elders work with children, children will also get the benefit of furthering their oral traditions, and learning their history from people who have lived those traditions and history. This is an opportunity for learning additional skills, and it helps develop creative ideas on management.

e) Direct Participation of Elders and Hunters/Trappers in Activities

Mapping. Elders and hunters/trappers are essential to mapping relevant lands—which is often a cornerstone of co-management agreement negotiations. Mapping helps to document the history of the community. These considerations should be kept in mind during meetings that take care of mapping:

- M Most information gathered through the mapping exercise is obtained from the Elders, so it will sometimes be necessary to work in native languages.
- M Mapping might need to monitor changes in land use, to plan and design habitat protection, and to evaluate changes in land use through comparison.
- M Proper mapping makes sure that conflicts over land allocation are avoided or addressed before negotiations begin. This provides a special opportunity for the people in a community to actually see the linkages and inter-relationships in land use patterns.
- M Questions that may be asked include information on: traplines and cabins; waterfowl habitat; moose, deer, and elk areas; traditional and current trail systems; heritage areas; grave sites; hay meadows; medicine areas; fish spawning areas; place names; changes in community/reserve boundaries; traditional territory boundaries; etc.
- M Mapping includes not only paper maps that are sketched by people (and later drawn by cartographers for printing), but also photographs taken from the air. Aerial photographs, as they are called, can provide a historical perspective of the changes in land use and formations over time.

How is Mapping Done?

- ✓ The first step is to introduce the idea of maps, mapping, and aerial photographs to small groups of roughly 5-7 people. These groups could be made up of community representatives. Or maybe a few sessions could be organized with a few factions of

Co-management of resources should always be done in an integrated manner. This means that the animals, forest, watersheds, birds and all other aspects of ecosystems must all be considered, because changes in one part of the system affect the other parts. Maps are helpful to show these interrelationships clearly.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

the community. For example, one introductory session with the Elders and another introduction section with the hunters and trappers, etc.

- ✓ If you are using aerial photographs or maps, common landmarks need to be identified first. These include the community names for lakes, rivers, roads, etc. Other areas can then be identified according to the other landmarks. You will need to have a specialist at the meetings who can help interpret the photographs for everyone there.
- ✓ Often, there will already be many maps available in a community if land claims discussions are progressing or have been settled. The information available on these maps should be examined in order to avoid doing the same work twice. These maps should be kept in a safe place, but they should be made available to those participating in mapping for co-management.
- ✓ It is very helpful to obtain maps in a variety of scales that represent the area to be co-managed. For example, in a First Nations forestry management project that involves both on and off-reserve land, it will probably be useful to look at: 1. provincial base line maps; 2. 1:50,000 scale forest cover maps of the area; 3. 1:15,000 scale maps of the townships covered; and 4. resource access maps, that reflect activities related to oil and gas, seismic work, pipelines, etc. These maps would also provide a good overview of the lakes, rivers and streams as well as significant spawning areas.

Life Histories. Sitting with the Elders individually and recording their life histories often helps to prepare for the co-management process.

- ✓ Elders may be asked specific questions relevant to their lives as individuals, families, and community members. They may be directed to tell stories about the area to be co-managed; on the history of their traplines and other land-use subjects, or asked for their views on

concepts of land and resource protection and conservation. Some sessions might be left open to any other relevant topics the elder wishes to explore.

- ✓ The interviewer working with the Elders, usually a community resident, may find it helpful to tape the discussions. Nothing is missed this way, and the elder's account is in his or her own words. If an individual is not comfortable with the use of a tape recorder, then the interviewer must take handwritten notes.

Life histories provide information for the community that can be used in various ways. For example, many stories about the community that would be lost can be preserved on tape and copied onto paper. The Elders' stories of the land use and other traditional knowledge can be used to develop education curricula for use by First Nations teachers and schools. These life histories can also be published in books the community can consult for teaching and to educate non-native people about community life.

Co-management as a Vehicle. This is a community participation exercise that can be a fun learning experience, and everyone can take part in it. Groups of 4-5 people are gathered to become familiar with some key ideas in co-management. A facilitator equipped with flipchart paper and coloured markers, or even a blackboard and chalk, can begin by asking: "If co-management were a vehicle, what would it look like?"

The facilitator will then briefly explain: For example, someone might say the wheels of the vehicle could represent the Chief and Council, since they move the vehicle along. The headlights could represent the Elders' advisory committee, as they guide the community through bad weather. The body of the vehicle might represent the community as a whole. The roads where the vehicle travels could represent trails and traplines. The engine of the vehicle could represent the hunters and trappers. And so forth. The object is to get people thinking about the concepts involved in co-

management and co-management. Being tomorrow's community, including its leaders, they will have to manage the lands and traditional territories after the agreement's negotiators are gone.

It is very important for both children and youths to have an active role in co-management discussions. The young will often see relationships between animals, trees, water, fish and birds that may escape the attention of adults. Involving them also increases community discussion about co-management, as our young bring home the ideas they are gathering, and they share them.

The following ideas aim to help get children and youths involved. The methods are geared toward developing their interest in co-management now and in the future.

a) Permission to work with the children. The first step should be to obtain leadership approval to approach the children in the school about the issue of co-management.

b) Involving Others. Once approval is given, the local education authority should be approached and asked to help. They might suggest the best approach for meeting the children to discuss the issues.

Secondly, the principal of the community school could also be contacted. This contact is important to make sure that the education administration plays a part in supporting the children's involvement in the project. Make sure that all these bases are covered; keep in mind that the teachers will very likely want to help in working with the children.

c) Public Meetings with Special Invitations to Parents. A public meeting for interested parents could also be held, even if only a few come, to explain what the co-management project is about. As a result, not only would the parents be informed, but they may also put forward some of their own ideas. Again: cover all the bases.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Scheduling is very important. Notices about what the project with the children is about should also be put up in the community, and with plenty of advance warning. A meeting that is not properly announced is bound to disappoint.

d) Participation of Schoolchildren and Youths in Activities. Presentations to children in their classes have to be geared to their age groups. To be of any value, presentations need to be ‘pitched right’ so as to interest their audiences. For example, children in grades 1 - 2 should be approached in very different ways from those in grades 7-8. Again: teachers can be very helpful with advice about presentations; and so can parents. They should be consulted beforehand, by public notice, phone and in person.

Videos and Films. Videos on Aboriginal forestry, hunting, and other activities involving land use could be shown and discussed. One afternoon a week, for example, could be set aside for “co-management” videos that would begin to focus the attention of children to resource management appropriate to their age.

Whenever possible, show videos with Aboriginal role models—showing kids what they, too, can do.

Maps. Small maps are also very useful tools for discussing co-management with children of any age.

M For example, forestry cut block maps are coloured by the foresters to demonstrate the different stages of logging, such as what areas have been cut, how long ago, what areas are to be cut next year, etc. The actual forestry map could be hung in the classroom and then children given their own sections of the map to colour.

M In one community, each child had his/her own section of map to colour any way they wanted to colour it. They each signed their name to the bottom of the map. Each section was joined

to the other with tape, and the entire management area was hung in the school for the community to see.

Story-Telling. Bring the Elders into classrooms to tell children stories about their community's history and land use. This involves the community's youth in co-management discussions in ways that often work very well. Combine this with hikes and field trips to berry-picking patches, hunting areas, etc.

M Have the Elders talk to the children about the importance of trees, birds, animals, fish, etc., to the community's way of life, and to explain how they, the children, will soon be responsible for the land. This too, can be very effective to give a sense of involvement, responsibility and pride about the resources to be co-managed.

M When the Elders tell stories of their childhood, their play areas and games, what they learned from their parents, and so forth, they can also be very effective in relating the importance of resource management.

M Recording these discussions also has the side benefit of providing the community with a valuable 'library' of community information that might otherwise never be recorded. This can be useful for curriculum development, presentations, funding applications, and other community purposes.

Field trips. All children like to take a break from the classroom for hikes and field trips. Make an effort to combine them with visits not only to land use areas, but to other areas where resources may be processed or used. People in industry are usually very cooperative.

M Field trips might even include helicopter flights when aerial photographs are being taken.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- M** Community residents should consider training to take over the jobs—and what better way than by encouraging school children? They are beginning to make decisions on their future, and about the uses of their education, so trips to field sites are particularly important. The community’s future economic development can be improved by encouraging the young to enter training programs, university programs, or other management programs related to the resource co-management.

- M** Children do often go camping and hunting with their families, but it is important to make field trips that are more formal. Taking the children as a group to a fish spawning area, for example, with a knowledgeable elder, adds to the importance of the place and the activity.

- M** Most people—including children—can grasp the ideas in ‘resource co-management’ more easily and better when they are actually present at the site listening to a person they respect talk about the resources.

- M** Field trips should be held on an ongoing basis. This keeps people’s interest up, maintains community involvement, and provides information that is current, or constantly updated. This last gives people a sense of what it takes to co-manage, and that it is a task that undergoes changes and has its own seasons.

Picture Drawing. Pictures can be produced easily. School-age children love to draw and can benefit educationally from this type of exercise.

- M** Drawings could include: what our community looked like when my grandfather was a little boy; what our community is like now; and what our community might look like when I am old. Pictures could also be of animals, traplines, fishing, etc.

- M** When completed, drawings can be hung in the school or community hall for everyone to see.

M This activity increases community awareness about co-management, as children will be talking to their parents and friends about what they are doing. Also, children may get a sense of the importance of resource management issues, as they are actively contributing to the community.

Organizers of activities should always consider the age group of the participants. High school youths are not going to be interested in colouring maps and signing their names, for example. But they *are* likely to be interested in learning how to read maps and what they mean.

Again, taking high school students out on field trips to potential job sites, and helping them learn how to read maps, gives them an awareness of their community and about the complexity of co-management. They also broaden their horizons and gain some skills. They are likely to learn about the tasks involved in co-management, such as monitoring wildlife patterns while hunting and trapping, etc.—as well as if they might want to pursue further education to work at map-making, piloting helicopters, etc.

IV Involving the Community as Whole

Co-management is sometimes difficult for many community residents to accept. Many do not feel they have any opportunity to influence and change things—perhaps because they feel that government and industry will not listen anyway. It is very important to undertake activities and discussions that reach as many members of the community as possible. This takes effort and time, but it is worthwhile.

It is also possible that, no matter what you do, some community members will never be happy. Sometimes, those who do not like something will complain to others instead of attending meetings and taking part in activities. This should not discourage the organizers; they should continue to their best to keep people informed and participating.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Even so, problems are often solved by sitting down with individuals over tea and providing them with a chance to be heard. *This could be one of the first steps taken toward resolving conflict.*

a) **Semi-Structured Interviews** provide a way to inform people, to gather some community opinions on issues, and to work toward solving problems.

- ✓ These interviews allow for focused, two-way conversation or dialogue. The conversation starts with general topics or questions, and the dialogue goes on from there to more specific issues.
- ✓ Those being interviewed should be encouraged to ask the interviewer questions too. The replies will often provide not just answers, but the reasons behind them.
- ✓ People being interviewed are likely to discuss sensitive or political issues frankly if they are not in a group and if they are in an informal, comfortable place—such as their own kitchens.
- ✓ In this setting, field staff can get to know community members (if the staff are not from the community), and community members will also get to know field staff.
- ✓ Depending on the topic and the community, it may be advisable to use outsiders for interviewing. They might be seen as more objective by those who are in disagreement about an issue.

b) Environmental Assessment (Not to be confused with environmental hearings)

These are used to get information that will look at the real and perceived environmental effects of resource management activities. All co-managed areas must be looked at from an environmental perspective.

- ✓ Holding meetings with concerned community members gives individuals a chance to voice their concerns and put forward their ideas on how to improve the management of resources.
- ✓ Issues that are raised may include the potentially negative and positive environmental impact of activities, and raising ‘warning flags’ for environmental factors which are potentially negative.
- ✓ Discussing these issues will help develop a community environment assessment framework that will help the negotiators of the co-management agreement. Discussions will also help to bring forward and deal with any community problems before they become major obstacles.
- ✓ A good starting point for such discussions might be to use a chart that people might contribute to. The chart could include as many categories or areas of discussion as the community members feel are relevant. These could include:

➤ fisheries;	➤ wildlife;
➤ vegetation;	➤ water;
➤ soil;	➤ forests;
➤ traplines; and	➤ traditional and current trails.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- ✓ Discussion can then begin about each category. The overall impact, benefits, and problems could be brought forward and discussed, and noted down on a chart. Each category might

- very positive impact;
- some, but limited positive impact;
- no effect, no impact;
- some definite, but limited negative impact; or
- very specific or extensive negative impact.

be ranked in terms of the positive and negative impact of the planned co-management, as well as the short- and long-term impact. Rankings could include items such as those in this box.

- ✓ Leave room for new categories and questions that might come up during the discussions.
- ✓ This method gets people and groups involved on an ongoing basis. It also provides systematic and consistent value judgements which can be compared over time.

D. PREPARING FOR NEGOTIATIONS: WHAT TO EXPECT

Negotiating strategies are unique to each negotiation, and they are often developed as the issues arise. No strategy is always right, and none applies to every negotiation. This is true for land claims negotiations, self-government negotiations, and co-management negotiations.

Even so, a First Nation may pave the way for its strategy by realizing that some basic issues affecting negotiations must be handled sensitively and appropriately. This section deals with some of the issues that often arise in some shape during negotiations; some suggestions will be made about a general approach to negotiations. In closing, the co-management structures for after agreements are reached will be discussed.

These pages should not be treated as a kind of recipe for negotiations. Instead, its aim is to help prepare negotiators for some broad issues that may obstruct negotiations, and what to do about them. Guidelines about actual negotiations occupy the following section, although basic principles about cooperation and fairness leading to co-management arise in connection with these issues.

I Background on the Scientific and Aboriginal Knowledge Bases for Negotiations

For many years, Aboriginal people were not recognized as having valid knowledge that was applicable to resource management. Management decisions were based on the data or ‘scientific’ knowledge

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

the different kinds of trees, their diseases, and re-planting trees that were taken by logging. It did not consider the relationship of people to the trees and the value of trees for things other than logging. This kind of knowledge also failed to consider the effects of logging on traditional Aboriginal ways of life, such as trapping and traplines.

In short, a key problem that negotiators often face turns on the unlikelihood that these knowledge bases can ever be bridged so as to lead to a satisfactory agreement through which all stakeholders can benefit. A second also apparently unsolvable problem that often surfaces in co-management discussions is about different ideas surrounding people's relationship to the land and its resources. Both problems are closely related, since they have to do with different views about people's basic relationship to the world, our place within it, and how we come to know it.

II Background on Land Use, Occupancy and Ownership

Land and the resources in and on that land are seen in different ways by First Nations people, government and industry representatives. When lands under discussion are off-reserve, for example, First Nations may often have the right to use them without having legal ownership. As a result, the meaning of 'unoccupied crown land' is often confusing to First Nations people. To non-Aboriginal people some land may appear to be unoccupied, while to First Nations people it is very much occupied and used in both traditional and current ways if it is being used for subsistence pursuits such as hunting, trapping, and fishing.

The provincial crown is said to own the land on behalf of the general public. Yet animals and trees do not recognize reserve boundaries. As a result, in order to gain economically from their resources First Nations often need agreements to go on using lands considered to be traditional territory. For its part, industry may obtain licenses and agreements with provinces to extract resources from that land, or it may work in partnership with First Nations to do this.

All provincial lands and resources have been held in trust for the good of all people, and the single, scientific basis for the government's knowledge of both land and resources is very closely related to how it has been treated. Decisions have generally been based on what the general population was thought to want. Since it was viewed as an accumulation or bank of resources to be exploited for the common 'good,' the role of government has often been to ensure that forests were cleared to produce land for agriculture, trees were extracted for logging, rivers were dammed for irrigation and other uses, animal populations such as wolves were controlled by artificial means, etc.

Little of this considered or reflected the best ways to manage an area for Aboriginal use. What the government and scientists did not realize was that Aboriginal people had been acting as stewards of the land and resources for centuries. These Canadians had substantial knowledge of the resources, forests, animals, birds and fish from an integrated perspective that the others did not have.

To illustrate the difficulty, let us consider some broad viewpoints that might representatives of these groups might put forward. These stands are not meant to reflect negotiations, which are usually much more complex than this; they merely provide instances of views that could be held by the stakeholders.

First Nation negotiators might see land use as something tied very closely to their daily lives, spiritual beliefs, and the future of their children. Further, they do not see land as something to be owned, but to be cared for. Each animal has a unique relationship to the land, to the people, and to other animals in the integrated natural system. No component of the system can be affected without affecting others. The interest is to maintain the resource and the land sustainably, and retain the way of life that is practiced on that land. It may also be desired to develop this in an economically sustainable way.

Government negotiators could see land, including the resources on it, as 'owned' by the federal or provincial crown for the public's common good. Government—representing both the interests of the

of computers and other written forms of communication, this traditional knowledge can be saved in a written record that can be used in addition to oral tradition.

In short, negotiators should remember that the knowledge brought forward by the First Nations stakeholders should be treated with as much validity as that brought forward by other stakeholders. Otherwise, it will not be possible to manage an area and/or resource cooperatively. In negotiating co-management agreements, it is very important that all stakeholders—Aboriginal, government, industry, and others—recognize the value that each knowledge base holds for resource management. One type of knowledge should not be valued as more worthwhile than the other. *Negotiations must try to make sure that all stakeholders recognize that both kinds of knowledge have their own value.*

Instruction in Aboriginal ways. A point related to the preceding ones and the one which follows is that once negotiations are underway it often becomes evident that non-Aboriginal individuals often need instruction or ‘cultural orientation’ on Aboriginal ways. This can be done most effectively through a team approach that includes someone not involved with any of the stakeholders as well as one individual representing the Aboriginal stakeholder.

The components of this instruction might include: traditional and current land use and occupancy; spiritual dimensions of the culture at issue and the regard for the land and resources; social structure and kinship systems, which is important to demonstrate interrelationships between individuals and the critical importance of the extended family; decision-making structures such as consensus and democratic forms; holistic management; and how all of these factors influence decision-making and co-management.

This discussion should also include the holistic world view of management held by First Nations, as contrasted with the more linear approach often taken by other stakeholders. For example, for the most part Aboriginal stakeholders prefer to get information on all aspects of management—its impact on the land, resources, economic development, culture, etc.—whereas other stakeholders may

prefer a more 'step-by-step' approach to co-management, dealing with first one area and then another. *These different approaches often meet head-on in preliminary discussions and negotiations.*

III Knowing the Issues

Negotiators must come to the table knowing the issues to be negotiated; this sounds simple, but it is not. Nothing is more frustrating and counter-productive than facing a representative of a stakeholder who does not clearly understand the issues. Reaching a successful co-management agreement and successful implementation terms depend as much on relationships between the stakeholders as on the institutions of management. A full knowledge by all parties of why everyone is there in the first place is the best start to good relationships.

Good relationships are bound to result from mutual respect, and that is only likely if representatives are skilled in the subjects under negotiation. Co-management discussions and ideas are handled best when representatives have hands-on experience in the right areas. This works both ways: for those who represent the interests of government, industry, and First Nations negotiators. Administrators should not be negotiating total allowable harvests, and hunters should not be assigned to haggle about mineral deposit extraction with mining engineers.

IV Other Issues Before Negotiations

One important point to keep in mind at the very beginning, while preparing for negotiations, is that *it is very useful to have co-management discussions and negotiations located in communities rather than in urban centres*. This provides a good opportunity for community involvement and also provides the other stakeholders, such as government and industry, with opportunities to work in the community and see how resources are used.

At certain stages it is useful to have a consultant involved in the co-management project who can act as a facilitator among the stakeholders. This may help where representatives are not at the stage where they are comfortable working regularly with one other. Communication can be facilitated and problems solved prior to coming to the table, provided there is someone that all parties can work with. This is not on a long term basis, but should be considered on an as-required basis.

These points pertain to the level of involvement of consultants, lawyers and other outsiders to the First Nations engaging in co-management negotiations:

DO NOT turn a community-based co-management process over to a consultant or lawyer. This results in cost inefficiencies and ineffectiveness. It is also not the point of co-management.

DO NOT undermine the position of the First Nation at the negotiating table by having an outside consultant negotiate on behalf of the First Nation.

DO NOT allow consultants, lawyers, and other resource people to determine the positions of the First Nation. Positions taken must be based on sound community-development principles and methods. Positions must not be based on what the consultant thinks the world should look like.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

DO use consultants and lawyers as resource people at negotiating sessions, if required.

They are there to advise the First Nation. They are not there to control the activities and positions of the First Nation.

DO use consultants when they are needed to facilitate the process of involvement, assist in sorting out problems and miscommunications, and work on special projects.

The following are a few important barriers to successful negotiating that representatives must prepare for before engaging in discussions:

Heads of Power. First Nation negotiators should be aware that differences arise not only with industry and government representatives. Differences also often exist between the federal government and provincial governments. In areas where the provinces have jurisdiction, it is very likely that federal government initiatives that do not recognize this will be soundly rejected. Provincial heads of power may not accept any proposed federal assumption that First Nations have rights and interests in off-reserve, ceded lands which had once been traditional lands—and which, from the First Nation’s perspective, may remain traditional lands

Clout. Successful co-management agreements can be developed and implemented only if government and industry stakeholders try to eliminate the temptation to bring their various legislative, financial, and political power bases to the negotiating table. Further, each of the stakeholders must try to reduce any possible direct or indirect messages that undermine principles of equality. Although the First Nation stakeholders do not usually have the political and financial power of government and industry, they are equal at the table in terms of knowledge and capability to manage resources.

Rhetoric. There is little place for rhetoric at the negotiating table, which is often used to try to equalize relationships between people who seldom treat one another equally. Rhetoric is difficult to

eliminate, as Aboriginal stakeholders often bring little political, legislative, or financial power to the table. However, treaty rights to hunt, trap and fish provide a legitimate basis for First Nations to be treated as equal partners in co-managing game and fish resources and habitat—and to avoid taking recourse in battles of rhetoric.

Use and Misuse of History. Problems can be avoided through a good understanding of the historical background of colonization, the treaties, the reserve and non-reserve system, and the beliefs of Aboriginal people and their special relationship with the land. As each co-management agreement deals with specific stakeholders, including different Aboriginal peoples, this understanding must be relevant to the culture of the stakeholders at the table.

The negotiations atmosphere may be affected by past events that have not been positive, or an unwillingness on the part of some stakeholders to participate in good faith at the table. People may misunderstand one another and get angry or upset. *If equal priority is given to traditional environmental knowledge, an effective atmosphere for negotiations and less chance of conflict and friction will be likely.*

V Co-management Structures

During co-management negotiations, the stakeholders involved will be working to reach agreements on a number of aspects or specific areas of the agreement; it is useful to do some preparation about these before negotiations begin. These areas or issues will differ according to the resource(s) to be co-managed and the size of the geographic area under consideration. It is usually easier to manage a smaller area than a larger one, particularly in terms of the provisions for monitoring and enforcement. Some typical examples of smaller issues or aspects of co-management agreements that typically consume negotiators' attention and efforts are:

- harvesting and quotas;

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- regulatory regimes;
- enforcement;
- the use and conservation of natural resources;
- the preservation of habitat;
- commercial developments;
- the creation of business opportunities for First Nations and other stakeholders;
- the creation of employment opportunities for First Nations and other stakeholders; and
- the impact of all of these factors both on and off settlement land in federal and provincial jurisdictions.

Getting co-management agreements about these (and other) areas of concern to negotiators often turn on discussions about the organizational structures that will help to implement them. In fact, it is not possible to have co-management implementation without appropriate co-management structures.

These structures are essential, and the agreement process must include negotiations about them. As with the issues that will be discussed during negotiations, these structures depend on the resource(s), the stakeholders, and the geographic area under discussion. These are some examples of typical structures that result from co-management agreements:

- M land use planning boards and commissions;
- M land and water boards;
- M fish and wildlife management boards;
- M renewable resource councils;
- M surface rights boards;
- M heritage management boards;
- M dispute resolution boards; and
- M resource sector-specific management planning boards.

a) Advisory boards

Advisory boards are the most basic form of co-management board. They do not have decision-making powers. Their power is limited to making recommendations to the appropriate minister. These boards include community committees, land claims boards, and boards outside of land claims agreements.

b) Management boards

Management boards represent the middle range of co-management agreements. Basically, these boards are quasi-judicial tribunals and panels whose decisions are usually binding and which influence the decision-making process of the body in which they participate. Membership on these boards is usually split equally between the stakeholders. Some examples are: the five co-management bodies listed under the *Inuvialuit Final Agreement*; bodies noted under the *Yukon Territory Umbrella Final Agreement*; and those found in the *Tetlit Gwich'in Final Agreement*.

c) Joint decision-making boards

Joint decision-making boards, or joint stewardship boards, are the most autonomous form of co-management boards. These are completely decentralized boards that operate at arms' length. Also, they have input into all aspects of decision-making that affects resources within their jurisdiction. Thirdly, they provide equal decision-making powers between the government and local communities. Examples include the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, the Porcupine Caribou Management Board, and the Nunavut Water Board.

There are other structures in place which fall outside of these three kinds and these special features. Two examples are structures that arise from bilateral agreements between individual First Nation stakeholders and provincial governments, and from trilateral agreements between First Nation stakeholders, a provincial government, and a federal department other than DIAND.

Management plans for these boards could be based on principles that include the following:

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- ✓ conserving wildlife and wildlife habitat for the benefit of all the area's residents;
- ✓ recognizing and protecting the traditional and current use of the area by the relevant First Nation;
- ✓ protecting the full diversity of wildlife populations and their activities from activities which could reduce the land's capacity to support wildlife; and
- ✓ encouraging public awareness and appreciation for the natural resources of the area to be co-managed.

E. HINTS AND GUIDELINES TOWARDS A NEGOTIATING STRATEGY

I The Basic Aims

Mutual benefit. As far as possible, successful co-management agreements should lead to sustainable development and sustainable resource management in ways that benefit all parties. Aside from other considerations about good stewardship of the land, if the development is not sustainable or if the resource is not managed sustainably, the benefit will terminate—that is, it will end at some time in the future. This, of course, can be disastrous for all the parties involved and their ways of life. Also, if not all the parties benefit, something will have gone wrong with negotiations, and the resource(s) will not be truly co-managed in everyone’s best interests.

Several things stem from these basic aims:

Partnerships. Solid partnership relationships should be one outcome of the negotiations process for co-management. As indicated, the best way to establish these is by gaining respect through competence at negotiating. At least in part, this involves knowing the issues well.

In most negotiations, there are several areas of mutual agreement that must be reached. This cannot be achieved without some *acceptance of the positions of the other stakeholders*. To focus on one example we have considered, it requires accepting all stakeholders’ knowledge bases. Both traditional and scientific knowledge bases must not only be respected and treated as valid, but they should be incorporated in the co-management agreement and reflected in the implementation procedures that are adopted. Otherwise, negotiations will not lead to processes that are truly *co-managed*.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

This requires that all stakeholders try to understand the world view(s) of the others. This does not mean that they must adopt them; only that the components of those world views that might contribute to sound co-management should be used for the good of the agreement.

Always go back to the community. Community involvement can really help to reach common areas of agreement, which benefits all stakeholders at the table. *In the case of First Nations and third party stakeholders, such as outfitters, it may be necessary to frequently go back to the people of the community/stakeholder group to verify positions taken at the negotiating table and to relay information received from the other negotiators.* This does not need to slow down negotiations if it is well built into the negotiation schedules.

Avoiding Disagreements. Mutual understanding cannot be forced on people. Often, no matter what is said by First Nations people, it will be rejected by others as unscientific. But the same is true of the knowledge that scientists bring to the table; it, too, is often rejected out of hand. When this occurs, a choice must be made between two options

1. consider if the representatives at the table are the likeliest to lead to a satisfactory agreement;
or
2. instruct these negotiators about the validity of the knowledge brought forward by both resource users (hunters/trappers, etc.) and scientists (biologists, foresters, etc.), how both are likely to contribute to the shared objectives, and so the importance of accepting both world-views.

Except as a last resort, questioning the presence of other stakeholders' representatives at the table—the first option—is usually not a good idea. Just as First Nations people do not like their choice of representatives questioned, neither does government and other stakeholders. If the very presence of some representatives is put into question, except as a last measure, people will become defensive and ground may be lost. The process of teaching and instruction—the second option—offered in a spirit of cooperation, is more likely to be effective.

Mutual understanding. Most co-management negotiators think that their problems always have solutions; the problem rests in finding them. The issues that arise during negotiations can be solved by considering a number of options and adopting the one that, without compromise to the negotiator, best helps to restore mutual understanding with the other stakeholders. A problem we considered previously will illustrate how resourcefulness and thinking creatively can produce many good ideas,

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Listening and mutual respect. The same holds true for the other stakeholders at the table. First Nations people must be encouraged to listen to and also respect the government/industry point of view. Often, it is necessary to bring in a facilitator to encourage communication.

If communication problems are stalling negotiations, show that you are open-minded about trying to understand. If you are unable to understand some point, for instance, state that you would welcome a neutral party present at discussions to help explain, if it is likely to help. And assume that the other

Mutual benefits, developing solid partnerships, effectively handling disagreements. These are some of the aims of negotiations, what follows from them, and one of the key skills that negotiating requires. But the overriding aim is always to negotiate with others to get what your people want. Negotiators of co-management agreements always keep an eye on this: their interests, and what they hope to achieve for the stakeholders. Meantime, their other eye should always be fixed on the other stakeholders' interests.

parties are also willing to act in good faith. For example, subsistence resources serve cultural, social and spiritual purposes that industry, government and science often do not value in the same way that First Nation representatives do. It may take only one session with a third party to open channels of understanding about this.

II Developing Interest-Based Negotiations

Negotiations based on common interests are usually very effective. It is best to focus on interests, and not on positions—as we will see in the next pages. Effective co-management negotiators always see themselves as representing a group's set of interests, but always as working together with the other negotiators, side by side, striving to tackle a problem. To achieve their goals, they:

- ! must not attack each other. It is more effective to try to separate the people as individuals from the problem. This can be done by focussing on interests, not on positions; and
- ! must explore which interests they have in common—such as the aim to manage a particular resource in a sustainable way—and avoid having a 'bottom line.' This does not mean anyone

has to ‘give away the farm.’ It does mean developing options to choose from to solve a problem, and developing and using objective criteria to solve every problem. Hanging on to extreme opening positions takes a lot of time and creates an incentive to stall reaching an agreement.

Rather than taking firm, rigid positions on issues, find the common areas of agreement between the stakeholders. This is not as hard as it might at first seem. Begin by finding these common areas. For example, all stakeholders want to ensure that forestry is done sustainably, that animal stocks are maintained, that trappers do not lose their livelihoods, that the environment is protected, and that the resource remains for the use and enjoyment of future generations. These things provide common ground for discussions to begin.

The more extreme the opening position and the smaller the concessions made, the more time it will take to even see if an agreement is possible. This situation gets even worse when there are more than two parties. In the case of co-management agreements, there are usually three parties at least.

Before exploring ways to negotiate successfully, it will help to look at some bad negotiation techniques which have often led to failure.

a) **How Not to Negotiate** Here are some examples of what *not* to do when negotiating:

Do not be argumentative. Having arguments about positions is not an effective way to negotiate. A position taken locks people into one way of approaching an issue. Negotiators can easily stall negotiations by trying to convince the other side of their positions—for example, a First nation arguing for total control of a resource, or the government position that it should keep all the control.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Do not be inflexible. The more you try to convince the others that any change in your position is impossible, the more impossible it will become. This makes reaching an agreement very unlikely, since neither side will want to give any ground.

Do not get ‘hung up’ on positions. The more attention that is paid to a set position, the less will be paid to meeting the underlying concern(s) of the stakeholders. The common concern, (such as managing the resource sustainably) will get lost in the scuffle about positions.

Hanging onto positions also takes a lot of time and energy; it is also an incentive to stall reaching an agreement. The more extreme the opening position and the smaller the concessions made, the more time it will take to even see if an agreement is possible.

This situation gets even worse when there are more than two parties—and there are usually at least three parties involved in the case of co-management negotiations.

Do not try just to be ‘nice.’ Just ‘being nice’ is never the solution. Negotiators will still be arguing about stands: you are just doing it gently, rather than shouting. If an agreement is ever reached, it is not likely to be a good one. It may be based on ‘splitting’ positions, rather than being a good solution that has been carefully worked out to meet the stakeholders’ interests.

DO NOT question the integrity of others at the table.

DO NOT become frustrated with the lack of awareness by some of the others at the table about traditional Aboriginal activities.

DO NOT ‘beat each other up’ over past injustices. Everyone knows what has occurred in First Nation/government/industry history. Co-management is a process set up to get on with doing things better.

DO NOT assume that all First Nations people are good stewards of the land, and all government and industry officials see the land as strictly a means to profit. Experience has shown that a number of factors influence the perceptions of resource management held by people. These must be taken into account.

b) How To Negotiate Effectively

Anger. All people have emotions. This sounds obvious and not worth saying until you consider that at the negotiating table it is easy to get angry about things others say that you disagree with. This is especially true when working on co-management negotiations, since resources are important to everyone at the table, and cross-cultural communication problems may very likely arise. Avoid shouting: it accomplishes very little, and it may offend people, who will no longer be willing to listen. *Negotiators often offend each other and have no idea why.*

Working cooperatively. Solving common problems by working cooperatively is the whole point of co-management of resources. As such, confrontational people should be avoided; the aim, on the contrary, should be to seek out negotiators who are problem-solvers. This approach is most effective and likeliest to lead to a wise agreement.

To be effective in a co-management negotiation, negotiators must come to view themselves as working side by side to attack a problem. For the most part, effective negotiating is done in ways that are not confrontational. Reaching a successful co-management agreement and successful implementation depend as much on relationships between the stakeholders as on the institutions of

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

management. Shouting at the table seldom accomplishes much. It offends people, who will no longer want to listen.

Also:

DO listen to the views of others with an open mind.

DO provide opportunities for all stakeholders to be heard—in a non-confrontational way—about their views on the resource to be managed. Remember: *negotiations based on common interests are usually very effective*. A central objective is to learn precisely what other stakeholders want.

DO remember that co-management discussions are about agreement, compromise and accommodating all stakeholders in the best possible way. They are not about getting your own way, regardless.

DO accept the fact that each individual at the table sees reality from his/her own point of view. Most points of view are as valid as others.

DO accept the fact that the market value of resources is not the only value of the other stakeholders.

DO accept the fact that in Canada today both traditional and ‘modern’ techniques of management are required in successful co-management of resources. Others should, too.

III Dispute Resolution

Co-management discussions, negotiation, and implementation are all forms of or derive from the idea of dispute resolution. *Co-management agreements themselves are really a form of dispute resolution, since they are the result of a process of joint decision-making between stakeholders, they involve*

joint policy development, the development of joint management structures, and the development of joint management plans. Such agreements involve First Nations, government, industry, and scientists coming together to develop policies and resource management plans jointly, rather than depending on unilateral action by the government. No stakeholder is satisfied with this last approach any longer.

Misgivings about agreements. It would be a mistake to not mention in the final co-management agreement any misgivings, differences or reservations any party has to any part of the agreement—about enforcement, for instance, or other co-management provisions. The agreements themselves should clearly spell out any reservations or important general observations that any party considers worth noting. The mechanisms for addressing or resolving such issues will depend on the problem to be solved. An example might be the wish by one party to express in the agreement its skepticism, raised during negotiations, about the agreed time-frames for achieving certain goals—such as concerning the time to repair some accidental environmental damage, and the need or desire for quicker action.

Independence of appointed bodies. Given the importance of the land and its resources to the First Nation world view, culture, and practice, the success of co-management dispute resolution processes depends on the degree of autonomy held by the co-management board and the equality of its representation. The co-management agreement may fail if representation and management authority between the stakeholders are not divided equally.

It is important to remember that others not party to the co-management agreement may also be affected by disputes. If they are, they may have a right to take part in the mediation for dispute resolution.

These further tips about resolving disputes may help while proceeding with negotiations:

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

DO NOT assume that everyone at the table has the same understanding of land ownership that you do. Each individual should make their perceptions clear through discussion.

DO NOT expect others to agree with your view, and do not become angry if they do not. Co-management is a process of compromise in the best interests of sustainable management: the goal is to make your view understood.

DO NOT think that the provincial crowns do not have an interest in co-management discussions with First Nations.

DO NOT think that the views held by some negotiators at the table are also those of others who are expressing them. Avoid attacking individuals. It is not productive.

DO recognize that many concerns about effective resource management will be shared by both Aboriginal stakeholders and non-Aboriginal residents of an area considered to be traditional territory. In spite of perceived and legal land ownership differences, these common interests may provide a basis for reaching common management goals.

DO accept that land and resources can be co-managed even while different views of land and resource ownership exist. Acceptance of and respect for the different views will make this possible.

DO make an effort to learn from the other stakeholders at the table by listening to their views and weighing them in terms of whether they can be of use.

IV Stakeholder Interests

Several renewable resource sectors may be part of a co-management agreement, and many jurisdictions can be involved. Depending on the resource, jurisdiction can be held by the federal government (for example, marine mammals and migratory birds), provincial governments (forestry and wildlife, for instance), and even combinations of both levels. Provincial and federal jurisdictions cover those lands which First Nations consider to be traditional territories. Stakeholders generally include First Nations, government, and industry. Other third parties may also have interests.

Participation and consultation *This is a critical issue that can make or ruin agreements, as well as sour relations between groups. Major problems can arise when consultations that are not full and complete have been or are being held with stakeholders with other interests in the land and/or the resources at stake.*

Stakeholder's interests may be more complex than they at first appear. For instance, while there may be a conflict regarding some interests, some other interests may also be shared between two stakeholders. Also, some interests might change during the course of negotiations. One example of how various stakeholder interests might accord is that, while First Nations may wish to protect various areas from industrial development owing to traditional activities, First Nations may also wish to take part in economic development activities based on resource extraction.

It must not be assumed that the presence of representatives at the table will avoid problems arising from their own constituencies. For example, while leaders of First Nations communities may support co-management, including the management of resource extraction activities, others in their communities might not. These cases are yet another reason why community consultation and participation are critical to negotiations, and to implementing the agreement.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Each stakeholder may also have different concerns about quotas, stocks, habitat issues, etc. These differences are very important and must be worked out at the table, and solutions should be outlined in the co-management agreement. Suggestions for working toward agreement on these differences in views include the following:

- ! The stakeholders should establish priorities about resource use that are compatible with sustainable development, traditional land use by First Nations, and industry requirements.
- ! Traditional Aboriginal knowledge and scientific knowledge can be useful in helping to reach agreed estimates of resource availability, both available and potential. The status of resource stocks and the subsistence needs of First Nations must also be considered.
- ! **Common problems** Problems common to all parties—such as decreasing fish stocks, declines in moose and caribou—provide a good starting point for discussions and agreement.
- ! Money, title, land, and quotas are not the only issues involved in co-management of natural resources. Issues of spirituality must be considered, as well as the non-market values of resources.
- ! Consideration must be given to the management of protected areas and parks. While protected for the general enjoyment of all people, these lands may be of special importance to First Nation resource users in the pursuit of hunting and other land use activities.
- ! Co-management of resources may incorporate business development. For example, oil and gas resources off-reserve are not commonly treated as resources to be co-managed. Benefits to First Nations may include developing business opportunities related to the support of the industry or participation in the industry. These may be addressed in the co-management agreement.

Many other issues may arise in connection with the different views held by various stakeholders, and many problems can occur as a result. Here are some tips that may serve as guidelines in this regard:

DO NOT assume that the presence of representatives at the table will avoid problems arising from their own constituencies. First Nations may altogether avoid many potential problems by consulting with the community on a regular basis and involving members in activities related to discussions and co-management.

DO NOT assume that all stakeholders agree on how parks and conservation areas should be managed. If at all unsure, spell out your views at the table, or ask others what their understanding is. For instance, many First Nations may want to continue to pursue traditional activities within the boundaries of these areas—and this may not fit with others' views.

DO NOT assume that all resources can be managed in the same way. Each resource under discussion requires specific and perhaps very different management activities (such as monitoring, enforcement, quotas, and so forth).

DO NOT assume that all First Nations cultures are the same. Each First Nation community, even within the same nation or cultural group (Cree, for example), is different. Two communities within close linguistic and geographic proximity may see the same issue from very different perspectives.

DO NOT assume that what stakeholders say will automatically be taken as true at the table. Different individuals bring different perceptions of reality to the table and to issues.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

DO NOT assume that all First Nations are opposed to industrial development (including, for example, mining or forestry). Many wish to be part of industrial development and take part in economic activities that will benefit them as individuals and their communities.

DO NOT assume that industry is opposed to working with First Nations in a cooperative way. Due to misperceptions about traditional ways, representatives of industry often do not know how to approach First Nations to work cooperatively.

DO assume that First Nations continue to use traditional territory in traditional pursuits.

DO assume that industry and government wish to work toward sustainable development in a context of co-management as strongly as First Nations do.

V The Financing of Co-Management

The financing of co-management depends in large part on each situation. Various mechanisms are available. This is no list of federal and provincial funding sources, but a few suggestions on what may be involved.

Government is no longer willing or able to be the only contributor of financial resources to co-management. First Nations must demonstrate a willingness to contribute, whether through land claim resources or business ventures stemming from co-management, or by providing educational opportunities to students. For its part, government must recognize that this takes time to implement.

Contributions also depend on the stage of the co-management discussions. During the discussion and negotiation phases, federal and provincial funding sources should fund the First Nation's participation. *Industry normally funds its own participation.*

Academic institutions *First Nations should seek additional support from academic institutions.*

Quite often students in science and arts faculties are looking for advanced research projects that could be about co-management research for a particular First Nation.

- ! Adequate funding must be set aside to implement any agreement. It makes no sense to outline extensive procedures to monitor a resource and detailed enforcement guidelines if no resources are available to cover the costs.

- ! All parties to co-management agreements should be expected to contribute financially or in-kind for implementing the agreement.

- ! In the discussion phases, when community consultation and participation are at a very active stage, First Nations must be able to have access to federal funding that has been committed. In some cases, provincial governments should also contribute to costs, especially if the area to be managed is on provincial crown land.

- ! All stakeholders must be committed to sharing in the costs and benefits of co-management. This includes both actual and potential benefits, as well as sharing available data.

- ! Industry must also contribute to co-management processes. This may take the form of support functions such as mapping, helicopter time, training community students, and cash contributions.

- ✓ **DO** assume that all the stakeholders are interested in developing self-sustaining, efficient,

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

and viable resource management processes. If not, they should not be at the table in the first place.

- ✓ **DO** remember that negotiators and stakeholders are individuals with different views about the problems and the other stakeholders. It is important to maintain respect for individuals and for the principles of co-management.
- ✓ **DO** remember that stakeholders are at the table with similar concerns: to conserve resources, develop areas and resources sustainably, and maintain ways of life.
- ✓ **DO** assume that the non-Aboriginal and non-government stakeholders at the table often have long-term roots in the area to be co-managed. Often, for example, outfitters and placer miners will be fourth- or fifth-generation residents in an area. They have as much right to be at the co-management table as do First Nations and government.

VI Using Consultants and Resource People

Developing a co-management agreement is a complicated process. Some tasks require help. Funding must be provided to First Nations to acquire the expertise where needed, or the expertise provided through government sources or academic sources. Some examples include: people familiar with mapping and land use planning; community development facilitators; biologists; anthropologists, lawyers, resource economists, foresters, miners, and others who can help to facilitate the process.

Certain points should be remembered when using the services of consultants and resource people:

- ! Hire people for short-term projects only. Specific expertise is required for specific tasks. The point is to co-manage resources at the local level, not to provide long-term employment.

- ! Target an individual at the local level to work with the Elders on a continuous basis. This individual should also be able to work on co-management issues at the same time. This way, it is not necessary to have a consultant present to verify information and involve the local community.

- ! A consultant can be used when required to facilitate the process of involvement, assist in sorting out problems and miscommunications, and work on special projects.

- ! At certain stages it is useful to have a consultant involved in the co-management project who can act as a facilitator among the stakeholders. This is not on a long term basis, but merely a support to turn to as needs require.

- ! A co-management project coordinator is required at the community level. It is NOT necessary to hire a consultant to do this job. A local person should be in the position, or if not available, should be trained. In the case of training, a consultant is helpful.

DO NOT restrict the involvement of consultants and resource people to biologists and others who work only with wildlife. Effective co-management is a community development and community management process. It is not only a process of resource and land management.

DO use consultants and lawyers as resource people at negotiating sessions, if required. They are there to advise the First Nation. They are not there to control the activities and positions of the First Nation.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

DO provide for extensive community involvement in the discussion and negotiating processes. Find consultants and resource people who agree with this principle and will facilitate it happening.

DO look for consultants with extensive community-based development experience. This means people who can actually function with the people in a community, and not only function in an urban environment. Too often consultants look great on paper, but cannot adapt to community reality.

APPENDIX I - **Aboriginal Co-Management Bibliography**

a) Canada and the United States

- Abel, Kerry and Jean Friesen (eds.)
1991 *Aboriginal Resource Use in Canada*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Adams, Marie et al.
1993 “Alaska and Inuvialuit Beluga Whale Committee - an initiative in “at home management.” In: *Arctic* 46(2):134-137.
- Albrecht, Daniel E.
1991 *Co-Management as Transaction: the Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada.
- Amend, Donald F.
1989 “Alaska’s regional aquaculture associations co-management of salmon in Southern Southeast Alaska.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 125-136.
- Anderson, Kat
1993 “Native Californians as ancient and contemporary cultivators.” In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.). *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 151-174.
- Andresen, Steinar
1993 “The effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission.” In: *Arctic* 46(2):108-115.
- Anonymous
n/d *Comprehensive Tribal Fisheries Management: A Holistic Approach*. Olympia: Treaty Indian Tribes of Western Washington.
- Anonymous
n/d *Presenting the Chelan Agreement: Comprehensive Water Resources Planning*. Olympia: Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Anonymous
1986 "Paper Promises Co-management for B.C." In: *Kahtou News* 4(4).
- Anonymous
1987 *Changing Times, Challenging Agendas: Economic and Political Issues in Canada's North*. Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.
- Anonymous
1989 "Co-management of the Fisheries Resources of the Pacific Northwest." In : *Native Law Review* 7(10).
- Anonymous
1990 *Porcupine Caribou Management Board: Fourth Annual Report - 1989-90*. Whitehorse, Yukon: Porcupine Caribou Management Board.
- Anonymous
1992 *Tribal Timber/Fish/Wildlife Programs: 1988-1990*. Timber/Fish/Wildlife(TFW) Agreement report. Olympia.
- Anonymous
1992 *The Yukon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan*. Whitehorse: Department of Renewable Resources.
- Anonymous
1994 *Co-Management Plan for Southeast Baffin Beluga*. Iqaluit: Planning Committee for Southeast Baffin Beluga.
- Anonymous
1994 "Fish and Wildlife Co-management." In: *Kahtou News* 3(1).
- Anonymous
1994 *Co-Management Development Guide*. Environment and Natural Resources Directorate. No publisher.
- Axon, Lee
1994 *The Application of ADR Within DIAND: An Inventory of Dispute Resolution Activities and Processes*. A report submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada. Ottawa: Policy Research and Analysis Directorate.

- Bailey, John
1994 “Managing protected areas in the north: what we know, what we need to learn about co-management.” In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.), *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 91-99.
- Bendickson, Jamie
1991 *Co-management Issues in the Forest Wilderness: A Stewardship Council for Temagami*. Calgary: Canadian Institute for Resources Law.
- Berkes, Fikret
1980 “Issues and perspectives in fish and wildlife management in the James Bay area.” In: *Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists* 37(2):95-101.
1981 “Fisheries of the James Bay area and northern Quebec: a case study in resource management.” In: M.R. Freeman (ed.), *Proceedings: First International Symposium on Renewable Resources and the Economy of the North*. Ottawa: Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies and the Man and the Biosphere Program, pp.143-160.
1984 “Alternative styles in living resources management: the case of James Bay.” In: *Environments* 16(3):114-123.
1987 “Common property resource management and Cree Indian fisheries in Subarctic Canada.” In: B.J. McCay and J.M. Acheson (eds.). *Capturing the Commons*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, pp. 66-91.
1989 “Co-Management and the James Bay Agreement.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 181-208.
- Berkes, F., P. George, R. Preston and J. Turner
1992 *The Cree View of Land and Resources: Indigenous Ecological Knowledge*. TASO Report, Second Series, No.8. Hamilton: McMaster University.
- Berkes, Fikret (ed.)
1989 *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press.
- Binder, Lloyd N. and Bruce Hanbidge
1993 “Aboriginal people and resource co-management.” In: Julian T. Inglis (ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, pp.121-132.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Black, Shawn D.
1994 *An Assessment of the Use of Indigenous Knowledge Within Yukon Land Use and Resource Management Plans*. Honours Thesis (Geography). Toronto: Ryerson Polytechnic University.
- Blackburn, Thomas C. and Kat Anderson (eds.)
1993 *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication.
- Bonar, Rick
1991 “Integrated planning for timber and wildlife.” In: Joan Sherman (ed.), *Boreal Forest Conference Proceedings*. Athabasca: Athabasca University, pp. 135-139.
- Bonin, Raymond
1995 *Co-Management: Report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development*. Ottawa: Canada Communication Group.
- Bowes, M. and J. Krutilla
1989 *Multiple Use Management: The Economics of Public Forestlands*. Washington: Resources for the Future Press.
- Bratton, Susan
1994 “Acceptable change: people, values and management.” In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.), *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 232-240.
- Busiahn, Thomas R.
1987 *Fishery Co-Management: a Response to Legal, Social, and Fiscal Imperatives*. Odanah: Great Lakes Indian Fish Wildlife Commission.
1989 “The development of state/tribal co-management of Wisconsin fisheries.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 170-180.
- Caulfield, Richard
1988 “The role of subsistence resource commissions in managing Alaska’s new national parks.” In: Milton M.R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.), *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management In Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp. 55-64.

- Cizek, Petr
1990 *The Beverly-Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board: A Case Study of Aboriginal Participation in Resource Management.* Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.
- Clancy, Peter
1990 “Political development and wildlife management.” In: Gurston Dacks (ed.), *Devolution and Constitutional Development in the Canadian North.* Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Cohen, Fay G.
1989 “Treaty Indian tribes and Washington state: the evolution of tribal involvement in fisheries management in the U.S. Pacific Northwest.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 37-48.
- Connell, Barbara E.
1985 *Arrangements for Co-Management of Fisheries and Wildlife by Native People and Government in Canada.* Ottawa: National Library of Canada.
- Dacks, Gurston and Ken Coates (eds.)
1988 *Northern Communities: The Prospects for Empowerment.* Edmonton: Boreal Institute for Northern Studies.
- Dale, Norman
1989 “Getting to co-management: social learning in the redesign of fisheries management.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 49-72.
- Department of Indian and Northern Affairs
1984 *Cree Naskapi Act, 8 June 1984.* Ottawa: Queen’s Printer.
- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
1994 *Resource Co-management Innovation Initiative, Saskatchewan Region.* Regina: DIAND.
- Dickason, Olive Patricia
1991 “For every plant there is a use: the botanical world of Mexico and Iroquoians.” In: Kerry Abel and Jean Friesen (eds.), *Aboriginal Resource Use in Canada.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, pp. 11-34.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Doubleday, Nancy C

- 1989 "Co-management provisions of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 209-230.
- 1993 "Finding common ground: natural law and collective wisdom." In: Julian T. Inglis (ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- 1994 "Arctic whales: sustaining indigenous peoples and conserving arctic resources." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and Urs P. Kreuter (eds.). *Elephants and Whales: Resources for Whom?* London: The Gordon Breach Publishing Group.

Drolet, C.A. et al.

- 1987 "Sharing wildlife management responsibilities with native groups: case histories in northern Quebec." In: *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. 52:389-398.

Duchesne, Luc

- 1993 *Towards Co-Management with the Shuswap People the Adams Lake Watershed, British Columbia*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada.

East, Ken

- 1986 "Resource co-management in Wood Buffalo National Park: the National Parks' perspective." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.), *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 86-96.

Einbender-Velez, LeGrand

- 1993 "Navajo forestry faces a cultural challenge." In: *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 17(1).

Elberg, N. et al.

- 1975 *Not By Bread Alone: The Use of Subsistence Resources Among James Bay Cree*. A Report on Research Conducted for the Indians of Quebec Association Task Force. Montreal: McGill University.

- Feit, Harvey
 1984 “Conflict arenas in the management of renewable resources in the Canadian north: perspectives based on conflicts and responses in the James Bay region, Quebec.” In: *National and Regional Interests in the North*. Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee, pp. 435-468.
- 1986 “James Bay Cree Indian management and moral considerations of furbearers.” In: J. Green and J. Smith (eds.), *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Proceedings of the 1986 symposium of the Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 49-65.
- 1988 *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute.
- Fortier, Moore and Evelyn Pinkerton
 1993 *A Model for First Nation Leadership in Multi-Party Stewardship of Watersheds and Their Fisheries*. Ottawa: A Report to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.
- Freeman, Milton M.R., Eleanor E. Wein and Darren E. Keith
 1992 *Recovering Rights: Bowhead Whales and Inuvialuit Subsistence in the Western Canadian Arctic*. Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Freeman, Milton M.R. and L. N. Carbyn (eds.)
 1984 *New/Old Approaches to Renewable Resource Management in the North*. Paper presented at the twenty-third annual meeting, Western Regional Science Association, Monterey, California.
- 1988 *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions*. Edmonton: Boreal Institute of Northern Studies.
- Freeman, Milton M.R.
 1985 “Appeal to tradition: different perspectives on arctic wildlife management.” In: Jens Brosted et al. (eds.), *Native Power: The Quest for Autonomy and Nationhood of Indigenous Peoples*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget AS, pp. 265-281.
- 1989 “The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission: successful co-management under extreme conditions.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 137-153.
- 1993 “The International Whaling Commission, small-type whaling, and coming to terms with subsistence.” In: *Human Organization* 52(3):243-251.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Friesen, Jean
1993 "Grant me wherewith to make my living." In: Kerry Abel and Jean Friesen (eds.), *Aboriginal Resource Use in Canada*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, pp.141-156.
- Gadgil, Madhav
1985 "Social restraints on resource utilization: the Indian experience." In: J.A. McNeely and D. Pitt (eds.), *Culture and Conservation*. London: Croom Helm, pp.135-154.
- Gadgil, Madhav and Fikret Berkes
1991 "Traditional resource management systems." In: *Resource Management and Optimization* 8(3-4):127-141.
- Gambell, Ray
1993 "International management of whales and whaling: an historical review of the regulation of commercial and aboriginal subsistence whaling." In: *Arctic* 46(2):97-207.
- Gosse, Richard
1995 *Searching For Common Ground: First Nations and the Management of Natural Resources in Saskatchewan*. A background paper to assist discussions on co-management issues. Report prepared under contract to DIAND.
- Government of Saskatchewan
1995 *A Draft Concept Plan For Integrated Forest Resource Management in the Amisk-Churchill Planning Area*. Regina: Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management.
- Government of Canada
1991(a) *Co-operative Fisheries Management*. Ottawa: Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
1991(b) *Cooperative Management Notes: Aboriginal Cooperative Fisheries and Habitat Management Program*. Ottawa: Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
- Green, Jeffrey E. (ed.)
1986 *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists.

- Grima, A.P. Limo and Fikret Berkes
 1989 "Natural resources: access, rights-to-use and management." In: Fikret Berkes (ed.), *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 33-54.
- Gunn, Anne et al.
 1988 "The contribution of the ecological knowledge of Inuit to wildlife management in the Northwest Territories." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.), *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management In Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp. 22-31.
- Hadway, Sharon
 1993 *Towards a Co-Management Model for Sustainable Resource Management in Traditional Shuswap Territory*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada.
- Halbert, Cindy L. and Kai N. Lee
 1990 "The Timber, Fish, and Wildlife Agreement: implementing alternative dispute resolution in Washington State." In: *The Northwest Environmental Journal* 6(1).
- Hobart, Charles W.
 1981 "Impacts of industrial employment on hunting and trapping among Canadian Inuit." In: Milton M.R. Freeman (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Symposium of Renewable Resources and the Economy of the North*. Ottawa: Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies.
- Hrenchuk, Carl
 1993 "Native land use and common property: whose common?" In: Julian T. Inglis (ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge and International Development. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, pp 69-86.
- Huntington, H. P.
 1992 "The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission and other cooperative marine mammal management organizations in northern Alaska." In: *The Polar Record* 28(164):119-126.
 1993 "Wildlife management and subsistence hunting in Alaska." In: *Wildlife Review*: Number 239.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

- 1985 *The Western Arctic Claim: The Inuvialuit Final Agreement*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1992 *Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement*. Vol.1. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1993 *Agreement Between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1993 *Champagne and Aishihik First Nations Final Agreement*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1993 *First Nation of Nacho Nyak Dun Final Agreement*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1993 *Vuntut Gwich'in First Nation Final Agreement*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Inuit Circumpolar Conference

- 1993 *Participation of Indigenous Peoples and the Application of the Environmental and Ecological Knowledge in the Arctic Environment*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Jacobs, Peter

- 1985 "The Lancaster Sound regional study." In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and David Pitt (eds.), *Culture and Conservation: The Human Dimension in Environmental Planning*. London: Croon Helm, pp. 65-80.

Johannes, R.E.

- 1993 "Integrating traditional ecological knowledge and management with environmental impact assessment." In: Julian T. Inglis (ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, pp. 33-39.

Johnson, Linda and Mary Jane Johnson

- 1994 "Traditional knowledge and protected areas." In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.), *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 107-131.

Johnson, Jim

- 1994 "A Parks Canada perspective on Vuntut National Park." In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.), *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 137-141.

- Kassi, Norma
1994 "Science, ethics, and wildlife management." In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.), *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 212-216.
- Kearney, John F.
1989 "Co-management or co-optation?: the ambiguities of lobster fishery management in Southwest Nova Scotia." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 85-102.
- Keith, Robert F, and David A. Neufeld
1988 "Northern resources planning and management: perspectives on community self-determination." In: Gurston Dacks and Ken Coates (eds.), *Northern Communities: The Prospects for Empowerment*. Edmonton: Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, pp. 91-100.
- Kellert, Stephen and Syma A. Ebbin
1993 *Empowerment and Equity of Indigenous Peoples of North America: Emerging Cooperative Institutions for Fisheries Management*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Labrador Inuit Association
1977 *Our Footprints Are Everywhere*. Nain: Labrador Inuit Association.
- Landmann, Peter
1989 *Co-Management of Wildlife under the James Bay Treaty: the Hunting, Fishing and Trapping Coordinating Committee*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada.
- Langdon, Steve J.
1989 "Prospects for co-management of marine animals in Alaska." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 154-169.
- Lewis, Henry T.
1993 "Patterns of Indian burning in California: ecology and ethnohistory." In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.), *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 55-116.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Lloyd, Kevin
1986 "Co-operative management of polar bears on northeast Baffin Island." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.), *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 108-117.
- Lonner, T.D.
1986 "Subsistence as an economic system in Alaska: theoretical observations and management implications. In: S.J. Langdon (ed.), *Contemporary Alaskan Native Economies*. Lanham: University Press of America, pp. 15-27.
- Lutra Associates Limited and H.J. Ruitenbeek Resource Consulting
1985 *Kitikmeot Region Economic Base Study*. Yellowknife: Government of the Northwest Territories Department of Economic Development and Tourism.
- Macleod, J.R.
1989 "Strategies and possibilities for Indian leadership in co-management initiatives in British Columbia." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. pp. 262-272.
- MacTavish, J.S. and Associates
1989 *Indian Self-Government and Renewable Resources*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- Matakala, Patrick W.
n/d *Co-Management and Community Decision-Making: A Multi-Case Analysis of Resource Management Conflict Resolution in Temagami, Ontario*. A Report Prepared for the National Aboriginal Forestry Association. Vancouver: Department of Forest Resource Management, University of British Columbia.
- McCarthy, Helen
1993 "Managing oaks and the acorn crop." In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.), *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 213-228.

- McCay, Bonnie J.
1989 “Co-Management of a clam revitalization project: the New Jersey ‘Spawner Sanctuary’ program.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 103-124.
- McDaniels, T.L., M. Healey and R.K. Paisley
1994 "Cooperative fisheries management involving First Nations in British Columbia: an adaptive approach to strategy design." In: *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 51(9).
- McDaniels, T.L., M. Healey and R.K. Paisley
1994 "Cooperative fisheries management involving First Nations in British Columbia: an adaptive approach to strategy design." In: *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 51(9).
- Morrell, Mike
1989 “The struggle to integrate traditional Indian systems and state management in the salmon fisheries of the Skeena River, British Columbia.” In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 231-248.
- Muir, Magdalena A.K.
1994 *Comprehensive Land Claims Agreements of the Northwest Territories: Implications for Land and Water Management*. Calgary: Canadian Institute of Resources Law.
- Murtha, Mike
1994 “Nisga’a Memorial Lava Bed Park: an example of co-management in British Columbia.” In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.), *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 278-283.
- Nakashima, D.J.
1992 *The Ecological Knowledge of Belcher Island Inuit: A Traditional Basis for Contemporary Wildlife Co-Management*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Nakashima, Douglas J.

1990 *Application of Native Knowledge in EIA: Inuit, Eiders, and Hudson Bay Oil*. Hull: Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council.

1993 "Astute observers on the sea ice edge: Inuit knowledge as a basis for Arctic co-management." In: Julian T. Inglis (ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, pp. 99-110.

Nelson, Richard K.

1983 *Make Prayers to the Raven: A Koyukon View of the Northern Forest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nelson, J. G. and Sabine Jensen

1984 *Planning and Managing Environmentally Significant Areas in the Northwest Territories: Issues and Alternatives*. Waterloo: University of Waterloo.

Njootli, Stanley

1994 "Two perspectives-one park: Vuntut National Park." In: Juri Deepre and Bob Jickling (eds.), *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 132-136.

Notzke, C.

1995 "A new perspective in Aboriginal natural resource management: co-management." In: *Geo Forum* 26(2).

Ortiz, Bev

1993 "Contemporary California Indian basket-weavers and the environment." In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.), *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 195-212.

Osherenko, Gail

1988(a) *Sharing Power with Native Users: Co-management Regimes for Native Wildlife*. CARC Policy Paper 5. Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.

1988(b) "Can comanagement save Arctic wildlife?" In: *Environment* 30(6).

- Oshmagari, Kayo
1995 "Traditional knowledge as an adaptive strategy for sustainable livelihoods among the Western James Bay Cree." In: Naresh Singh and Laurie Ham (eds.), *Community-Based Resources Management and Sustainable Livelihoods: the Grass Roots of Sustainable Development*, pp. 119-141.
- Ovington, J.D.
1984 "Aboriginal people - guardians of a heritage." In: J. Hanks (ed.), *Traditional Life-Styles, Conservation and Rural Development*. Proceedings of a symposium, Bandung, Indonesia, 1982. Commission on Ecology Papers No.7. Gland: IUCN.
- Paisley, Richard et al.
n/d *Analysis of Strategies for Co-operative Fisheries Management Between Government and Native Indians*. Report prepared for Native Affairs Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Vancouver: Westwater Research Centre, University of British Columbia.
- Peepre, Juri and Bob Jickling (eds.)
1994 *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College.
- Pinkerton, Evelyn
1983 "Co-management efforts as social movement: The Tin Wis Coalition and the drive for forest practices legislation in B.C.," In: *Alternatives* 19(3).
1983 "Taking the minister to court: changes in public opinion about forest management and their expression in Haida land claims." In: *B.C. Studies* 57:68-85.
1992 "Translating legal rights into management practice: overcoming barriers to the exercise of co-management." In: *Human Organization* 51(4):330-341.
1993 "What is co-management?," In: *Alternatives* 19(3):37-46.
1995 "Local fisheries co-management: a review of international experiences and their implications for salmon management in British Columbia." In: *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 51(10).
- Pinkerton, Evelyn (ed.)
1989 *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Pinkerton, Evelyn et al.
1993 *A Model for First Nation Leadership in Multi-Party Stewardship of Watersheds and Their Fisheries. A Report to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.* No publisher.
- Reed, Maureen G.
1995 "Cooperative management of environmental resources: a case study from northern Ontario, Canada." In: *Economic Geography* 71(2).
- Rees, William E.
1988 "Stable community development in the north: properties and requirements." In: Gurston Dacks and Ken Coates (eds.), *Northern Communities: The Prospects for Empowerment.* Edmonton: Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, pp. 59-76.
- Richard, P.R. and D.G. Pike
1993 "Small whale co-management in the Eastern Canadian Arctic: a case history and analysis." In: *Arctic* 46(2):138-143.
- Richardson, Miles and Bill Green
1989 "The fisheries co-management initiative in Haida Gwaii." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.), *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 249-261.
- Riewe, Rick and Lloyd Gamble
1988 "The Inuit and wildlife management today." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.) *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management In Northern Regions.* Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp. 22-31.
- Robinson Consulting and Associates Ltd. et al.
1995 *Land and Resources Joint Management Arrangements.* Victoria.
- Rock, T.W.
1992 *A Proposal for the Management of Woodland Caribou in Saskatchewan.* Regina: Saskatchewan Natural Resources.
- Ross, Monique and J. Owen Sanders (eds.)
1992 *Growing Demands on a Shrinking Heritage: Managing Resource-Use Conflicts.* Essays from the Fifth CIRL Conference on Natural Resources Law. Calgary: Canadian Institute of Resources Law.

- Schwarber, James Arthur
 1992 *Conditions Leading to Grassroots Initiatives for the Co-Management of Subsistence Uses of Wildlife in Alaska*. MA Thesis. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Sewell, Dan
 1986 "Co-management of the recreational chinook fishery in the Strait of Georgia." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.), *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 96-107.
- Sherman, Joan (ed.)
 1991 *Boreal Forest Conference Proceedings*. Athabasca: Athabasca University.
- Singh, Naresh and Laurie Ham (eds.)
 1995 *Community-Based Resources Management and Sustainable Livelihoods: the Grass Roots of Sustainable Development*.
- Singleton, Sara Gail
 1994 *Common Problems, Collective Action and Efficiency: the Evolution of Institutions of Co-Management in Pacific Northwest Tribal Fisheries*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Washington: University of Washington.
- Skare, Mari
 1994 "Whaling: a sustainable use of natural resources or a violation of animal rights?" In: *Environment* 36(7).
- Sloan, Pamela and Roger Hill
 1995 *Corporate Aboriginal Relations*. Toronto: Hill Sloan Associates Inc.
- Smith, Richard Chase
 1993 "Indians, forest rights, and lumber mills." In: *Cultural Survival Quarterly*: 17(1).
- Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
 1994 *Proceedings Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) - A Study of Co-Management of Natural Resources*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Swerdfager, Trevor

- 1990 "Cooperative wildlife management: implications for wildlife management professionals." In: *Proceedings of the 55th North American Wildlife and Natural Resource Conference*. No publisher.
- 1992 *Cooperative Wildlife Management*. Ottawa: Canadian Wildlife Service.

Swezey, Sean L. and Robert F. Heizer

- 1993 "Ritual management of Salmonid fish resources in California." In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.), *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 299-328.

Tan-Kim-Yong, Uraivan

- 1993 "Participatory land-use planning as a sociological methodology for natural resource management." In: *Regional Development Dialogue* 14(1).

Therrien, B.K.

- 1988 "Joint management: a look at the early record of the Porcupine Caribou Management Board." In: *The Northern Review* 2:17-43.

Thomas, D.C. and J. Schaefer

- 1991 "Wildlife co-management defined: the Beverly-Kaminuriak Management Board." In: *Rangifer*. Special Issues No.7(11):73-89.

Usher, Peter J.

- 1986 *The Devolution of Wildlife Management and the Prospects for Wildlife Conservation in the Northwest Territories*. Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.
- 1987 "Indigenous management systems and the conservation of wildlife in the Canadian North." In: *Alternatives* 14(1):3-9.
- 1993 "The Beverly-Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board: An Experience in Co-Management." In: Julian T. Inglis (ed.), *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, pp. 111-120.

Watson, Dwight

- 1989 "The evolution of appropriate resource-management systems." In: Fikret Berkes (ed.), *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 55-69.

- Waquan, Archie
1986 “Resource co-management in Wood Buffalo National Park: the Cree band’s perspective.” In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.), *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 86-96.
- Westwater Research Centre
n/d *Analysis of Strategies for Co-operative Fisheries Management Between Government and Native Indians*. Ottawa: Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
- Wheeler, Polly
1988 “State and indigenous fisheries management: the Alaska context.” In: Milton M.R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.), *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management In Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp. 38-47.
- Wills, Richard H.
1984 *Conflicting Perceptions: Western Economics and the Great Whale River Cree*. USA: Tutorial Press.
- Winn, Stephen Nicholas
1992 *Co-Management Under the Inuvialuit Final Agreement: Bridging the Gap Between Indigenous Self-Regulation and State-Based Resource Management in the Western Arctic*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada.
- Zbeetnoff, Darrell
1979 *Water Management and Native Land Claim Problems: Issues and Alternatives for the Canadian North*. Masters thesis (Natural Resource Management). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba. Microfiche.

APPENDIX I - **Aboriginal Co-Management Bibliography**

b) Indigenous International

- Anderson, Anthony B. and Edvigis Marta Ioris
1992 "The logic of extraction: resource management and income generation by extractive producers in the Amazon Estuary." In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Padoch (eds.). *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp.175-202.
- Arnold, J.E.M. and J. Gabriel Campbell
1986 "Collective management of hill forests in Nepal: the community forestry development project." In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 425-454.
- Artz, Neal E. et al.
1986 "Management of common grazing lands: Tamahdite, Morocco." In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 259-280.
- Baines, Graham B.K.
1989 "Traditional resource management in the Melanesian South Pacific: a development dilemma." In: Fikret Berkes (ed.), *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 273-295.
- Baines, Graham B.K. and Edvard Hviding
1993 "Traditional ecological knowledge for resource management in Marovo, Solomon Islands." In: Nancy M. Williams and Graham Baines (eds.). *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Wisdom for Sustainable Development*. Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies. Canberra: Australian National University, pp. 56-66.
- Balakrishnan, Mundanthra and Dora E. Ndhlovu
1992 "Wildlife utilization and local people: a case-study in upper Lapande game management area, Zambia." In: *Environmental Conservation* 19(2): pp.135-144

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Bjorklund, Ivar
1988 “Sami reindeer pastoralism as an indigenous resource management system in northern Norway - a contribution to the common property debate.” In: Milton M.R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.). *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management In Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp. 48-54.
- Bradley, P. N. and K. McNamara (eds.)
1993 *Living with Trees: Policies for Forestry Management in Zimbabwe*. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- Bruce, J.W. and Louise Fortmann
1989 *Agroforestry: Tenure and Incentives*. Land Tenure Centre Paper no.135. Madison: Land Tenure Centre, University of Wisconsin.
- Burley, F. William
1992 “The Rio Bravo Conservation and Management Area of Belize.” In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Padoch (eds.). *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp.220-227.
- Campbell, B.M. et al.
1991 “Traditional agroforestry practices in Zimbabwe.” In: *Agroforestry Systems* 14(2):99-111.
- Cordell, J.C.
1984 “Traditional sea tenure and resource management in Brazilian coastal fishing.” In: J.H. Kapetsky and G. Lasserre (eds.). *Management of Coastal Lagoon Fisheries*. Rome: General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean, Studies and Reviews No. 61, FAO.
- Cruz, Wilfrido D.
1986 “Overfishing and conflict in a traditional fishery: San Miguel Bay, Philippines.” In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp.115-136.
- Cumming, D. H. M.
n/d *Developments in Game Ranching and Wildlife Utilization in East and Southern Africa*. Gland: World Wildlife Fund for Nature.
- Dahl, A.L.

- 1985 “Traditional environmental management in New Caledonia: a review of existing knowledge.” In: *Topic Review* No. 18. Nairobi: South Pacific Environment Programme, UNEP.
- Fortmann, Louise R. And Emery M. Roe
1986 “Common property management of water in Botswana.” In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 161-180.
- Fortmann, L.P. and J.W. Bruce (eds.)
1988 *Whose Trees? The Proprietary Dimensions of Forestry*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Fortmann, L.P. and J.W. Bruce
1988 “The daily struggle for rights.” In: L.P. Fortmann and J.W. Bruce (eds.). *Whose Trees? The Proprietary Dimensions of Forestry*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 337-341.
- Geiser, U.
1995 "Indigenous resource management and external development interventions in the dry zone of Sri Lanka." In: *GeoJournal* 35(2).
- Gill, Dhara and Janaki R.R. Alavalapati
1992 *Social Forestry: A Conceptual Analysis*. Edmonton: The Department of Rural Economy, The University of Alberta.
- Gilmour, D.A. et al.
1991 “Management of forests for local use in the hills of Nepal.” In: Donald A. Messerschmidt and Navin Rai (eds.). *Readings in Social Forestry and Natural Resource Management for Nepal*. Nepal: H.G. Ministry of Agriculture - Winrock International. Research Support Series Number 10.
- Gilmour, D.A. and R.J. Fisher
1991 *Villagers, Forests and Foresters*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press.
- Griffin, D.M.
1991 “Implementation of the results of scientific research in practical management: a case study from Nepalese forestry.” In: *Mountain Research and Development* 11(3):195-201.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Guha, Ramachandra
1989 *The Unquiet Woods: Ecological Change and Peasant Resistance in the Himalaya*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hafner, J.A. and Y. Apichatvullop
1990 "Farming the forest: managing people and trees in reserved forests in Thailand." In: *Geo Forum* 21(3):331-346.
- Halbert, Cindy L. and Kai N. Lee
1990 "The Timber, Fish, and Wildlife Agreement: implementing alternative dispute resolution in Washington State." In: *The Northwest Environmental Journal* 6(1).
- Hasler, Richard
1993 *Political Ecologies of Scale and the Multi-tiered Co-Management of Zimbabwean Wildlife Resources under CAMPFIRE*. Mount Pleasant, Harare: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe.
1994 "Cultural perceptions and conflicting rights to wildlife in the Zambezi Valley." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and Urs. P. Kreuter (eds.). *Elephants and Whales: Resources For Whom?* Berkshire: The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.
- Heyzer, Noeleen
1992 "Rainforest management and indigenous livelihoods: a Malaysian case study. In: *Development* 4:14-17.
- Hinojosa, Flavio Coello
1992 "The Cuyabeno Wildlife Reserve: human needs and natural resource conservation in the Ecuadorian Amazon." In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Podoich (eds.), *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 245-258.
- Hinton, Peter
1985 "An approach to the study of traditional systems of coastal resources management in Thailand." In: K. Ruddle and R.E. Johannes (eds.), *The Traditional Knowledge and Management of Coastal Systems in Asia and the Pacific*. Jakarta: UNESCO, Regional Office for Science and Technology for Southeast Asia.

- Hiraoka, Mario
1992 "Caboclo and Ribereno resource management in Amazonia: a review." In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Padoch (eds.). *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp.134-158.
- Hunt, Robert C.
1986 "Canal irrigation in Egypt: common property management." In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 199-214.
- Kaplan, Hillard and Kate Kopischke
1992 "Resource use, traditional technology, and change among native peoples of lowland South America." In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Padoch (eds.). *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 83-107.
- Kuperan, K. and N.M. Raha Abdullah
1994 "Small-scale coastal fisheries and co-management." In: *Marine Policy* 18(4).
- Kvist, Roger
1991 "Saami reindeer pastoralism as an indigenous resource management system - the case of Tuorpon and Sirkas, 1760-1860." In: *Arctic Anthropology* 28(2):121-134.
- Leach, M. and J. Fairhead
1994 "Natural resource management: the reproduction and use of environmental misinformation in Guinea's forest-savanna transition zone." In: *IDS Bulletin* 25(2).
- Ledec, George and Robert Goodland
1988 *Wildlands: Their Protection and Management in Economic Development*. World Bank Technical Paper. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- Leonard, D.K.
1984 *The Political Realities of African Management*. New York: Institute for Development Anthropology.
- Lim Cristina P., Yoshiaki Matsuda and Yukio Shigemi
1995 "Co-management in marine fisheries: the Japanese experience." In: *Coastal Management* 23(3).

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Matzke, Gordon E.
1993 *Resource Sharing Schemes for State Owned Land in Zimbabwe: A Discussion of Conceptual Issues Needing Consideration in the Development and Planning of Co-Management Regimes*. Harare: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe.
- May, Peter H.
1992 “Common property resources in the neotropics: theory, management progress, and an action agenda.” In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Padoch (eds.). *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 359-378.
- McKean, Margaret A.
1986 “Management of traditional common lands (Iriaichi) in Japan.” In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 533-590.
- Messerschmidt, D.A.
1986 “People and resources in Nepal: customary resource management systems of the Upper Kali Gandaki.” In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 455-480.
1987 “Conservation and society in Nepal: traditional forest management and innovative development.” In: P.D. Little et al. (eds.). *Lands at Risk in the Third World: Local Level Perspectives*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 373-397.
1990 “What is a tree?” In: *Forest, Trees and People Newsletter*. The International Rural Development Centre. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Miller, Peter
1995 “Sustainable livelihoods and the Manitoba Model Forest: a top-down initiative to foster bottom-up sustainable resource management at the regional level.” In: Naresh Singh and Laurie Ham (eds.). *Community-Based Resources Management and Sustainable Livelihoods: the Grass Roots of Sustainable Development*, pp. 119-141.

- Milloy, John
1991 "Our country: the significance of the buffalo resource for a Plains Cree sense of territory." In: Kerry Abel and Jean Friesen (eds.). *Aboriginal Resource Use in Canada*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, pp. 51-70.
- Moorehead, Richard
1989 "Changes taking place in common-property resource management in the Inland Niger Delta of Mali." In: Fikret Berkes (ed.), *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 256-272.
- Nhira, Calvin and Louise Fortmann
1993 "Local woodland management: realities at the grass roots." In: P.N. Bradley and K. McNamara (eds.). *Living with Trees: Policies for Forestry Management in Zimbabwe*. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. pp. 139-155.
- Niamir, M.
1990 *Herder's Decision-Making in Natural Resource Management in Arid and Semi-Arid Africa*. Community Forestry Note 4. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.
- Orejuela, Jorge E.
1992 "Traditional productive systems of the Awa (Cuaiquer) Indians of Southwestern Colombia and neighbouring Ecuador." In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Padoch (eds.). *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 58-82.
- Osborne, Bryan
1995 "Watershed community development: planning for sustainable livelihoods." In: Naresh Singh and Laurie Ham (eds.). *Community-Based Resources Management and Sustainable Livelihoods: the Grass Roots of Sustainable Development*, pp. 39-60.
- Peluso, Nancy Lee and Mark Poffenberger
1989 "Social forestry in Java: reorienting management systems." In: *Human Organization* 48(4):333-344.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Peluso, N.L.
1990 *Rich Forests and Poor People: Resource Control and Resistance in Java.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pernetta, J.C. and Lance Hill
1984 "Traditional use and conservation of resources in the Pacific basin." In: *Ambio* 13(5-6):359-364.
- Poffenberger, Mark (ed.)
1990 *Keepers of the Forest.* West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Poffenberger, M.
1990 *Joint Management for Forest Lands: Experiences from South Asia.* New Delhi: The Ford Foundation.
- Pollnac, Richard B.
1991 "Social and cultural characteristics in small-scale fishery development." In: Michael M. Cernea (ed.), *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 257-300.
- Pomeroy, R.S. and M.D. Pido
1995 "Initiatives towards fisheries co-management in the Philippines: the case of San Miguel Bay." In: *Marine Policy* 19(3).
- Pompe, Jeffrey and Charles E. Rockwood
1993 "A cooperative management solution to a fishery commons." In: *Marine Fisheries Review* 55(4).
- Poole, Peter
1989 *Developing a Partnership of Indigenous Peoples, Conservationists, and Land Use Planners in Latin America.* Washington: The World Bank.
- Redford, Kent H. and Christine Padoch (eds.)
1992 *Conservation of Neotropical Forests.* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Roddan, Chris
1994 "Participatory rural appraisal as a process in community forestry." In: *International Journal of Ecoforestry* 10(3):104-109.

- Salick, Jan
1992 "Amuesha forest use and management: an integration of indigenous use and natural forest management." In: Kent H. Redford and Christine Padoch (eds.). *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 305-332.
- Scoones, Ian and Frank Matose
1993 "Local woodland management: constraints and opportunities for sustainable resource use." In: P.N. Bradley and K. McNamara (eds.). *Living with Trees: Policies for Forestry Management in Zimbabwe*. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. pp. 157-193.
- Smith, Allan H.
1991 *Co-Management of the White Sea Urchin Resources in St. Lucia*. Christiansted: Caribbean Natural Resources Institute.
- Taylor, D. Russell
1994 "Elephant management in the Nyaninyami District, Zimbabwe: turning a liability into an asset." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and Urs P. Kreuter (eds.). *Elephants and Whales: Resources For Whom?* Berkshire: The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.
- Timbrook, Jan, John R. Johnson and David D. Earle
1993 "Vegetation burning by the Chumash." In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.). *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication. pp. 117-150.
- Unruh, J. D.
1995 "The relationship between indigenous pastoralist resource tenure and state tenure in Somalia." In: *Geo Journal* 36(1).
- Warren, Michael D.
1991 *Using Indigenous Knowledge in Agricultural Development*. World Bank Discussion Paper #127. Washington: The World Bank.
- Westoby, Jack
1987 *The Purpose of Forests*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

White, T. Anderson and C. Ford Runge

1994 "Common property and collective action: lessons from cooperative watershed management in Haiti." In: *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 43(1).

Williams, N.M. and E.S. Hunn (eds.)

1982 *Resource Managers: North American and Australian Hunter-Gatherers*. American Association for the Advancement of Science, Selected Symposium, No. 67. Boulder: Westview Press.

APPENDIX I - Aboriginal Co-Management Bibliography

c) Other Relevant Reading

- Acheson, James M.
1989 "Where have all the exploiters gone? Co-management of the Maine lobster industry." In: Fikret Berkes (ed.), *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press, pp.199-217.
- Adamowicz, W.L.
1991 "Valuation of environmental attitudes." In: *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 39(4):609-618.
- Adamowicz, W.L. et al.
1993 *Forestry and the Environment: Economic Perspectives*. CAB International.
- Anonymous
1978 *Forestry For Local Community Development*. FAO Forestry Paper 7. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Anonymous
1993 *Sustainable Use of Natural Resources: Concepts, Issues, and Criteria*. Gland: World Wide Fund for Nature.
- Baldwin, Sandra and Jenny Cervinskaskas (eds.)
1991 *Community Participation in Research*. Proceedings of a workshop held in Nairobi, Kenya 23-27 September 1991. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre and the University of Nairobi.
- Bender, M.J., G.V. Johnson and S.P. Simonovic
1994 "Sustainable management of renewable resources: a comparison of alternative decision approaches." In: *International Journal of Sustainable Development* 1:77-88.
- Blair, Harry W.
1988 *Forestry In Development Planning: Lessons from the Rural Experience*. London: Westview Press.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Bombay, Harry
1993 "Many things to many people." In: *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 17(1):15-18.
- Brightman, Robert
1993 *Grateful Prey: Rock Cree Human-Animal Relationships*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brody, Hugh
1976 "Land occupancy: Inuit perceptions." In: Milton Freeman (ed.), *Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Project*. Volume One. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, pp.185-242.
- Brokenshaw, David W., D.M. Warren and Oswald Werner (eds.)
1980 *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Bruce, John W.
1989 *Community Forestry: Rapid Appraisal of Tree and Land Tenure*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Bruce, J.W. and Louise Fortmann
1989 *Agroforestry: Tenure and Incentives*. Land Tenure Centre Paper no.135. Madison: Land Tenure Centre, University of Wisconsin.
- Buck, Susan J.
1989 "Multi-jurisdictional resources: testing a typology for problem structuring." In: Fikret Berkes (ed.), *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press."p.127-147.
- Canada and Saskatchewan
1993 *Saskatchewan Long-Term Integrated Forest Resource Management Plan*. Prince Albert: The Canadian Forest Service of Natural Resources Canada.
- Canada
1992 *Natural Resources Management Process Manual*. Ottawa: Environment Canada Parks Service.

- Carley, Michael and Ian Christie
 1992 *Managing Sustainable Development*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cernea, Michael M.
 1991 "The social actors of participatory afforestation strategies." In: Michael M. Cernea (ed.), *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 340-394.
- Cernea, Michael M. (ed.)
 1991 *Putting People First*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, Robert
 1991 "Shortcut and participatory methods for gaining social information for projects." In: Michael M. Cernea (ed.), *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 515-537.
- Davis Case, D'Arcy
 1989 *Community Forestry: Participatory Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
 1990 *The Community Toolbox: The Idea, Methods and Tools for Participatory Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation in Community Forestry*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Devereux, Stephen and John Hoddinott (eds.)
 1993 *Fieldwork in Developing Countries*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Dewalt, Billie R.
 1994 "Using indigenous knowledge to improve agriculture and natural resource management." In: *Human Organization* 53(2).
- Dove, M.R.
 1992 "Foresters' beliefs about farmers: a priority for social science research in social forestry." In: *Agroforestry Systems* 17(1):13-41.
- Fisher, Roger and William Ury
 1991 *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Fortmann, Louise P.

1988

“Great planting disasters: pitfalls in technical assistance in forestry.” In:
Agriculture and Human Values 5(1-2):49-60.

- Howes, Michael
1980 "The use of indigenous technical knowledge in development." In: David W. Brokenshaw, D.M. Werner and Oswald Werner (eds.). *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham: University Press of America, pp. 341-358.
- Howes, Michael and Robert Chambers
1980 "Indigenous technical knowledge: analysis, implications and issues." In: David W. Brokenshaw, D.M. Werner and Oswald Werner (eds.), *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham: University Press of America, pp. 329-340.
- Kay, Geoffrey
1975 *Development and Underdevelopment*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Knippers Black, Jan
1986 *Development in Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Korten, D.C. and N.T. Uphoff
1981 *Bureaucratic Reorientation for Participatory Rural Development*. NASPAA Working Paper No.1.
- Kottak, Conrad Phillip
1991 "When people don't come first: some sociological lessons from completed projects." In: Michael M. Cernea (ed.), *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp .429-464.
- Le Moigne, Guy, et al. (eds.)
1992 *Country Experiences with Water Resources Management: Economic, Institutional, Technological, and Environmental Issues*. World Bank Technical Paper. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- Marks, S.
1984 *The Imperial Lion: Human Dimensions of Wildlife Management in Central Africa*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Maser, Chris
1994 *Sustainable Forestry: Philosophy, Science and Economics*. Delray Beach: St. Lucie Press.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- McLuhan, T.C.
1994 *The Way of the Earth*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- McNeely, Jeffrey A. and David Pitt
1985 “Culture: the missing element in conservation and development.” In:
 Jeffrey A. McNeely and David Pitt (eds.), *Culture and Conservation: The
 Human Dimension in Developmental Planning*. London: Croom Helm, pp.
 1-9.
- Messerschmidt, D.A.
1991 *Rapid Appraisal for Community Forestry: The Rapid Assessment Process
 and Rapid Diagnostic Tools*. Pokhara, Nepal: Institute of Forestry Project
 Technology. Paper No.TP91/2.
- Messerschmidt, Donald A. et al. (eds.)
1993 *Common Forest Resource Management: Annotated Bibliography of Asia,
 Africa, and Latin America*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of
 the United Nations.
- 1993 *Rapid Appraisal for Community Forestry: The RA Process and Rapid
 Diagnostic Tools*. Nepal: Pokhara Institute of Forestry.
- Meyers, Renee
1993 "Technology serving tradition." In: *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 17(1).
- Milburn, D. et al.
1994 *Northern Water Resources Studies. Northern Aquatic Ecosystems and
 Mineral Development: Potential Impacts and Research Needs*. Ottawa:
 Ministry of Supply and Services.
- O'Brien, William E. and Cornelia Butler Flora
1992 “Selling appropriate development vs. selling-out rural communities:
 empowerment and control in indigenous knowledge discourse.” In:
 Agriculture and Human Values Spring 1992, pp. 95-102.
- Ostrom, Elinor
1994 *Governing the Commons*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.
- Posey, Darrell Addison
1992 “Interpreting and applying the “reality” of indigenous concepts: what is
 necessary to learn from the natives?” In: Kent H. Redford and Christine
 Padoch (eds.), *Conservation of Neotropical Forests*. New York: Columbia
 University Press, pp. 21-34.

- Raintree, John B.
1991 *Socioeconomic Attributes of Trees and Tree Planting Practices*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Rocheleau, Dianne E.
1994 "Participatory research and the race to save the planet: questions, critique, and lessons from the field." In: *Agriculture and Human Values*. Spring-Summer pp. 4-25.
- Roddan, Chris
1994 "Participatory rural appraisal as a process in community forestry." In: *International Journal of Ecoforestry* 10(3):104-109.
- Ross, David P. and Peter J. Usher
1986 *From the Roots Up: Economic Development as if Community Mattered*. New York: The Bootstrap Press.
- Ross, Monique and J. Owen Sanders (eds.)
1992 *Growing Demands on a Shrinking Heritage: Managing Resource-Use Conflicts*. Essays from the Fifth CIRL Conference on Natural Resources Law. Calgary: Canadian Institute of Resources Law.
- Sadler, Barry and Peter Boothroyd (eds.)
1993 *Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Environmental Assessment*. A manuscript prepared for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council. Microfiche.
- Sample, V. Alaric
1993 "A framework for public participation in natural resource decision making." In: *Journal of Forestry* 91(7).
- Sheng, Fulai
1993 *Integrating Economic Development with Conservation*. Gland: World Wildlife Fund for Nature.
- Subedi, Bhishma P, Chintamani L. Das and Donald Messerschmidt
1993 *Tree and Land Tenure in the Eastern Terai, Nepal*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

- Thomas, Stephen J.
1994 "Seeking Equity in Common Property Wildlife in Zimbabwe." In: Milton Freeman and Urs. P. Kreuter (eds.), *Elephants and Whales: Resources For Whom?* Berkshire: The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.
- Thomson, James T. et al.
1986 "Institutional dynamics: the evolution and dissolution of common property resource management." In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 391-424.
- Thomson, James T.
1992 *A Framework for Analyzing Institutional Incentives in Community Forestry*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Thrupp, Lori Ann et al.
1994 "Participatory methods in planning and political processes: linking the grassroots and policies for sustainable development." In: *Agriculture and Human Values* Spring-Summer pp.77-84.
- Uphoff, Norman
1991 "Fitting projects to people." In: Michael M. Cernea (ed.), *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 465-512.
- Uchendu, Victor C. (ed.)
1980 *Dependency and Underdevelopment in West Africa*. International Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Veeman, T.S.
1989 "Sustainable development: its economic meaning and policy implications." In: *Canadian Journal of Agriculture Economics* 37:875-886.
- Westoby, Jack
1987 *The Purpose of Forests*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Whyte, William Foote
1991 *Participatory Action Research*. London: Sage Publications.

- Wolfe, Jackie et al.
1992 *Indigenous and Western Knowledge and Resources Management Systems*.
Guelph: University of Guelph School of Rural Planning and Development.
- Woodley, Stephen (ed.)
1993 *Ecosystem Management for Managers: Canadian Parks Service National
Workshop*. Waterloo: Heritage Resources Centre.
- World Bank (The)
1992 *Strategy for Forest Sector Development in Asia*. Land Resources Unit,
Asia Technical Department. Washington: The World Bank.
- World Conservation Union, et al.
1990 *Caring For the World: A Strategy for Sustainability*. Gland: IUCN.

APPENDIX II - Annotated Co-Management Bibliography

Adams, Marie et al. 1991 “Alaska and Inuvialuit Beluga Whale Committee—an initiative in ‘at home management.’” In: *Arctic* 46(2):134-137.

Major topics: management, subsistence harvest, beluga whales, Inuvialuit, Inupiat

Summary: The AIBWC, formed in 1988 to promote the wise conservation and management of beluga whales, provides the focus of this article. Its membership includes researchers and technical advisors as well as representatives from coastal beluga whale-hunting regions and communities in Alaska, the Mackenzie River Delta in Canada, and U.S. federal, state and local government agencies. Only representatives from the beluga hunting regions vote on matters related to hunting, while the committee as a whole votes on other issues. A joint Inupiat-Inuvialuit plan to manage the shared Beaufort Sea beluga whale stock is being discussed. This 5-year-old committee has successfully raised awareness about beluga whales and conservation issues, both nationally and internationally. It is intended that Russian hunters and scientists become part of the process.

Anderson, Kat. C. 1993 “Native Californians as ancient and contemporary cultivators.” In: Thomas Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.). *Before the Wilderness: Environmental management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 151-174.

Major topics: sustainability, environmental management, Indian people: Yukots, Mono, Miwok, Karok.

Summary: This article explores the sustainable use of resources by Indian people along the west coast, north, and north central regions of California. Through practices such as judicious gathering of berries, roots and stems; selective cultivation of berries and corns; controlled burning of shrub; and pruning and coppicing of basketry shrub, the author demonstrates the Indian peoples continued success in utilizing their environment on a sustainable level. The author suggests that in an era when public land managers, academics, government officials, and nature groups have seen the need to protect plants and animals, they would do well to observe the successful techniques utilized by California Indians in the sustainable use of their environment.

Andresen, Steinar 1993 “The effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission.” In: *Arctic* 46(2):108-115.

Major topics: resource management, effectiveness, interests, power, institutions, policy, the International Whaling Commission.

Summary: The effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) is examined in relation to its stated goals, the correspondence between scientific advice and political decisions, and relative improvements to the status quo. This article’s analytical approach shows that the IWC’s effectiveness has varied considerably over time, as whaling issues are affected by increased political complexity, combined with strong emotional and moral elements. It is further pointed out that *one should avoid placing too much emphasis on the formal structures and goals of organizations*. The IWC, for example, is a totally different body today from what it was in its early years, although its goals and formal structure remain the same. This article’s analytical framework provides a way to systematically examine the history and performance of the whaling organization.

Anonymous. No date *Presenting The Chelan Agreement: Comprehensive Water Resources Planning*. Olympia: Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission.

Major topics: cooperative resource management, water resources management, land use, co-management.

Summary: An analysis and supporting documentation of the Chelan Agreement, a water management/planning agreement. The agreement’s participants include the tribes of Washington state, state and local governments, businesses, environmental officials and fisheries operators. As with much of the natural resources such as forests and fisheries in Washington state in the late 1980s, the allocation, use and management of water was in chaos with constant conflict and acrimony among the many users. In 1990, *the various water resource users negotiated and signed a cooperative approach to the use, planning and management of their water resource*. This report of the agreement is an example of the cooperative approach to resource management.

Anonymous. No date *Comprehensive Tribal Fisheries Management: A Holistic Approach*. Olympia: Treaty Indian Tribes of western Washington.

Major topics: fishery management, cooperative fisheries planning, cooperative habitat protection, fish stock enhancement, harvest monitoring.

Summary: This comprehensive report documents the history, current status and outlook of fisheries management in the state of Washington. *The report emphasizes cooperation, as opposed to litigation, in the management of fish stocks, fish habitat, wildlife habitat, commercial fishery and*

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

their enforcement. The Indian tribes are those which inhabit western Washington, however, all tribes in the state with an interest in fisheries and wildlife management are assumed to have roles in the overall management of state fisheries. The author discusses a wide spectrum of topics, from tribal fishery rights promised in treaties to the costs of cooperative fisheries management.

Anonymous
1987 *Changing Times, Challenging Agendas: Economic and Political Issues in Canada's North.* Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.

Major topics: resource management, northern development, traditional activities.

Summary: This book is a report of a symposium on economic and politic issues facing the north. First Nation, community, government and industry perspectives on the management of northern resources are presented. *The requirements for the development of 'building blocks' that will enhance greater community roles in the management and development of northern resources are discussed and documented.*

Anonymous
1992 *Tribal Timber/Fish/Wildlife Programs: 1988-1990.* Timber/Fish/Wildlife (TFW) Agreement report. Olympia, Washington.

Major topics: consensus-based decision making, cooperative management, wildlife management, habitat protection, environment protection.

Summary: The author examines the Timber, Forestry and Wildlife agreement, an integrated consensus-based cooperative management agreement of forestry, fishery and wildlife resources in Washington state. *The participants in the agreement are tribal representatives, wildlife game officials, conservationists, and timber industry officials.* Reviewing the critical background to forestry, fishery and wildlife resources, the author concludes that tribal governments, *state officials and industry officials were left with little choice but strike an agreement that could form the basis to solve common problems.*

Anonymous.
1993 *Sustainable Use of Natural Resources.* Gland: World Wide Fund for Nature.

Major topics: sustainable management, environment, economic development.

Summary: The authors define the concepts and examine the issues of sustainable management, and *assess the criteria that will enable sustainable management to become a vital component of common land management practice both in policy formation and project implementation.* This article is intended for general knowledge and understanding of the topic to achieve the fundamental purpose of the authors, which is to conserve nature. The authors begin with

the assumption that much of the relationship between human needs and the capacity of the earth to meet these needs is based on an unsustainable use of nature's resources. They end with the conclusion that *the goal of satisfying human needs must be achieved within the carrying capacity of the environment.*

Arnold, J.E.M. and J. Gabriel Campbell.

1986 "Collective management of hill forests in Nepal: the community forestry development project." In: National Research Council/BOSTID. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 425-454.

Major topics: community forestry, development, Nepal, local practices, management

Summary: This article reports on the progress made in initiating and institutionalizing community forestry in the hill areas of Nepal through the Community Forestry Development Project. *It examines the Nepalese government's initiative to build upon local traditions and practices to provide a widely applicable framework for developing productive local forest management systems suited to current needs.* It discusses this historical background, decision-making arrangements, pre-existing local forest management systems, patterns of interaction, and outcomes. The general conclusion is that despite having only limited experiences to date, they are encouraging.

Bailey, John

1994

"Managing protected areas in the north: what we know, what we need to learn about co-management." In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.). *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 91-99.

Major topics: co-management, land claims, Inuvialuit Settlement Region, harvesting, environmental management.

Summary: This article provides a description of the Inuvialuit Settlement Region and the *two functioning systems of co-management: a state system developed by governments that is based on scientific data, and an indigenous system pursued by aboriginal subsistence hunters.* The indigenous system relies on the cumulative experience of community members and the passing on of that experience from one generation to another. *Both systems of management are expressed through the co-management regimes established under the Inuvialuit Final Agreement,* including the Environmental Impact Screening Committee, Environmental Impact Review Board, the Fisheries Joint Management Committee, and the Wildlife Management Advisory Council. Membership on these committees includes representatives of the Inuvialuit, the federal government, and both territorial governments. The author is of the view that in order to be effective, the assurance that government agencies and land claim beneficiaries are going to embrace the concept of co-management must exist.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Further, third party interests must be considered under land claim's co-management processes. Lastly, consideration needs to be given to how national programs for protected areas will be addressed through co-management.

Bendickson, Jamie *Co-management Issues in the Forest Wilderness: A Stewardship Council for Temagami*. Calgary: Canadian Institute for Resources Law, pp. 256-275.
1991

Major Topics: co-management, sustainable development, dispute resolution, forestry.

Summary: This publication examines the development of a joint management institution as a means of dispute management over resource use, aboriginal rights and environmental concerns. The creation of a stewardship council over the forest resource deflected public criticism of provincial resource management policies and provided for some involvement in resource management by the Teme-augama Anishinabe. *The study examines co-management as a vehicle to reconcile growing and competing demands over access to the resource and to introduce a regime of sustainable forestry practices.* The case of the Wendaban Stewardship Authority (WSA) is used to illustrate a *comprehensive management structure with decision-making authority, rather than advisory authority only.* A challenge for the WSA is to find ways to ensure an acceptable level of accountability for its decision making.

Berkes, Fikret "Co-management and the James Bay Agreement." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.).
1989 *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.189-208.

Major topics: James Bay Agreement, fisheries co-management, James Bay co-management.

Summary: This article examines wildlife and fisheries co-management systems devised under the James Bay Agreement. *Various components of co-management such as consensus mechanisms, data collection, skill development among co-management partners, users group conflicts and resource allocations are discussed. Also discussed are obstacles to co-management such as contradictory value systems among partners and large geographic areas which have to be managed.*

Berkes, Fikret (ed.) 1989 *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press.

Major topics: common property, resource management, community development, case studies.

Summary: This book provides a wide-ranging survey on the role and importance of natural resources held in common ownership and the issues raised by their *conservation as a key component of sustainable economic development*. Case studies are taken from a wide range of geographic locations and resource management sectors. Theoretical problems are also presented.

Bradley, P.N. and K. McNamara (eds.) 1993 *Living With Trees: Policies for Forestry Management in Zimbabwe*. Washington: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Major topics: forest resources, management, macroeconomics, industry and community interests, duality of roles.

Summary: This publication is a compendium of the results of a joint World Bank and Zimbabwe Forestry Commission study in which the status, use and future of Zimbabwe's forest, woodland and tree resources are reviewed. Land, agriculture, and economic structural adjustment are key policy concerns in Zimbabwe. *The roles of the Forestry Commission, industry, and communities are examined with a view to local technical practices for the management of woodland and trees, the status and economic significance of these resources, tenure and gender issues, the institutional and legal forces in play, and problems of woodland valuation*. This is of particular interest to the co-management of forest resources in Canada as structural similarities exist between Canada and Zimbabwe, particularly in terms of colonial history.

Brokenshaw, David W., D.M. Warren and Oswald Werner (eds.) 1980 *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Major topics: management, indigenous knowledge, development, technology, scientific knowledge.

Summary: This book is an early collection of indigenous knowledge systems that explicitly *examines the relationship between indigenous knowledge and development*. The papers presented cover a wide range of geographical regions and topics. *One of the pervasive issues critical to successful co-management is the relationship between indigenous and scientific knowledge*.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Carley, Michael and Ian Christie

1993 *Managing Sustainable Development*. London: Earthscan Publications.

Major topics: sustainable development, definition of concepts, integrated management.

Summary: Following publication of the Brundtland Commission report, the need for environmental change was discussed in terms of ‘sustainable development,’ *but there was/is little agreement on what sustainable development means or how to achieve it. Realistic guidelines must be developed regarding the means of achieving actual sustainable development and enhancing the human relationship with the planet.* Environmental management concerns the mutually beneficial management of the humankind-nature interaction, in addition to biophysical management, to ensure environmental and social quality for future generations. The discussion in the book is divided into 5 parts: world trends and environmental consequences, the western industrial model of development, the present organization of world business and finance, the potential of innovative management approaches to contribute to sustainable development, and four case studies.

Caulfield, Richard A. "Aboriginal subsistence whaling in west Greenland." In: Milton M.R. Freeman

1994 and Urs P. Kreuter (eds.). *Elephants and Whales: Resources for Whom?*. London: The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.

Major topics: aboriginal subsistence whaling, commercial whaling, whale resource management, sustainable development, collective whaling.

Summary: In this study of Greenland Inuit harvest of whales, the author documents the role that whaling has in the lives of the Inuit. The author demonstrates that *there is little profit motive among the Inuit in the harvest of whales. Rather, whales occupy cultural, spiritual and subsistence roles in the lives of the Inuit.* The author shows that international concerns about whale populations and other marine mammals have exerted intense pressure on local Greenland Inuit in their traditional harvest of whales. *The effect of internal and external pressures on whaling has left Greenland whaling management in a state of uncertainty.*

Cizek, Petr

1992 *The Beverly - Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board: A Case Study of Aboriginal Participation in Resource Management*. Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.

Major topics: co-management, self-management, conservation, environment planning, commercialization.

Summary: An examination of the issues, obstacles and benefits of resource co-management through a study of the *Beverly-Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board, a renewable resources management board that advises inter-governmental agencies on the management of two*

migratory caribou herds that cross jurisdictions. The board is made up of traditional users and government representatives from Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and Canada. The author proposes that governments, traditional users, commercial users, and wildlife officials would do well to participate together in the management of renewable resources.

Clancy, Peter
1990 "Political development and wildlife management." In Gurston Dacks (ed.) *Devolution and Constitutional Development in the Canadian North*. Ottawa, Ontario: Carleton University Press.

Major topics: wildlife management, devolution, cooperative management, joint management.

Summary: The author sets out to analyze federal devolution and its effect on the management of resources in the Northwest Territories. Among the issues analyzed is the fact that *although management of certain resources has not been devolved, local elected leaders and resource users have undertaken de facto management of their resources. When an actual management structure is instituted, the author suggests that local users will be part of the management structure.* Moreover, the author suggests that because of continuing devolution of resources and the management of resources through legislation, government policy or claims settlements, *the structure of resource management will be a unified-integrated management structure.*

Cohen, Fay G.
1989 "Treaty Indian tribes and Washington state: the evolution of tribal involvement in fisheries management in the U.S. pacific Northwest." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp. 37-48.

Major topics: tribal fishery, fisheries management.

Summary: The history, legal background and current state of fisheries management in the U.S. northwest are examined. *An active role for aboriginal people in the management of state fishery through functions such as local fisheries committees, as well as fish stock enhancement that has been planned and implemented at the local level have resulted in tribal pride in the management of the fish resource.* The article further reveals that tribal involvement in cooperative management of state fishery extends to joint management activities with state and federal officials.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Dale, Norman
1989 "Getting to co-management: social learning in the redesign of fisheries management." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.49-72.

Major topics: co-management, fisheries management, social learning.

Summary: The author assesses the fishery co-management in northwest United States as a learning basis for the development and implementation of British Columbia co-management model among native people, commercial fishermen and sport fishermen. Co-management as a form of land management was implemented in Washington state in the 1970's and 1980's. The article mentions *conditions for effective co-management to occur, such as the need for a crises in resource stocks and court imposed directives for cooperative management.*

Doubleday, Nancy C.
1989 "Co-management provisions of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.209-227.

Major topics: co-management, Inuvialuit Final Agreement, conservation.

Summary: This article seeks to analyze the co-management provisions contained in the Inuvialuit Final Agreement. The agreement was a comprehensive land claim agreement between Inuit of the western arctic and Canada. There is discussion of *key ingredients of co-management such as harvesting rights, participation in management and incorporation of traditional user knowledge.*

Doubleday, Nancy C.
1994 "Arctic whales: sustaining indigenous peoples and conserving Arctic resources." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and Urs P. Kreuter (eds.). *Elephants and Whales: Resources for Whom?*. London: The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.

Major topics: Inuit subsistence whaling, Inuit trade in whale products, sustainable Inuit whaling, sustainable and equitable development.

Summary: An assessment of the challenges and obstacles facing the Canadian Inuit in their struggle to preserve their traditional harvest of Arctic whales. Inuit who harvest whales are the object of the article, and Inuvialuit of the Western Arctic are cited as a case study. Faced with well-financed, well-orchestrated and ultimately, effective, inter-national anti-fur campaigns, the Inuit right to hunt whales and to "freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources" has been adversely affected. It is the view of the author that *a co-management approach to whales that incorporates*

the experiences, knowledge and needs of resource users - Inuit - will address issues of conservation and provide for sustainability and equity in the use of that resource.

East, Ken
Parks' 1986 "Resource co-management in Wood Buffalo National Park: the National perspective." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.). *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 86-96.

Major topics: co-management, joint management, legislative authority, advisory role in management, Peace-Athabasca Delta, wolves, bison.

Summary: Considers the changes imposed upon the existing management structure of northern Alberta's Wood Buffalo National Park by a land claims settlement. *The article presents the issues, obstacles and possible structures of the proposed 'co-' and/or 'joint' management of the national park by government and the Fort Chipewyan Cree Band of northern Alberta.*

Feit, Harvey
1988 "Self-management and state management: forms of knowing and managing northern wildlife." In: Milton M. R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.). *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp.72-91.

Major topics: wildlife management, resources, self-management, state-management

Summary: Looks at the relationship between local systems of self-management and systems of state-management of wildlife in the Canadian north. *Self-management* is defined as the local or regional level systems for regulating the use of wildlife and/or for managing the wildlife themselves. *These systems do not depend on recognition by any other governmental authority for their essential operation. Special emphasis is placed on how knowledge is related to action.* The mutual autonomy and mutual inter-dependence of the two systems is explored. The conclusion reached is that both management systems exist, both have a future in the Canadian north and, in a real and practical sense, are now inseparably interlinked and are necessary to each other. *Whether co-management will be successful or whether it will lead to co-optation and domination that weakens self-management will depend on whether the autonomy of self-managers is recognized, and whether their participation will be treated with equal authority, legal standing, resources, and respect.*

Freeman, Milton M.R.
1993 "The International Whaling Commission, small-type whaling, and coming to terms with subsistence." *Human Organization* 52(3):243-251.

Major topics: subsistence whaling, International Whaling Commission, commodization.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Summary: The author analyses various terms and principles in the whaling industry, with a special interest in the role that subsistence whaling has alongside small type commercialized whaling. The author discusses at length the term "subsistence" and gives it form beyond usual academic use. The central theme of the article is that *subsistence resource usage serves cultural, social and spiritual purposes that industrial enterprises do not consider.*

Freeman, Milton M.R.

1989 "The Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission: successful co-management under extreme conditions." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.137-153.

Major topics: co-management, state-management systems, bowhead whaling.

Summary: Examination of Alaska's whaling co-management process in the face of drastic differences in the cultures of the participants in the co-management. On the one hand are traditional Alaskan whale hunters, and on the other are scientific managers. In spite of their differences, the two groups succeed in co-managing whales within their jurisdictions. *The experience of co-management in Alaska illustrates three features of successful co-management: the imposition of a federal or, in this case, international, moratorium on resource use; the requirement that participants, both users and government officials, in co-management are localized, as opposed to representing distant jurisdictions; and resource users are the ones responsible for implementing and enforcing the co-management agreement.*

Gambell, Ray
1993 "International management of whales and whaling: an historical review of the regulation of commercial and aboriginal subsistence whaling." In: *Arctic* 46(2):97-207.

Major topics: management, regulation, subsistence, International Whaling Commission, bowhead whales, exploitation, aboriginal people.

Summary: A summary of the history of agreements among whalers, intergovernmental agencies, the establishment of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and an outline of the tensions between the objectives of the conservation of Alaskan bowhead whale resources and the orderly development of the whaling industry. In 1975 the IWC adopted its "new management procedure," based on the concept of maximum sustainable yield, for commercial whaling. *Tensions exist as a result of the perceived dependence on the Alaskan native communities on the hunt, rather than an emphasis on the status of the whale stock. The author feels that these developments will perhaps lead to the development of a more practical procedure of bowhead management that takes*

account of all relevant factors - including the status of the whale stocks and the subsistence needs of the aboriginal hunters and their communities.

Gosse, Richard
1995 *Searching For Common Ground: First Nations and the Management of Natural Resources in Saskatchewan.* A background paper to assist discussions on co-management issues. Report prepared under contract to DIAND.

Major Topics: co-management; forestry; jurisdictional disputes; third party stakeholders.

Summary: Prepared to facilitate First Nations participation in Montreal Lake area forest resource co-management in a controversial atmosphere, whereby the provincial government and other third party stakeholders had registered opposition to DIAND's proposal for co-management. The paper makes the case for a continuing interest of First Nations in off-reserve lands, as well as for a process which adequately accommodates provincial jurisdictional concerns and concerns of third parties. This case highlights *several issues which must be addressed for reaching a successful co-management agreement: contending jurisdictions; recognition of First Nations interest in management of off-reserve resources; and the accommodation of third party stakeholders. The report suggests that it would be advantageous for First Nations to consult and work with other stakeholders.*

Green, Jeffrey E. (ed.)
1986 *Native People and Renewable Resource Management.* Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists.

Major topics: sustainable development, wildlife management, co-management, renewable resources, aboriginal people.

Summary: *Report of a symposium on native people and renewable resources management. This comprehensive document has contributions from academics, politicians, technicians, traditional users and commercial users.* The papers in the report involve Canadian First Nations from across Canada, with most of the case studies involving First Nations from Alberta, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories. The sectors discussed include wild rice, forestry, national parks management, whaling, fisheries and seal harvesting.

Gunn, Anne et al.
1988 "The contribution of the ecological knowledge of Inuit to wildlife management in the Northwest Territories." In: Milton M. R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.). *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions.* Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp.22-31.

Major topics: scientific and ecological knowledge, the Inuit, biologists, wildlife management.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Summary: Focuses on the history of wildlife management by both Inuit and biologists in the northern Northwest Territories and the knowledge systems both bring to bear on the issue. *Many management failures occurred as a result of the biologists failure to consult with and to integrate hunters' knowledge in wildlife management decisions.* By the 1980's increases in the availability of wildlife in the N.W.T. have engendered less confrontation and less polarized positions between aboriginal hunters and biologists. *Hunters also have gained increased political influence, leading to a more cooperative approach to management and an exchange of knowledge between hunters and biologists.* Examples are provided which illustrate the contributions to and limitations of the two approaches to wildlife management. *The key to the integration of the indigenous and scientific management knowledge systems in the N.W.T. may be more effective communication between hunters and biologists.*

Hasler, Richard
1994 "Cultural perceptions and conflicting rights to wildlife in the Zambezi Valley." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and Urs P. Kreuter (eds.). *Elephants and Whales: Resources for Whom?*. London, England: The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.

Major topics: wildlife control and use, wildlife co-management, natural resource management, problem animal control, sustainable hunting.

Summary: Brief discussion of conflicting notions of ownership, control and the right to kill elephants among park officials, two local ethnic groups, hunting operators, game hunters, 'spirits' and spirit mediators. Using two separate elephant kills, the author *illustrates differences in meat distribution and income distribution that arise out of different perceptions of the right, ownership and control of elephants.* There are two ethnic African people under consideration, and the area is a small valley along the Zambezi valley, which cuts through Zambia and Mozambique. Along with the usual discussions of wildlife management, *the article is an opportunity to observe the role of spirituality and "spirit" mediators in wildlife management.*

Howes, Michael
1980 "The use of indigenous technical knowledge in development." In: David W. Brokenshaw, D.M. Werner and Oswald Werner (eds.), *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham: University Press of America, pp. 341-358.

Major topics: indigenous knowledge, development, botanical knowledge and organized science.

Summary: Reviews a selection of literature that considers accounts of the nature of indigenous knowledge, including descriptions of case studies. *These studies pertain to botanical*

knowledge and awareness of changes in ecosystems, and their interaction with organized science. It is important to understand these forms of interaction as a component of management regimes that function appropriately. Indigenous knowledge has as much validity as scientific knowledge.

Howes, Michael and Robert Chambers

1980 “Indigenous technical knowledge: analysis, implications and issues.” In: David W. Brokenshaw, D.M. Werner and Oswald Werner (eds.). *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham: University Press of America, pp. 329-340.

Major topics: definitions, indigenous knowledge, scientific knowledge, knowledge transmission.

Summary: An important article that focuses on the potential for using indigenous technical knowledge in development. *A comparison is made with institutionally organized science and technology. The conclusion is that indigenous knowledge is underutilized, and that it can be profitably generated, assimilated and transmitted.* The author argues that professionals and officials concerned with progressive development would benefit from applying this knowledge.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

1985 *The Western Arctic Claim: The Inuvialuit Final Agreement*. Ottawa: Queen’s Printer.

Major topics: land claim agreement, Western Arctic, wildlife management, fisheries.

Summary: This *land claim agreement has been signed off between the Government of Canada and the Inuvialuit (Western Arctic Inuit)*. *Co-management structures in the forms of board and councils* are included in the following: Land Use Planning Commissions; Water Management; Participation Agreements: Petroleum, Coal, Mineral Rights or Interests; Environmental Impact Screening Committee; Environmental Impact Review Board; Yukon North Slope Conservation: Wildlife, Habitat, Traditional Use; Wildlife Management Advisory Council: National Park Management, Territorial Park Management, Yukon, Harvesting Management, Conservation, Habitat Protection; Fisheries Joint Management Committee; Inuvialuit Game Council and Inuvialuit Hunters and Trappers Committees; and research Advisory Council.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

1992 *Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement. Vol. 1.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Major topics: land claim, co-management, self government, board structures.

Summary: This *land claim agreement has been signed off between the Government of Canada and the Tetlit Gwich'in. Co-management structures in the form of boards and councils* are included in the following: Renewable Resources Board: Wildlife Harvesting, Trapping Areas, Policy and Planning, Education and Training, Research and Harvesting Studies, Commercial Activities, Park Management Plans, Forestry; Renewable Resource Councils; Management of Migratory Species; National Park Management and Guidelines Plans; National Park Impact and Benefit Plans; National Park Management Committees; and Protected Areas.

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

1993 *Champagne and Aishihik First Nations Final Agreement, First Nation of Nacho Nyak Dun Final Agreement, Vuntut Gwich'in Final Agreement, Teslin Tlingit Final Agreement.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Major topics: land claims, co-management, board structures, implementation.

Summary: These *land claims agreements have been signed off between the Government of Canada and four Yukon First Nations. Co-management structures in the forms of board and councils* are included in the following: Renewable Resource Councils; Special Management Areas; Fish and Wildlife Management Board: Trapline, Salmon Harvesting, Fishing, Training and Education, Wildlife Harvesting; Land Use Planning Council and Regional Land Use Planning Commissions; Heritage Resources Board: National Parks and National Historic Sites, Research, Place Names, Documentary Heritage Resources, Heritage Sites; Water Board; Transboundary Agreements; Training Trust and Training Policy Committee; etc. *A review of these provisions is most helpful in gaining a solid understanding of the value of co-management in which the interests of all parties are involved.*

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

1993 *Agreement Between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Major topics: land claims, Nunavut Territory, co-management, board structures, wildlife.

Summary: This *land claim agreement has been signed off between the Government of Canada and Nunavut. Co-management structures in the forms of boards and councils* are included

in the following: Nunavut Wildlife Management Board: Wildlife, bowhead traditional knowledge, harvesting research, raptors, migratory birds; National and Territorial Park provisions: natural regions, special preservation, wilderness state, economic benefits, impact and benefit agreements; Joint Inuit/Government Parks Planning and Management Committee: management of conservation areas in terrestrial and marine environments; Surface Rights Tribunal; Nunavut Planning Commission: land use planning in the settlement area, including water and wildlife, economic opportunities, cultural factors and priorities, community infra structural requirements, environmental protection and management needs, and energy requirements; Nunavut Impact Review Board; and Nunavut Water Board.

Jentoft, Svein and Trond Kristoffersen

1989 “Fishermen’s comanagement: the case of the Lofoten fishery.” In: *Human Organization* 48(4):355-364.

Major topics: fisheries co-management, regulations, management models.

Summary: Addresses the efficacy of decentralizing authority and responsibility to producer organizations and groups in fisheries co-management. Questioning whether co-management models are feasible in fisheries regulations, this paper examines their strengths and weaknesses. *It concludes that fisheries co-management in general is superior to other management forms. Further, regulations that fishermen themselves consider illegitimate will be ineffective because they will tend to be bypassed and resisted. It is argued that legitimacy is not just a result of the management decision itself, but how that decision is reached.*

Johnson, Jim
1994 “A Parks Canada perspective on Vuntut National Park.” In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.). *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp.137-141.

Major topics: Vuntut National Park, national regions, northern Yukon.

Summary: Reports discussions on establishing a national park in the Old Crow Flats area of the Yukon Territory. In addition to establishing the park, the recently-settled Vuntut Gwich’in First Nation Final Agreement provides for the *Old Crow Special Management Area, which will be managed cooperatively by Government and the First Nation. The land claim agreement establishes the Vuntut Gwich’in as a full partner in the management of wildlife and wildlife habitat, and recognizes the current and traditional use of the area.* Parks Canada recognizes this establishment as a *possible model that may be applicable elsewhere.* Further, the protection of the Old Crow Flats is a significant and positive environmental action with international implications, owing to the

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

wetlands significance of the flats. *This management structure provides the means to not only protect natural resource values, but cultural resources as well.*

Johnson, Linda and Mary Jane Johnson

1994 “Traditional knowledge and protected areas.” In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.). *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 107-131.

Major topics: traditional knowledge, Kluane National Park, Champaign and Aishihik First Nations.

Summary: Based on the record from one of the sessions of the conference. Many of the *Elders and hunters in attendance speak about their life experiences on land currently held within protected areas, including the impact of various policy decisions made by government. There is also a discussion regarding government’s lack of interest in traditional knowledge for the purpose of establishing parks, as well as the occupation by non-aboriginals of traditional territories, due to the establishment of parks. The rules imposed on hunters and trappers, including the recording of furs, is also recorded. The article reflects the perspective that traditional knowledge should be valued for what it can offer in establishing protected areas, and that aboriginal people who have traditionally occupied the land must be included in decisions regarding protected areas.*

Judd, Charles M. “Cognitive effects of attitude conflict resolution.” In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 22(3):483-498.

1978

Major Topics: conflict resolution, attitude, cooperation.

Summary: Focusing on the idea that *interpersonal conflicts often arise from conflicts over scarce resources, aside from attitude differences. The changes in attitude conflicts are very likely to influence the changing views on the issues under dispute. The article concludes with the results showing that competition leads to decreased perceived similarity between positions, and overemphasizes on ways in which positions differ. Cooperation has the opposite effect.*

Kassi, Norma “Science, ethics, and wildlife management.” In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.). *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp.212-216.

1994

Major topics: Old Crow Flats, western science, management, wolves, biologists.

Summary: *Discusses the gulf between traditional management practices and those of western science. Examples given reflect natural connections being broken and the danger involved in this action. The author talks about the damage done by western scientists who do not understand*

the natural reasons for animal behaviour and natural population cycles. There needs to be a negotiation process established whereby scientists and indigenous people bring their knowledge bases together for more effective wildlife management.

Kearney, John F. "Co-management or co-optation? The ambiguities of lobster fishery
1989 management in southwest Nova Scotia." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.85-102.

Major topics: co-management, cooperative self-determination, co-optation.

Summary: Examines the conflicts and contradictions of Nova Scotia lobster co-management. The participants are commercial and sport fishermen and government officials. *In addition to the differences in priorities and positions between fishermen and government officials, there are also differences between fishermen. A basic issue the author examines is the potential for co-optation when the fishermen enter into co-management.* The author asserts that *cooperative actions among users will consolidate their strengths and bargaining positions in negotiations with government officials.* This leads to the proposition that *co-management as negotiated among parties with common priorities and backgrounds has a better chance of success than one where negotiating parties are far apart in backgrounds and interests.*

Keith, Robert F. and David A. Neufeld
1988 "Northern resources planning and management: perspectives on community self-determination." In: Gurston Dacks and Ken Coates (eds.). *Northern Communities: The Prospects for Empowerment*. Edmonton: The Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, pp. 91-100.

Major topics: land claims, Yukon, Northwest Territories, devolution, land use planning and management, control, Ellesmere Island, Polar Bear Pass, Beverly-Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board.

Summary: Report showing that *policy makers often emphasize structure rather than process, stability rather than flexibility, and containment rather than exchange. This has led to the breakdown of, and threat to, ecological systems as well as the loss of economic viability in some communities, the oscillating processes of the formal economy, and the diminution of social vitality.* Much of Canada's northern development policy can be characterized as designs based on containment and exclusion resulting in a sense of alienation and powerlessness in northern communities. One answer is in self-determination and cooperative planning and management. *Self-determination is cast*

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

in a multi-actor framework of government, industry, indigenous resident, and third party interests. A balanced set of interests and the fair sharing of powers and responsibilities is required. Northern land use planning and management demonstrates a considerable accomplishment in this area, and the examples of the Polar Bear Pass National Wildlife Area, Ellesmere Island National Park Reserve, and the Beverly-Kaminuriak Caribou management board are given as examples. The author states that it is through land claims settlements that northern Native communities can expect to acquire a more effective role in resource planning and decision-making, in addition to forging more cooperative links between government, industry, and communities.

Kellert, Stephen and Syma A. Ebbin

1993

Empowerment and Equity of Indigenous Peoples of North America: Emerging Cooperative Institutions for Fisheries Management. New Haven: Yale University.

Major topics: cooperative management, resource allocation, sustainable management, resource constraints.

Summary: *An analysis of tribal requirements for fish resources and a co-management framework that satisfies both human needs and sustainable fisheries.* The aboriginal resources users represented by First Nations located near the Puget Sound region in Washington state and along the Yukon River in Alaska. The author questions the rationale of co-management regimes - often intended to empower marginalized groups and share decision making authority - and assesses whether co-management regimes are a more effective manner of resource management.

Langdon, Steve J.

1989

"Prospects for co-management of marine mammals in Alaska." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.154-169.

Major topics: walrus management, co-management, co-operative management planning.

Summary: Documentation of the history of Alaskan harvest, management, and co-management of marine mammals. However, the author also considers *the reluctance of state and federal officials in incorporating the experiences, knowledge and needs of Alaskan Eskimos in walrus management. Several key factors in this co-management are listed: a decline of a resource and the need to protect it; support for local and de-centralized control over resources; and, co-management combined with other concrete benefits of conservation management such as sale of animal parts.*

Le Moigne, Guy, et al. (eds.)

1992

Country Experiences with Water Resources Management: Economic, Institutional, Technological, and Environmental Issues. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Major topics:

water supply management, water allocation, water pricing, water resources development, privatization.

Summary:

On water and the experiences of different countries in dealing with the development, allocation and distribution of this most vital resource. This document is based on the experiences and forecasts of the World Bank, and is therefore international in scope. The editors have included articles that deal with specific river basins and the reader can easily infer useful lessons from the experiences of other peoples on such issues as water allocation, health and environment as related to water, technological issues, and institution building.

Lewis, Henry T.

1993

"Patterns of Indian burning in California: ecology and ethnohistory." In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.). *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians.* Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 55-116.

Major topics:

controlled burning, resource management.

Summary:

Focusing on how hunting/gathering societies utilized systematic burning as a control mechanism in the man/environment relationship. The people under consideration are those Indians who inhabit the north-coast, north interior, and mid-west regions of California. It is the writer's thesis is that *total fire suppression in California has not succeeded, but has instead exacerbated the wildfire problem by allowing the accumulation of forests that would otherwise be purposely burned. The Indian tribes under consideration historically utilized controlled spot-burning to maintain and control the amount, type, and nutrient usefulness of forests, tree underlay, and shrub. In short, fire was a physical factor utilized by Indians to change and affect their local environment.*

Lloyd, Kevin

1986

"Cooperative management of polar bears on northeast Baffin Island." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.). *Native People and Renewable Resource Management.* Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp.108-117.

Major topics:

wildlife management, cooperative management, renewable resources.

Summary:

Assessment of the *cooperative management of polar bears on Baffin island by the Government of Northwest Territories and traditional and commercial Inuit users.* The article

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

reveals the dynamics of practical cooperative management of a local resource, as opposed to international resources such as whales and migratory birds.

McCarthy, Helen 1993 "Managing oaks and the acorn crop." In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.). *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp. 213-228.

Major topics: resource management, sustainable use, sustainable management.

Summary: Inquiry into the strategies and practices of the land management practices of the Indians of California in their use of acorns. These Indians are the Mono and Chukchansi people of California's Sierra Nevada region. *The author itemizes, examines and assesses the efficacy of the practical and spiritual strategies utilized by the Mono and Chukchansi in the sustainable use and management of oak and acorn. This article stresses the sustainable management of resources which have been and continue to be vital to the people under examination.*

Messerschmidt, D.A. 1986 "People and resources in Nepal: customary resource management systems of the Upper Kali Gandaki." In: National Research Council. *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management*. Washington: National Academy Press, pp. 455-480.

Major topics: customary resource management systems, forests, irrigation, common property.

Summary: Presenting traditional resource management systems in two districts in a north central watershed of Nepal. Examples of both forest and irrigation management systems are provided, followed by an analysis of common property issues. The author *points out the importance of the cultural context of local understanding and decision making. Conclusions reached include that cultural diversity and diversity of form, function, meaning and use provide a key to understanding how and why common property management systems survive in the world. This article is useful in understanding the same concepts within the context of Canadian First Nation resource co-management.*

Messerschmidt, D.A. 1987 “Conservation and society in Nepal: traditional forest management and innovative development.” In: P.D. Little et al. (eds.). *Lands At Risk in the Third World: Local Level Perspectives*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 373-397.

Major topics: forest degradation, policy implementation, fragile environments.

Summary: The forests of Nepal are degrading at a very rapid rate, and the attributed cause is a combination of flawed forest policies, population pressures, and a fragile environment. *This article discusses the most hopeful management options based on identifying and incorporating local indigenous and traditional management techniques, whereby project planning uses the knowledge of local leaders and farmers, local organizations, and traditional rules regulating forest use.*

Morrell, Mike 1989 "The struggle to integrate traditional Indian systems and state management in the salmon fisheries of the Skeena River, British Columbia." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.231-248.

Major topics: traditional fishery policy, fishery as social endeavour, First Nation fishery management.

Summary: A statement of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en First Nation position on management and co-management of fish resources within traditional territory (the upper Skeena river in north central British Columbia). *The First Nation push for managing its own resources responds to legal confrontations with enforcement officers, disputes with commercial and sport fishermen, and*

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

land and water management system for the Northwest Territories is not realistic given the absence of consistent approaches to land and water management in the various land claims settlements.

Murtha, Mike
1994 “Nisga’a Memorial Lava Bed Park: an example of co-management in British Columbia.” In: Juri Peepre and Bob Jickling (eds.). *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness*. Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Yukon College, pp. 278-281.

Major topics: co-managed park, Nisga’a, government.

Summary: Reviews the processes leading to the establishment of the park. *The operating structure between the Province of British Columbia and the Nisga’a is loose and apparently effective. Signage is bilingual and the management process is cooperative.*

Nelson, J.G. and Sabine Jessen
1984 *Planning and Managing Environmentally Significant Areas in the Northwest Territories: Issues and Alternatives*. Ottawa: Canadian Arctic Resources Committee.

Major topics: environmentally significant areas, environment protection, land use planning, land use management.

Summary: An analysis of management systems for lands designated as Environmentally Significant Areas in the Northwest Territories. *With competition for land use from mining, hydro-electricity, defence, petroleum and other uses, there is a real need to develop a coordinated management system for various national parks, territorial parks, and wildlife sanctuaries. Analysing management boards, government agencies and departments, advisory committees and commissions, and international land management systems, the author concludes that a comprehensive land management system for Environmentally Significant Areas is required to meet current land use requirements in the Northwest Territories.*

Nhira, Calvin and Louise Fortman
1994 "Local woodland management: realities at the grass roots." In: P.N. Bradley and K. McNamara (eds.). *Living with Trees: Policies for Forestry Management in Zimbabwe*. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, pp.139-155.

Major topics: local woodland management, commercial forestry, traditional forestry, social forestry, sustainable forestry.

Summary: *An argument that governments should facilitate locally controlled and enforced management of forests.* The author discusses issues in general terms as they are experienced in societies that deal with forestry, although he does focus on Zimbabwe. The argument consistent throughout the article is that the co-management of forests anywhere can not be based on a single model of management, but rather there should be an amalgam of models based on local conditions and land tenure systems.

Ortiz, Bev. 1993 “Contemporary California Indian basket-weavers and the environment.” In: Thomas C. Blackburn and Kat Anderson (eds.). *Before the Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians*. Menlo Park: Ballena Press Publication, pp.195-212.

Major topics: co-management, natural resources, environmental management, balance, traditional knowledge.

Summary: On the co-management of natural resources used in basket making. Those involved are various Indian groups in northern, northwestern, and north central California and farmers, parks officials, commercial operators, florists and hobbyist gatherers. Historically, Indian basket weavers of California combined complex social and religious traditions with practical techniques to guide them in the management of the natural resources used as inputs in the basket production. *Through prudent harvesting, pruning, cultivation, debris cleaning and controlled burning, the Mono, Yurak, and Pomo succeeded in achieving a balance between their tradition of basket weaving and their environment. Recently, the delicate balance has been disturbed by developments such as property restrictions, permit procedures, improper waste disposal, herbicide and pesticide spraying, as well as competition from commercial growers. The resolution of these issues will be accomplished in part with the recognition and application of the knowledge the California Indians have to offer.*

Osharenko, Gail 1988 “Wildlife management in the North American Arctic: the case for co-management.” In: Milton M. R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.). *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp.92-104.

Major topics: wildlife management, dualism, government, indigenous user groups

Summary: Both indigenous and state models of wildlife management are in common use throughout Canada and Alaska. In this article, *the author states that the indigenous system has limited application and the state system has never worked well. The paper argues that co-*

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

management arrangements in which governmental authorities share power with indigenous user groups offer the best prospect for solving problems. The management regimes examined include: the Beverly-Kaminuriak Barren ground caribou in the central Arctic, the Northern Quebec beluga, and the Yukon-Kuskokwin Delta geese in Alaska.

Paisley, Richard et al. *Analysis of Strategies for Co-operative Fisheries Management Between Government and Native Indians.* Report prepared for Native Affairs Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Vancouver: Westwater Research Centre.
No date

Major Topics: co-management, fisheries.

Summary: Identifies factors contributing to successful co-operative fisheries management practices in the Pacific Northwest. *Co-management agreements usually have developed as a result of a conflict over resource use and a crisis in resource management.* These agreements may break down if the crisis which fostered the initial agreement disappears, unless equity in benefits is perceived by all stakeholders - including aboriginal and non-aboriginal third party interests. *Important characteristics of successful agreements have included: technical committees to develop common information bases; a non-litigious dispute resolution mechanism; extension of decision-making authority to resource users; and the ensuring of economic incentives among stakeholders.* In an environment where resource stocks continue to fluctuate and stock measurement is difficult, *successful co-management requires adequate attention to the quality of the process rather than a single-minded focus on outcomes.*

Peepre, Juri and Bob Jickling (eds.)
1994 *Northern Protected Areas and Wilderness.* Whitehorse: Canadian Parks and Wilderness, Yukon College.

Major topics: parks, co-management, wilderness, traditional knowledge, First Nations, government, industry.

Summary: This forum *explored ways to complete a protected areas network; identify possible solutions to issues in northern protected areas and wilderness management; search for ethical approaches to the care of ecosystems; encourage communication between environmental organizations, government, First Nations, and industry; and foster an appreciation for the use of traditional knowledge and co-management.* Participants included First Nations people, government representatives, wilderness advocates, teachers, students, parks professionals, and academics. The compilation includes articles, stories, transcripts, comments, papers, and reports.

Pinkerton, Evelyn et al.

1993

A Model for First Nation Leadership in Multi-Party Stewardship of Watersheds and Their Fisheries. A Report to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. No publisher.

Major Topics: locally-based resource management, fisheries.

Summary: Examines a pilot project in locally-based watershed management by the Skeetchestn Band of the Shuswap Nation as a model for a province-wide system. This is provided through a system of local watershed management committees that coordinate efforts through a multi-watershed fisheries commission. *Identifies several prerequisites for successful watershed management: social, economic geographic and habitat characteristics favouring effective resource management; adequate management capacity, previous experience with or concern for the resource; recognition of the stature and sense of purpose of the project initiator.* The experience of the Skeechestn Band in problem identification and setting of direction are explored, with the key factors in each identified. These activities precede negotiation and agreement of resource management strategies, and contribute to the capacity of building of relationships which will support future local resource management strategies. *The report highlights the difficulty of integrating local management with regional and global resource management.*

Poole, Peter

1989

Developing a Partnership of Indigenous Peoples, Conservationists, and Land Use Planners in Latin America. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Major topics: wildlife management, indigenous land rights, indigenous knowledge, wildlife management models.

Summary: Based on research undertaken by the World Bank, this document assesses various issues in wildlife management and indigenous peoples. Using case studies from indigenous communities in Canada, United States and Latin America, the author *illustrates basic principles of incorporating indigenous knowledge and needs in wildlife management.* This is a comprehensive book with discussion of issues such as wildlife planning and management, indigenous knowledge, indigenous needs, various wildlife management models, conservation and sustainable development.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Richard, P.R. and D.G. Pike

1993 "Small whale co-management in the Eastern Canadian Arctic: a case history and analysis." In: *Arctic* 46(2):138-143.

Major topics: Southeast Baffin, High Arctic, Greenland, hunters, harvesting, conservation, protection, Nunavut.

Summary: Dealing with the problems and challenges of co-management of beluga and narwhal populations in the Eastern Arctic regions of the Northwest Territories. *The history of management in this region is informal and incomplete as hunters did not have full participation in the research regarding stock status, nor did they have the power to decide on the management of the stock.* The decision of federal Fisheries and Oceans to severely limit beluga hunting created a crisis, leading to the creation of the Beluga co-management committee. *The conclusion reached is that complete co-management, with full participation of Inuit hunters, is necessary for effective conservation and management of eastern Canadian small whales. Challenges to this include the vast area to be managed, the large number of people and communities that are involved, and the difficulties in determining stock status.*

Richardson, Miles and Bill Green

1989 "Fisheries co-management initiative in Haida Gwaii." In: Evelyn Pinkerton (ed.). *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management & Community Development*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, pp.249-261.

Major topics: First Nations management, co-management, fisheries management, habitat protection.

Summary: The foiled overtures of the Haida people for co-management of their traditional lands (Queen Charlotte Islands) are the focus of this article. Alarmed by trends in the 1970's such as the mismanagement of abalone fish, the failure of governments to protect fish spawning and rearing habitat, and fishery licensing policies, the Haida initiated co-management proposals with government and other users of the fish resources historically used by the Haida. This article reveals *one of the conditions of any system of successful co-management: the will on the part of all users to incorporate the concerns, philosophies and needs of the other users in the management of the resource.*

Riewe, Rick and Lloyd Gamble

1988 “The Inuit and wildlife management today.” In: Milton M. R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.). *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute, pp. 22-31.

Major topics: traditional management, Keewatin, caribou, geese, Nunavut.

Summary: *Traditional management systems of the Inuit have been disrupted by Euro-Canadians. Inuit, however, continue to employ some traditional management techniques.* This article focusses on the controlled spring harvest of geese and eggs as one example of traditional management, as well as on Inuit management of wildlife by means of both traditional and modern techniques. *Management has been attempted through a system of regional wildlife boards, attempts which often have been frustrated by government agencies, though the limitation of the role of these boards.* Through the recently-signed Nunavut Wildlife Agreement, it is hoped this situation will change.

Robinson Consulting and Associates Ltd.

1995 *Land and Resources Joint Management Arrangements*. Victoria.

Major Topics: co-management, mining, forestry, oil and gas, hydro.

Summary: *Report examining five formal co-management agreements covering minerals, forestry, oil and gas, and hydroelectric sectors including both post-treaty and modern land claim agreements. The findings suggest that no single co-management model can be devised. Each arrangement must consider the treaty arrangements affecting the balance between First Nations and governments on land ownership, regulatory power and management responsibilities. Further, partners must be committed to cooperative working relationships. Where co-management agreements involve the negotiation of economic benefits for First Nations, potential conflicts between regulatory responsibilities and economic interests must be managed. The report also suggests that where authority for board appointments or funding for boards rests with governments, delays and bureaucratic interference can hamper implementation.*

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Scoones, Ian and Frank Matose

1993

“Local woodland management: constraints and opportunities for sustainable resource use.” In: P.N. Bradley and K. McNamara (eds.). *Living With Trees: Policies for Forestry Management in Zimbabwe*. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, pp. 157-193.

Major topics: policy development, woodlands management, tenure issues.

Summary: This article focusses on the major issues surrounding woodland management and tenure issues in Zimbabwe. Common property resource management options in the communal areas are considered, using experiences of grazing and wildlife management. Legislation regulating processes of planning and natural resource management is examined and major policy issues that require attention are outlined. Conclusions reached include the *need for experimentation with new organizational models of management. These models are based on decentralized resource management strategies that combine sustainable resource use with investment.*

Sewell, Dan

1986

"Co-management of the recreational chinook fishery in the Strait of Georgia." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.). *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp.96-107.

Major topics: fishery resources, fishery co-management, commercial fishery, recreational fishery.

Summary: Assessment of the co-management of the recreational salmon fishery on the strait of Georgia, British Columbia. An analysis of perspectives that discusses *conflicting positions among commercial fishermen, native fishermen, and recreational fishermen*. The roles of commercial fishermen and government officials in the co-management of salmon in this sector of resource use are highlighted.

Sheng, Fulai

1993

Integrating Economic Development with Conservation. Gland: World Wild Fund for Nature.

Major topics: economic development, conservation, sustainable resource use.

Summary: The goal of this paper, which is international in scope, is the implementation of an integrated approach to development that synthesizes economic development with the goals of conservation. The author argues that *conservation provides the basis for sustainable economic development, while economic development provides the financial resources with which to undertake conservation activities.*

Taylor, Russell D. "Elephant management in the Nyaminyami district, Zimbabwe: turning a liability into an asset." In: Milton M.R. Freeman and Urs P. Kreuter (eds.). *Elephants and Whales: Resources for Whom?*. London: The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.

Major topics: wildlife management, problem animal control, crop damage by wildlife, sustainable wildlife hunting, trophy hunting.

Summary: Focusing on attempts by Zimbabwe game officials to control elephant wildlife with to *achieve a balance between elephant wildlife and local people*. Pressured by the local population, which wants to kill elephants that destroy crops and property, *Zimbabwe park officials combined the need to control elephant populations with the revenue generated from trophy hunting*. *The article shows how government agencies and local people manage wildlife; the reader can gather useful lessons about sustainable wildlife hunting, land use planning and problematic wildlife control*.

Therrien, B.K.
1988 "Joint management: a look at the early record of the Porcupine Caribou Management Board." In: *The Northern Review* Number 2. pp. 17-43.

Major topics: management, caribou, Northwest Territories, Yukon Territory, Gwich'in, Northern Tutchone, federal government, Yukon government, N.W.T. government.

Summary: In the past, government sponsored wildlife management regimes were based on premises of scientific management through the imposition of order on unregulated hunting. *It was not until recently that the indigenous system of management was recognized, based on self-limiting principles*. These two systems of management have been joined into one system: the Porcupine Caribou Management Board (PCMB). *The aim is to involve all groups which have an interest in the good management of renewable resources - in this case, the Porcupine Caribou - and seeks to make the harvesting and management of a renewable resource compatible with the conservation of that resource*. This successful move towards joint management is based on *focussing attention on ways to involve native users in all phases of wildlife management, including research and monitoring activities*. *For continued success, continuity of participation of all parties is required*.

Best Practices for Reaching Agreements and Making them Work

Usher, Peter J. 1986 "Devolution of power in the Northwest Territories: implications for wildlife." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.). *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 69-81.

Major topics: wildlife co-management, models of wildlife management, devolution, land claims.

Summary: An analysis of two models of wildlife management in the Northwest Territories—the ‘state system’ and the ‘indigenous system’ both as wildlife management systems as they exist, or as they should exist when both systems are practiced. *The author considers that the ‘state system’ has legislative prerogative and is the basis of government policy, but that the ‘indigenous system’ is covertly practiced at the local level. Greater cooperation between both wildlife management systems must be in place if economic development is to result without a considerable environmental cost.*

Waquan, Chief Archie 1986 "Resource co-management in Wood Buffalo National Park: the Cree Band's perspective." In: Jeffrey E. Green (ed.). *Native People and Renewable Resource Management*. Edmonton: Alberta Society of Professional Biologists, pp. 81-86.

Major topics: co-management, traditional territory, renewable resources, Cree.

Summary: A First Nation person's perspective on the co-management of the Wood Buffalo National Park in northern Alberta (Fort Chipewyan Cree Band of Alberta). This article shows *the role that First Nations can have in managing a national park.*

Watson, Dwight Berkes 1989 "The evolution of appropriate resource-management systems." In: Fikret (ed.). *Common Property Resources: Ecology and Community-Based Sustainable Development*. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 55-69.

Major topics: resource management, shifting cultivation, deforestation, Malaysia.

Summary: This article argues that, *in the context of resource use, the term ‘management’ requires careful definition from the start. Environmental and social problems may be created if developing resource management systems does not keep pace with changing social, economic and environmental conditions.* This case study in Sarawak, Malaysia, examines shifting cultivation as a management system, appropriate under conditions of low population density, which is no longer appropriate in a situation of increasing demand for the limited resources of agricultural land. Subsequent deforestation is causing an number of environmental problems, and endangering wildlife

through habitat destruction. The author *recommends developing active management systems which enhance natural productivity in order to meet increased demands for limited renewable resources. Further, integrating the creation and assimilation of new scientific knowledge with greater individual control over the resource is recommended.*

Wheeler, Polly
1988 “State and indigenous fisheries management: the Alaska context.” In: Milton M. R. Freeman and L.N. Carbyn (eds.). *Traditional Knowledge and Renewable Resource Management in Northern Regions*. Edmonton: The IUCN Commission on Ecology and the Canadian Circumpolar Institute. 38-47.

Major topics: fisheries, management, indigenous systems, Alaska, Koyukan Athabaskans, commercial fishing, subsistence fishing .

Summary: Directly considers the existence or possibilities for Native self-management of Alaskan fish and game resources, as opposed to through state management. The author holds that subsistence fishing practices by Lower Koyukan Athabaskans are a self-regulating system controlled through need by several different social, cultural, and technological mechanisms. In contrast, regulation of commercial fishing is not attempted by local fishermen, who regard regulation as a state management responsibility. The conclusion is that *subsistence resources are in an entirely different realm from commercial fishing resources, and as such are effectively managed by means of a viable self-regulating system. In some circumstances, a synthesis of indigenous and state management practices may result in a superior framework for management.*