

Impact Assessment Working Group

Community Workshops Report



2026



ᑕᑎᑎᑦ ᑦᑕᑎᑦᓂᑦᑦᑦ ᑦᑕᑦᑦᑦᑦᑦ ᑕᑎᑎᑦᑦ
Comité consultatif de l'environnement Kativik
Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee



ᑕᑦᑦᑦᑦ
Makivvik

Table of Contents

Foreword	3
Context	6
Questions and Feedback about Impact Assessment	9
General Questions and Observations	10
Questions Specific to the Different Steps of an Impact Assessment	11
Observations Regarding Community Engagement	15
Communication	15
Resources	17
Timing	18
Review bodies	19
Table of Engagement Tools	21
Recommendations from the Working Group	23
Communication	23
Resources	24
Harmonization of Processes	24
Conclusion	27
Next Steps for the Working Group	27
Appendix 1: Participant list	29
Appendix 2: Other observations	30

Foreword

Makivvik is the birthright organization that represents the Inuit of Nunavik. It is mandated to protect the rights, interests and financial compensation provided by the 1975 James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA) and the 2006 offshore Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement (NILCA). Makivvik represents approximately 14 000 Inuit who are beneficiaries of the JBNQA and the NILCA, of whom the majority live in 14 coastal communities north of the 55th parallel in the province of Québec.

The Naskapi Nation is an Indigenous Nation now based in Kawawachikamach, Quebec, whose traditional territory, *Nuchimiyuschiy*, extends across northern Quebec and Labrador. Since time immemorial, the Naskapi people have maintained a deep cultural, spiritual, and subsistence relationship with this land, traditionally following the migratory caribou herds that sustained their way of life. Today, the Naskapi Nation continues to protect its lands, waters, wildlife, and cultural heritage while ensuring that development within its territory respects Naskapi rights, interests, knowledge, and priorities.

The mandate of the Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee (KEAC) is to examine and oversee administration and management of the environmental and social protection regime established under Section 23 of the JBNQA. It is the preferential and official forum for the governments of Canada and Québec, the Kativik Regional Government, the northern villages and, when applicable, the Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach, regarding laws and regulations related to the environmental and social protection regime for the territory covered under the JBNQA north of the 55th parallel.

In 2020, representatives from the KEAC, Makivvik, and the Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach (NNK) formed a Working Group (WG) to address the multiplication of environmental and social impact assessment processes applicable within the Territory¹ and the Nunavik Marine Region (NMR), where treaty-based processes already exist via the JBNQA, the Northeastern Québec Agreement and the NILCA.

In 2022, the WG drafted [a report](#) analyzing these treaty-based processes as well as Canada's Impact Assessment Act (2019), including the tools it offers to support harmonizing efforts. Building on this work, the WG developed a 2023–2025 Action Plan with several actions intended to improve the harmonization of impact assessment processes

¹ Refers to the terrestrial lands located north of the 55th parallel of latitude in the province of Québec, as defined in the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement.

in the Territory and the NMR, and strengthen collaboration, communication and coordination between communities, review bodies and decision-makers.

In 2023, the WG organized an Impact Assessment Harmonization Seminar to raise awareness of the complex impact assessment framework in the region and to help build a foundation for relationship-building and collaboration among participants.

Context



Context

The impact assessment regime in Nunavik is complex, where a single development project can trigger multiple, overlapping assessment processes based on location, project type, features, and anticipated impacts. This complexity is compounded by the absence of a recognized and systematic harmonization mechanism. As development activities increase in northern Quebec, there is a growing need to strengthen the understanding of the region's impact assessment regime and to ensure that the rights of Indigenous Nations are consistently recognized and respected throughout all stages of project development. To do so, the current approach to community consultation and engagement must be improved.

In 2025–2026 the WG organized impact assessment community workshops with the following objectives:

- To improve community understanding of impact assessment and how to be engaged within the various processes;
- To identify challenges faced by communities during an impact assessment and gather recommendations to strengthen community engagement.

« You came in believing in us”

– Kuujjuarapik workshop participant referring to the WG

To facilitate participation and enable the exchange of ideas and perspectives across communities, three separate workshops were held in Kuujjuarapik, Kuujuaq and Quaqtaq, in which representatives from nearby communities were invited to participate. Targeted invitations were sent to local and regional organizations most likely to be involved in impact assessment, including the Northern Villages, Landholding Corporations, local Anguvigaq, Whapmagoostui First Nation, the Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikmach, the Kativik Regional Government and the Nunavik Research Center (Makivvik). See Appendix 1 for a complete list of participating organizations.

During the morning session of each workshop, the WG presented the general concept of impact assessment by addressing five main questions:

- Why does impact assessment exist?
- When is an impact assessment triggered?
- What is impact assessment?
- Where does impact assessment apply in the region?
- Who is involved?

The afternoon sessions were more interactive, with group activities designed to encourage participants to share their knowledge, experiences and expectations regarding how communities wish to be involved and equipped to participate in project planning, engagement and consultation.

The WG explained to participants that although it does not have the power or authority to make direct changes to impact assessment processes, its goal was to listen to community members and organizations, gather input, and to synthesize the feedback received during the workshops.

As such, the objective of this report is to share what was said during the community workshops and to inform review bodies, decision-makers, governments, and regional organizations of the participants' perspectives on community engagement during impact assessment. This report is also intended as a resource for communities, supporting their knowledge and strengthening their participation during the review of development projects. Finally, based on our previous analysis of impact assessment, the 2023 seminar discussions, and feedback from the community workshops, the WG has identified recommendations to improve community engagement.

Please note that not all communities or relevant organizations were able to join the workshops and therefore, it should not be seen as a comprehensive account representing the opinions of all Inuit, Naskapi and Cree of the Territory. This report is intended to reflect the participants' insights and serve as a basis for future discussions on the matter.

The report shares comments on what was heard during the workshops, including comments from Whapmagoostui participants in Kuujjuarapik's workshop. The WG does not speak on behalf of the Cree, and the Cree Nation Government did not take part in the planning of the workshops.

Questions and Feedback



Questions and Feedback about Impact Assessment

During the morning portion of the workshop, the WG described the general steps of a typical impact assessment process (Figure 1).

FIGURE 1: IMPACT ASSESSMENT STEPS, AS PRESENTED BY THE WG DURING THE WORKSHOPS



Steps	Description
Pre-planning	Includes all engagements and actions taken by the proponent, the Government or review body, before a project is officially subject to an impact assessment process. Not considered an official part of an impact assessment process.
Planning	Official start of an impact assessment process. Proponent provides project description and review bodies submit the guidelines to the proponent.
Impact study	Document developed by the proponent, in response to the guidelines, which describes the project in detail, including, but not limited to, the potential negative and positive impacts and the proposed mitigation measures.
Review	Assessment of the impact study by the review bodies to determine if the project is deemed acceptable or not. Public consultations may take place. *
Decision-making	Provincial and/or Federal governments make the final decision to authorize a project or not, based on the assessment and recommendations of the review bodies.
Post-decision	Differs from project to project. Involves conditions for project, including monitoring, follow-up plans and mitigation measures. Not considered an official part of an impact assessment process.

*Consultation and engagement may happen at any time before, during and after the official impact assessment process. The consultations held during the review step usually represent the government's constitutional duty to consult.

General Questions and Observations

Participants were welcomed to share their questions and comments throughout the morning session, during which the WG group presented the general steps of an impact assessment.

Participants raised questions about applicable impact assessment processes in the region, particularly the difference between the federal environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure under Section 23 of the JBNQA and the process provided for in Canada's Impact Assessment Act, and why both processes would apply in the region. The multiplication of processes was described as confusing, with an expressed need for a better understanding of how the different processes interact and how their timelines align.

While discussing impact assessment, some participants felt the lack of updates to the JBNQA, including Section 23, has weakened the environmental and social protection regime compared to more modern processes, and that governments would rather replace parts of the agreement with provincial and federal regulations and laws.

Participants thought Section 23 could be improved to ensure that JBNQA review bodies be composed of Indigenous members only and could include representatives from all communities. Some participants also saw a need to create a united body, where Inuit, Cree and Naskapi could sit together to have a stronger voice about projects on the Territory.

While some participants were familiar with the Kativik Environmental Quality Commission, their level of familiarity with other review bodies varied. Participants expressed a desire to improve their knowledge of the review bodies, their members, how they operate, and how to improve communication with them. They also questioned the roles and responsibilities of other regional, provincial and federal organizations involved in impact assessment.

Participants inquired as to when a community would be considered as a project proponent and if impact assessment processes would be triggered in the same way as for proponents from outside the region.

Some participants expressed a need to better understand the permits and authorizations required for projects in addition to the impact assessment process. The need for more in-depth training and information concerning impact assessment and other required authorizations for different types of projects was repeated at each workshop.

Questions Specific to the Different Steps of an Impact Assessment

“We can’t keep up when we get involved halfway through”—
Kuujjuaq workshop participant

The pre-planning step raised many questions and comments from participants. In all three workshops, participants highlighted the importance of ensuring communities are involved and informed upstream of any proposed project. For example, participants mentioned that even preliminary mineral exploration activities should be monitored and that communities should be informed and provided the opportunity to participate in these activities. Although the WG noted that pre-planning is not considered an official part of an impact assessment, participants emphasized that proponents and review bodies should always engage with communities and regional organizations at the pre-planning step. During all workshops, the WG heard that early engagement is essential to ensure meaningful participation in a project. Integrating community priorities and concerns from the very beginning is fundamental to building trust between proponents, review bodies and communities.

It was repeatedly mentioned that the concept of an “impact”, as well as the thresholds that trigger an impact assessment process or a community consultation, are not adequate. Even small projects can have significant impacts. For example, the presence of a group of new people, such as company employees or researchers, in a community could cause impacts to the environment, cultural activities and social dynamics.

“As soon as they come, they create an impact”—
Quaqtaq workshop participant

Participants noted that communities and local organizations should be equally involved at the planning step of impact assessment. This would ensure that local expertise informs the project, provides valuable insight on sensitive areas, best practices and realistic adaptations to consider the unique challenges associated with projects in the north. Community participation during the development of impact study guidelines was also identified, in all workshops, as an essential component of the process.

Participants at one specific workshop highlighted that proponents should consider the value of having a cultural awareness plan, a racism policy, and a drug and substance policy when planning a project and its mitigation measures.

For the impact study step, it was noted that positive and negative impacts of a project should be equally described and presented to the community. The scope of an impact study was also identified as a concern, since, oftentimes, project impacts extend well beyond the nearest communities. Jurisdictional boundaries should not limit the engagement of nearby communities. For example, the hydroelectric dams in the James Bay area impacted ecosystems in both the Hudson and Ungava Bays, but not all affected communities were consulted on these projects.

Participants also noted the importance of having access to independent data and analysis from regional organizations such as the Avataq Cultural Institute and Nunavik Research Centre to help validate project information.

During the review step, participants felt that economic impacts were considered disproportionately to environmental or social impacts. They wondered if, and how, Indigenous knowledge and community opinion were considered during project review, and how these were reflected in conditions established as part of an authorization.

During all workshops, participants highlighted that decision-makers usually have little to no knowledge of the Territory or the NMR and its Nations. Some participants suggested that decision-makers should be present during public hearings to ensure accountability and to support clear communication, thereby improving transparency. Participants also expressed the view that communities themselves should have decision-making authority, including the power to approve or reject a project, determine the conditions for project approval, and have their decisions respected by all parties.

“Why is it the government that decides what happens in Nunavik?”—
Kuujuarapik workshop participant

When discussing the post-decision step, most comments were centred around monitoring challenges, including limited community involvement. Participants in all workshops insisted that community members should be trained to ensure independent monitoring of projects, with dedicated funding available to support these initiatives. Land guardian

programs were mentioned as a great example, and it was suggested that the Umajuit Wardens could expand their role to include project monitoring tasks.

Participants also mentioned that once projects are authorized and operational, ongoing communication and engagement with communities is essential. Upholding a healthy relationship between proponents and communities was seen as key to understanding the short-, medium-, and long-term impacts of projects, and in identifying and implementing adaptation measures if and when needed. Participants noted project legacy is not adequately considered during the review period and noted that proponents should remain engaged with communities even after a project has ended, when impacts on the land and people continue to be visible and measurable.

Finally, participants also raised concerns about the lack of enforcement of a project's authorization conditions and emphasized the need for stronger enforcement measures.



Observations



Observations Regarding Community Engagement

During the afternoon sessions, questions prepared by the WG helped guide open conversations where participants shared their main concerns, observations and needs regarding engagement in impact assessment. Their comments are organized into main themes and presented below. Note that comments concerning subjects other than impact assessment have also been considered in this report and can be found in Appendix 2.

Communication

“The format of consultation should be culturally adapted, not corporately oriented.”

—Kuujjuaq workshop participant

Language

In all workshops, participants emphasized that documents providing information about projects are often available in French and/or English but that translations in the language of the impacted communities, including Inuktitut, Naskapi, and Cree should also be provided. Translations also need to consider dialects, as they often differ between coasts and even communities. Interpretation should always be available when meetings, consultations or public hearings are held in the communities.

Diversity of Outreach Methods

In all workshops, participants emphasized that a diversity of outreach methods are needed to engage with the entire population—whether it be during pre-planning engagement, proponent outreach, or consultations undertaken by governments or review bodies. Suggested approaches included greater use of social media and local radio stations (FMs), with radio call-in shows being effective in some communities. Posters and pamphlets in public places (i.e. grocery stores, municipal offices, airports) were also mentioned as being a good way to inform people. While public hearings were considered a necessary component of the process, some participants mentioned that these events can be intimidating and suggested that opportunities to share anonymous comments should also be available. When public hearings or presentations do take place, participants noted an appreciation for efforts to encourage attendance, including raffles, prizes and honorariums. Participants also cited the possibility of a designated location in the communities most impacted by a proposed project where people can ask their questions and learn more about the project (for example, the proponent could establish an office in the community). Table 1, found on pages 17 and 18, presents different engagement tools

discussed during the workshop's afternoon activity and how useful the participants thought these tools would be in their communities.

Meaningful Consultation and Engagement

"If we work together, the outcome will be much better"—
Quaqtaq workshop participant

In all workshops, the participants insisted that consultation and engagement be meaningful, honest and transparent, rather than just "checking a box". Community engagement should not be rushed and must allow adequate time and support impactful dialogue. Although the population at large should be consulted, it was noted that in some instances targeted groups, such as Elders, hunters, land users, women and youth, could be contacted directly and involved in small discussions.

In all workshops, participants mentioned that community consultation and engagement should happen at each step of an impact assessment process, and that ongoing and meaningful communications throughout the lifespan of the project (and even beyond) were necessary. In-person meetings and consultations are essential in building trust and relationships with communities. Proponents and review bodies need to honour community perspective concerning development projects and should collaborate in engagement activities. Additionally, proponents should be mindful that some communities may have had negative experiences with past projects or past proponents, which may contribute to trust issues. As a result, building relationships in these communities may require additional time and involvement. Effective community engagement and consultation should aim to involve communities, rather than merely inform them.

Access to Information and Documentation

Across all workshops, participants noted the importance of having access to all the documentation available for a project. Communities expect transparency from proponents, governments and review bodies; as such, this information should be readily and easily accessible. All information shared should be clear, easy to read and balanced, presenting both benefits and adverse impacts. Participants also indicated the need for simplified summaries of documents, in the language of their choice. For larger or more complex documents, in-community presentations and meetings could help with comprehension and presentations should be distributed beforehand. Some participants suggested that having a centralized and accessible information database might be useful.

Information about a project that participants felt were specifically important include: the project's objective, potential benefits, stakeholders and communities involved, project duration and proposed timelines, monitoring plans, project closure and rehabilitation plans, planned infrastructure and energy source(s), as well as all related documents supporting the decision-making process for a given project.

Finally, some participants mentioned that video or visual options for information sharing should be available, as Inuit, Naskapi and Cree all have strong oral traditions. In general, communications involving community members are more likely to be trusted and considered.

Frequency

In all workshops, participants felt that more frequent meetings and communications were needed, especially during any major milestones, decisions or changes made to projects. Some participants considered that monthly updates would be preferable, while others proposed referring to the calendar of local entities, such as Landholding Corporations, Northern Villages or Council, to attend their recurring meetings.

In all cases, participants felt that long periods of silence are to be avoided, as it can create uncertainty and concerns among the people.

Resources

Liaison coordinator or team

Almost all participants agreed that a liaison coordinator or dedicated liaison team would be beneficial. A liaison coordinator or team composed of community members could be the central point for communications and information sharing throughout an impact assessment process and the life of the project. When multiple impact assessment processes are triggered, the liaison coordinator or team could also play a role in process harmonization efforts by enabling efficient communication between proponents, review bodies and the community. They could also potentially help to decrease the burden of consultations by organizing meetings and follow-ups with the different stakeholders at appropriate times. It was stated that this liaison role could help build local expertise and better prepare communities to engage in projects even before they are formally proposed. However, some participants expressed concern that having a liaison coordinator or team could lead to uneven access to project information within the community.

Local Expertise

“We are the gatekeepers of the North”
—Kuujjuaq workshop participant

Participants also noted the importance of Indigenous knowledge and its inclusion in all steps of an impact assessment, with clear explanations of how it has been applied and considered. Workshop participants highlighted the need for Inuit, Naskapi and Cree to be more involved at each step of impact assessment. To ensure this involvement, participants highlighted the need for targeted community training to improve overall understanding of the different impact assessment processes applicable in the Territory as well as the laws and regulations related to project review and authorization.

Some participants noted that work training programs should be offered early to ensure stronger employment of community members.

To facilitate communication and improve information sharing during impact assessment, participants highlighted that proponents, review bodies and governments should clearly identify a contact person and make their contact information easily accessible. Participants also mentioned that review bodies should regularly visit communities to introduce themselves and discuss their role, as well as provide updates on their review of projects.

Timing

Early Involvement

There was a consensus among participants that community engagement should begin even before a project is fully conceptualized. Communities always want to be informed about activities occurring on their lands and therefore engagement should happen at the earliest stage of any project or impact assessment. During pre-planning and planning, communities should be involved in the development of the project guidelines to ensure specific concerns, expertise, and locally valued components are included in the scope.

Seasonality

In all workshops, participants insisted that engagement and consultation need to account for cultural activities. Proponents, governments and review bodies should contact communities to plan the best moment to visit, as land-use calendars may differ between community and season.

Timelines

Participants in all workshops stressed the importance of having sufficient time to review and analyze project documents and impact studies to truly understand a project's scope and implication. They also noted that community meetings should allow enough time for everyone to express themselves without feeling rushed.

Review bodies

Relationship with Communities

Many comments were shared concerning the lack of awareness regarding the role, mandate and activities of the review bodies, specifically mentioning their absenteeism within communities. In all workshops the lack of regional representation on the review bodies and the need for more community involvement in their respective processes was highlighted by participants.

Harmonization

Harmonizing public consultations when multiple impact assessment processes are triggered was discussed among participants; some noting that joint consultations could be positive and would lower both consultation fatigue and confusion caused by multiple processes. Others thought that having separate consultations could increase participation and allow for a wider range of questions and subjects to be expressed. Participants thought that review bodies should respect a community's perspective of a project and ensure that community viewpoints and concerns are central to their review and decision-making processes.

Decision-making

Participants noted that review bodies and decision-makers should honour the perspective of communities when making the decision to authorize or reject a project. Before making their decisions or identifying the conditions of authorizing a project, decision-makers should visit the project location with community members to have a better sense of the potential positive and negative impacts of the project on the environment and the community.

Table of Tools



Table of Engagement Tools

A new activity was added during the Kuujjuaq and Quaqtaq workshops to better understand preferred communication tools for sharing information and gathering feedback from community members. Various communication tools were written on pieces of paper and placed on the walls around the meeting room. Participants were invited to check “yes” or “no” on the papers, depending on their preference of each tool. At the end of the activity, WG members and participants discussed the responses, including why certain tools were considered effective or not. Table 1 presents the results of this activity.

Since this activity was added after the Kuujjuarapik workshop, participants from that session did not have the chance to participate directly. However, comments concerning the benefits and limits of some outreach methods were nonetheless shared during their workshop. Therefore, to represent these insights, a “+” has been added to the “Yes” column when discussions indicated a preference for a tool, and to

Table 1: Appreciation of various engagement tools

	Yes	No	Maybe
Telephone number	3	9	2
Online form/QR code	12		
Targeted discussion groups	11 +	1	
Template for developing comments	4	6	4
Designated place to get information	11	1	
Facebook live event	10	2	
Instructional videos	8	3	2
Community engagement liaison coordinator	12 +		
Dood to door visit	1	11	
Public hearing	7	4 +	
Press release or news article	12		
Email address	12		
Social media videos and posts	11 +	1	
Posters	11+	1	
Public drop in event	10	2	
Email mailing list	12		
Radio call-in show	10 +	2	
Pamphlets by mail	8+	4	

Recommendations



Recommendations from the Working Group

Informed by previous analysis of impact assessment processes applicable on the Territory and the NMR, as well as the insights gathered through the 2023 Seminar and the 2025–2026 community workshops described in this report, the WG has identified overarching recommendations to improve community engagement which are presented in this section. The main themes identified include:

- communication;
- resources; and
- harmonization of impact assessment processes.

Communication

Indigenous Nations have lived in harmony with the land for millennia and continue to serve as active stewards of their territories. This role must be implicitly recognized and respected within both project development and impact assessment. Nations should be meaningfully involved from the earliest stages, and their knowledge, concerns, and decisions genuinely considered and upheld. When communities are provided with complete, accurate, and accessible information regarding a proposed project, they can then consider the full range of potential impacts and benefits, including those on the land, water, wildlife and people, as well as the interconnected ecological systems that sustain them. Effective communication is therefore fundamental to meaningful participation and informed decision-making. As such, communication strategies must be developed at both the regional and community levels and tailored to the needs and realities of each Nation. Information should be shared openly, clearly, and in formats that are understandable and accessible to all community members. Cultural considerations must also be prioritized, including the consistent availability of interpreters and the translation of documentation into the preferred language of the affected Nation(s). Concise and accessible summary documents should be readily available throughout all stages of the process.

At the same time, proponents and review bodies would benefit from a stronger understanding of community communication needs and priorities as well as cultural realities. Early and meaningful engagement is essential not only for strong impact assessments, but also for social acceptability and the long-term success of projects.

It should also be considered that communities that continue to practise traditional activities may operate according to seasonal schedules, cultural obligations, and local priorities. As such, timelines for engagement and consultation processes must remain flexible and culturally appropriate and should be determined through open and transparent

discussions directly with communities, recognizing that needs and expectations may vary significantly from one community to another.

Review bodies must also take proactive steps to broaden their project review scope to better understand all the communities that may be affected by a project. Building trust requires ongoing relationship-building efforts, including community visits, learning about local realities and priorities, and maintaining open and accessible lines of communication. Likewise, communities have expressed a desire to better understand the mandates, roles, and responsibilities of review bodies.

Resources

Communities require adequate funding, technical expertise, and human resources to meaningfully participate in project development, impact assessment and consultations. Just as proponents rely on investors and technical expertise to advance projects, communities also require sustained support to effectively review, assess, and respond to proposed developments within their territory. Local expertise and traditional knowledge are invaluable components of impact assessment; however, communities require adequate funding, training opportunities adapted to regional realities and needs, and human resource capacity to fully mobilize that expertise. Providing this support is essential to avoid placing an unfair burden on communities that already have limited capacity and are often required to respond to multiple consultation processes at the same time.

Furthermore, the establishment of a liaison coordinator or team would support local participation, facilitate dialogue between the community, proponents and review bodies and ensure community priorities are effectively represented throughout project reviews.

Communities should be supported in undertaking independent impact studies, review of documentation, community-led baseline studies and monitoring of proposed projects, which could strengthen trust in project information and improve community confidence in the reliability of the data.

Harmonization of Processes

From the community perspective, a project remains a single project regardless of the number of jurisdictions or regulatory processes involved. Overlapping impact assessment processes often create confusion and duplication, while further contributing to consultation fatigue in communities that already face significant capacity limitations.

Greater efforts among review bodies to harmonize their respective impact assessment procedures would help reduce administrative burdens and improve the clarity, efficiency,

and accessibility of consultation processes. This would, in turn, support more meaningful, informed, and genuine community participation.

Improved harmonization of processes would allow communities to focus more directly on the proposed project itself (including its potential impacts, opportunities, and risks) rather than navigating the complexity of multiple jurisdictions, differing regulatory requirements and timelines, and overlapping consultation processes.



Conclusion



Conclusion

“At the moment, proponents are just informing us instead of involving us”

—Kuujjuaq workshop participant

Across all three workshops, the overarching themes that consistently emerged as being essential to successful impact assessments and responsible project development in the region were: early and meaningful engagement, timely and clear communication, transparency, adequate resources, harmonization of impact assessment processes and respectful approaches.

Next Steps for the Working Group

In its continued efforts to improve the harmonization of impact assessment processes in the Territory and NMR, and to strengthen collaboration, communication and coordination between review bodies and decision-makers in the region, the WG has secured funding for the organization of a second impact assessment seminar. We hope to once again bring together review bodies, government authorities, and regional stakeholders to discuss the issues identified in this report and expand on the relationship-building experience of the 2023 Seminar. Where possible, participants from the community workshops would also be invited to encourage open, honest, and inclusive dialogue among all parties involved.

Following the seminar, the WG intends to develop a regional participation and engagement guide for proponents. This guide could include:

- an overview of the region;
- culturally important information;
- key stakeholder and organizational contacts;
- guidance on community engagement expectations and recommended approaches; and other practical information intended to support more respectful and effective engagement processes.

The WG would undertake this initiative collaboratively with regional organizations, government authorities, and communities.

Appendixes



Appendix 1: Participant list

TABLE 1: LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE WORKSHOPS

Community	Organization
Aupaluk	Nunavik Landholding Corporation
Inukjuak	Anguvigaq of Inukjuak
Ivujivik	Anguvigaq of Ivujivik
Ivujivik	Nuvummi Landholding Corporation
Kangiqsualujuaq	Qiniqtiq Landholding Corporation
Kangiqsujaq	Nunaturlik Landholding Corporation
Kawawachikamach	Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach (Nation office representatives)
Kawawachikamach	Naskapi Development Corporation
Kawawachikamach	Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach (KRG nominated KEAC representative)
Kuujuuaq	Nayumivik Landholding Corporation
Kuujuuarapik	Anguvigaq of Kuujjuaraapik
Kuujuuarapik	Sakkuq Landholding Corporation
Quaqtaq	Anguvigaq of Quaqtaq
Salluit	Qaqqalik Landholding Corporation
Salluit	Anguvigaq of Salluit
Umiujaq	Anguvigaq of Umiujaq
Umiujaq	Northern Village of Umiujaq
Umiujaq	Annituvik Landholding Corporation
Whapmagoostui	Council
Whapmagoostui	Cree Nation of Whapmagoostui

*In two of the workshops, the interpreters actively participated in some of the conversations and activities. Their experience and insight were welcomed and integrated in the report.

TABLE 2: REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHO ATTENDED THE WORKSHOPS

Regional organizations
Kativik Environmental Advisory Committee
Nunaliit Association
Kativik Regional Government
Nunavik Research Centre (Makivvik)
Nunavik Marine Region Impact Review Board
Nunavik Regional Board of Health and Social Services
COFEX-North
Anguvigaq

Appendix 2: Other observations

Workshop participants generously offered many examples of current issues and impacts in their communities related to different development activities. Even if these comments are not strictly about impact assessment, the WG felt it important to highlight them.

Waste

Participants from one workshop raised concerns about waste management in their communities. They mentioned that northern landfills were not well designed nor well located, resulting in litter being scattered onto streets, into waters and on the land. Smoke from open-air burning at local landfills was also identified as an issue. Furthermore, participants mentioned that waste created from construction projects was not well managed and felt that all businesses and companies working in the north should be responsible for the elimination of the waste they produce.

Participants also noted that there are many abandoned sites on the Territory with hazardous materials, infrastructure and equipment from research projects, mining exploration activities, outfitting camps, fuel caches and other land users.

Wildlife

Several participants raised concerns about how the cumulative impacts of projects in the region negatively affect the populations and health of several wildlife species. For example, they feel that increased shipping vessel traffic in the NMR is affecting marine wildlife and is leading to decreased whale populations. They also shared observations on declining fish populations and how development activities may have consequences on the health of some fish, stating that some were no longer good to eat, or seemed to have lost their sense of direction due to increased sediment because of mining activity. Finally, they noted the impact of muskoxen on the caribou population.

Security/Infrastructure

Limitations regarding infrastructure were mentioned by some participants, who highlighted that airport runways are too short for some planes, which causes safety concerns when medical emergencies happen and limits cargo options. The gravel airstrips in some communities can create air quality issues, as they sometimes cause significant dust during dryer weather. It was noted that large groups of workers travelling to the region should charter their own planes, as the availability of commercial flights is already a challenge for residents of the region.

Wastewater treatment infrastructure was also mentioned as being worrisome, with concerns that lagoons might contaminate the tundra and nearby wildlife. For example, in

one community, lagoon water flows to an area known for mussel picking and as a result community members no longer harvest mussels in this area.

Important safety concerns were also shared, including the disruption in sea ice from shipping vessels and the insecurity of winter routes normally used by communities. The lack of emergency cabins along the Hudson Strait was also mentioned, as this area is prone to bad weather.

Contamination

Participants from one workshop were worried about the contamination caused by mining exploration and exploitation activities near their communities, such as oil leaks from heavy machinery, the impact of dust pollution on lakes, rusted fuel barrels left on the shore near a mussel-picking area, and old batteries leaching acid into the water. They also mentioned the lack of action regarding these issues when authorities are notified.

Climate Change

A few participants wanted to highlight that the region is not only impacted by development projects, but also by climate change, with issues such as an increase in freezing rain, later seasonal ice freeze, and unreliable ice thickness for winter travel. Also, new wildlife species are being observed in some communities, and weather patterns are becoming unreliable and unpredictable.

Some participants proposed that mitigation measures set out in project authorizations should be better adapted to the region. For example, as forest stands are rare in the region, it should be mandatory for any proponent to compensate for every tree cut during a development project by planting a new one.

Impacts of Dams

Participants from two workshops mentioned how hydroelectric projects in the James Bay area continue to impact their lands. They felt that the impact assessment processes that led to the authorization of these projects did not properly document the impacts on their communities. They highlighted impacts on the shoreline, sea currents and wildlife migrations and that monitoring, and follow-ups are lacking in the region. They also mentioned that communities north of the 55th parallel were not properly compensated for these consequences.