Canadian Journal of Forest Research
Revue canadienne de recherche forestière

**What does “First Nation deep roots in the forests” mean?
Identification of principles and objectives for promoting
forest-based development.**

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Forest Research</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfr-2015-0170.R3
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Dec-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Beaudoin, Jean-Michel; Université Laval, Sciences du bois et de la forêt Bouthillier, Luc; Université Laval, Sciences du bois et de la forêt Bulkan, Janette; University of British Columbia, Forest Resources Management Nelson, Harry; University of British Columbia, Forest Resources Management Trosper, Ronald; University of Arizona, American Indian Studies Wyatt, Stephen; University of Moncton, School of Forestry
Keyword:	First Nations, Forestry, Culture, Sustainable development, Quebec

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

What does “First Nation deep roots in the forests” mean? Identification of principles and objectives for promoting forest-based development.

Author names and affiliations:

Jean-Michel Beaudoin¹

Faculty of Forestry, Laval University, Pavillon Abitibi-Price, 2405 rue de la Terrasse, Québec, G1V 0A6, Canada. Canada. Email: jean-michel.beaudoin@sbf.ulaval.ca

Luc Bouthillier

Faculty of Forestry, Laval University, Pavillon Abitibi-Price, 2405 rue de la Terrasse, Québec, G1V 0A6, Canada. Email: luc.bouthillier@sbf.ulaval.ca

Janette Bulkan

Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, Forest Sciences Centre, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 1Z4, Canada. Email: janette.bulkan@ubc.ca

Harry Nelson

Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, Forest Sciences Centre, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 1Z4, Canada. Email: harry.nelson@ubc.ca

Ronald Trospen

American Indian Studies, University of Arizona, Harvill, 1103 E. 2nd Street, P.O. Box 210076, Tucson, Arizona 85721. Email: rltrosper@email.arizona.edu

Stephen Wyatt

School of Forestry, University of Moncton, 165 boulevard Hébert, Edmundston, New Brunswick, E3V 2S8, Canada. Email: Stephen.wyatt@umoncton.ca

¹ Current affiliation and address of corresponding author:

Jean-Michel Beaudoin, Department of Forestry, Laval University, Pavillon Abitibi-Price, Office 2175, 2405 rue de la Terrasse, Québec, G1V 0A6, Canada. Phone number : 418-656-2131, extension 6106. Email: jean-michel.beaudoin@sbf.ulaval.ca

23

24 **Abstract:** We often hear about the resistance of First Nation (FN) communities against the industrial
25 model of forestry, but we hear less about what they wish to achieve. Translating FN perspectives into
26 concepts that are understood by the mainstream society can help inform current and future forest
27 policies. Such translation can support initiatives that seek ways to increase FN participation in the forest
28 sector. This paper documents one process of translation. It identifies the principles and objectives for
29 forest-based development of the Essipit Innu First Nation in Quebec, Canada, reflective of the deep
30 roots that anchor the Essipit to their territory. Based on participatory research carried out between
31 January and July 2013, we identify 34 objectives folded into three core FN principles: Nutshimiu-Aitun
32 (identity-territoriality), Mishkutunam (sharing-exchange), and Pakassitishun (responsibility-autonomy).
33 Our analysis shows that the economic aims of the dominant forestry model are too narrow for FN
34 communities. This paper contributes to expanding FN engagement in forestry through management and
35 economic approaches that are better adapted to their culture and values.

36 **Keywords:** First Nation, forestry, culture, sustainable development, Quebec

37 1. Introduction

38 “Deep roots in the forests” is a message conveyed by many stories in the Aboriginal world, yet
39 understanding what this message means remains a major challenge for Canadian forestry. On the one
40 hand, First Nations (FNs) have used and stewarded forests for centuries, accumulating valuable knowledge
41 along the way (Trosper et al. 2012). Today, with 80% of FN communities located in forested areas
42 (Gysber and Lee 2003), standing forests continue to play a central role in the environment, economy, life,
43 and culture of FN communities (Booth and Muir 2013; Tindall and Trosper 2013; Beaudoin 2014; Smith
44 2015). On the other hand, forest exploitation on a commercial scale has long been promoted as an
45 instrument for economic development in FN communities (RCAP 1996; Government of Québec 2011).
46 Recent reports show that the forest sector plays an increasing role in FN economies across Canada, with
47 FNs holding 6.4% of Canada’s total wood allocation volumes, involving over 1 400 FN businesses and
48 16 000 FN workers (NAFA 2007; Beaudoin et al. 2009; FPAC 2014; Government of Canada 2015). Yet
49 the forest sector creates the potential for conflicts, as explained by Berkes and Davidson-Hunt (2006),
50 where industrial-scale logging practices impact forest ecosystems (e.g. loss of biodiversity and old
51 forests) and, consequently, FN cultural links to the forests. Thus, there are ongoing discussions in FN

52 communities over the trade offs between the necessity to create jobs versus the responsibility to protect
53 the forests and FN culture (Booth and Skelton 2011; Smith 2015). The dichotomy between the visions of
54 “intact forest landscape” and of a “forest industry” prompts the following questions: Are these two
55 visions really incompatible, or are the constraints imposed by the industrial development models
56 limiting the kind of objectives FN communities can promote?

57 The Canadian forest sector is built around a dominant model of industrial forestry that emphasizes the
58 economic values of Canada’s forests (Beckley 1998; Howlett and Rayner 2001; Chiasson et Leclerc
59 2013), while ecological values are treated as constraints and addressed through regulations and the
60 creation of protected areas in which harvesting is excluded. In this model, governments assume that
61 forest companies with long-term timber rights will generate jobs, revenues and other social benefits in
62 forest communities (Nadeau et al. 2003). This provides a rationale for government to actively seek to
63 increase FN-held concessions or licences in order to tackle poverty in FN communities (Nikolakis and
64 Nelson 2015). For example, the last Federal strategy, *A Vision for Canada’s Forests: 2008 and Beyond*,
65 states “Aboriginals and their businesses have a role to play in the forest economy. They are involved in
66 the development of sustainable forest management practices, notably through the application of their
67 knowledge and practices” (CCFM 2008, p. 12).

68 Research indicates, however, that such policies have failed to meet the expectations of FN peoples
69 (Parkins et al. 2006; Wyatt et al 2015). One well-known challenge is that “governance approaches and
70 tools to engage First Nations in natural resource development are too few and limited in scope. Often,
71 they cast First Nations in the narrow role of respondent; that is, of responding to already defined projects
72 as part of regulatory reviews or fixed processes for consultation and accommodation” (WGNRD 2015,
73 p.14). We know that FN communities expect more than economic benefits from forestry initiatives, and
74 extensive US research on indigenous governance has demonstrated the importance of linking economic

75 development to good governance in ways that are consistent with values and objectives (Jorgensen
76 2007). However, there is much work to be done in order to achieve sustainable forest management² in
77 First Nation communities or in their territories (Wyatt 2008; Booth and Muir 2013).

78 There are a number of sources that provide interesting insights into how FN values can be incorporated
79 into existing forest management systems (Wyatt 2008). In particular, FN criteria and indicators (C&I)
80 have been promoted as a tool to incorporate FN rights and values in the sustainable management of
81 forests (NAFA 1995; Kopra and Stevenson 2008). Several examples exist where the values of FN
82 community members were identified and translated in the form of principles, criteria and indicators
83 (Natcher and Hickey 2002; Karjala et al. 2004; Sherry et al 2005; Shearer et al 2009; St-Arnaud and
84 Papatie 2012). These sets of C&I, generally derived from national frameworks, build a baseline on
85 which trends in the sustainability of forest resources can be measured and monitored in order to go
86 beyond sustained yield forestry and address the needs of Aboriginal communities (Smith et al. 2010).
87 Previous research highlights that community members' participation in the development of FN C&I is
88 important to create a local framework that is effective at incorporating Aboriginal peoples in the
89 discussion about forestry (Hickey and Nelson 2002), as well as to take into consideration social
90 heterogeneity within communities. Yet adapting forest management activities to reflect forest values and
91 conditions that respect and integrate Aboriginal rights, needs and perspectives remains challenging
92 (Adam and Kneeshaw 2008). Before focussing on forest management activities, communities prefer

² Forest management is "the process of planning and implementing practices for the stewardship and use of forests and other wooded land to meet specific environmental, economic, social and cultural objectives » (FAO 2014). Thus, it focuses on operational aspects for maintaining forest ecosystems and their functions. In comparison, forest governance is "a *modus operandi* by which officials and institutions (formal or not) acquire and use authority in the management of the [forest] sector to support and improve the well-being and quality of life of stakeholders depending on it" (Chiasson and Leclerc 2013, p.65). Thus, it focuses on how decisions are made about forests and on the interests of stakeholders.

93 considering a broader land use planning exercise which foresters are reluctant to do (Smith et al. 2010).
94 In the end, Aboriginal C&Is based on the experience and worldview³ of FN peoples provide valuable
95 information on forest conditions and the sustainability of forest practices. They do not, however, provide
96 a systematic way to assess the trade-offs involved in the economic development of forest resources nor
97 are they necessarily integrated into larger strategic objectives the FN may have and their decision-
98 making processes in which this development may be evaluated.

99 The rationale behind current dominant forestry models prompts forest companies to create partnerships
100 with FN communities in order to secure continued access to timber concession licenses (Hickey and
101 Nelson 2005). However, Boyd and Trosper (2010) show that joint venture partnerships do not really
102 give FN communities control over forest management decisions and fail to address the preservation of
103 traditional culture, values, and language. As mentioned previously, a major issue is that FN communities
104 have been working mainly within the constraints of the dominant forestry model (Wyatt 2008), with
105 little flexibility to define a model of their own. This occurs because the management of Canada's forest
106 is dominated by the decision-making of experts from the state⁴ and private forest companies (Beckley
107 1998; Bouthillier 2001; Chiasson 2013), and tenures and licences have long been designed to meet the
108 needs of forestry companies rather than of FN or local communities (Ross and Smith 2002). But how,
109 then, can governments and forest companies rationalize and share the benefits of forest-based
110 development with FN communities? How can they better address the needs of FN communities?

³ Aboriginal worldviews are ecocentric (Parsons and Prest 2003), i.e. humans are part of the natural world and maintain strong connections with the land. Aboriginal worldviews also convey principles of respectful interactions and relationships with surrounding forests and the world around them.

⁴ In this paper, 'state' refers to both Federal and Provincial levels of government. In Canada, provinces hold administrative jurisdiction over Crown Forests and the Federal government holds jurisdiction over national parks and Indian Reserves.

111 Traditionally, economic development has been defined as the process whereby per capita income
112 increases over a long period of time (Barbier 1987). Porter (2000, p.19) specifies that economic
113 development is “determined by the productivity of a nation’s economy, which is measured by the value
114 of the goods and services (products) produced per unit of the nation’s human, capital, and physical
115 resources.” Trosper (1988) indicates, however, that economic growth may not be the primary goal of FN
116 communities and that it is important to also consider non-economic goals. More specifically, Trosper
117 (1995; 2009; Trosper et al 2012) proposes six principles of FN approaches to economic development
118 that could also apply to forest-based development:

- 119 1. Identity: Distinct cultures of FN peoples are to be protected and enhanced;
- 120 2. Connectedness: Everything is connected, including the peoples and their territory;
- 121 3. Reciprocity: FN systems of sharing benefits among themselves need to be maintained;
- 122 4. Sustainability: Maintaining the sustainability of the system;
- 123 5. Accountability: FN leaders must be responsible for their actions, especially in relation to
124 land, reciprocity, and sustainability;
- 125 6. Limits on market economy: FN economic development puts a limit on the logic of market
126 capitalism, notably by not managing forests only for the purposes of wood production and profit
127 accumulation.

128 While we can find references to these characteristics across several disciplines, including anthropology,
129 political science, and sociology (Hornborg 1994; Holm et al. 2003; Rodon 2003; Simard 2003), no
130 research has spelled out the implication for how these findings might inform FN forest-based
131 development initiatives in Canada. Although we were not testing Trosper’s principles in our exercise,
132 they provided useful insights for understanding the Essipit case study.

133 Research shows that in contrast to goals around maximizing either economic activity or aggregate wealth,
134 some FN economies emphasize elements of egalitarianism, sharing and communal activity (Dana 2015).
135 Furthermore, Anderson (1997) shows that FN goals for engaging more □actively in economic

development activities encompass more than job and revenue creation; they are also seeking greater control over their lands, wealth for socioeconomic improvements in their communities, as well as protection for their cultures, values and languages. In forest sciences more specifically, Nikolakis and Nelson (2015) conclude that: “FNs are working to establish a ‘different way’ of doing business, but that existing tenure arrangements constrained management for multiple values. Interviewees identified a model of forestry integrating multiple values and enhancing a stewardship ethic over their territories.” Thus, the question is no longer “to log or not to log”, but how to log with respect for FN deep roots in the forests.

The culture of forestry in Canada is changing (Stevenson and Natcher 2009), with FN communities diversifying their approaches to economic development (Beaudoin 2012). Henceforth, the term « forest-based development » is used in this article to allow for alternative models, rather than simply a timber extraction one – as there probably is no one FN model. This article draws on the results of a research project which identified the linkages between FN values, needs and objectives for forest-based development, and which paid careful attention to the ways in which socioeconomic benefits were recognized beyond the traditionally more narrow economic focus employed in dominant forestry models. In this article, we first contextualize the research topic and explain the methodology. Then, we present our results, discuss them and offer our conclusions.

3. Methods

The research project employed a participatory approach to advance knowledge on FN objectives⁵ for forest-based development. Participatory research provides local communities with a significant role in the research process, grounds research in local perspectives and needs, and distributes research benefits

⁵ We use the FSC definition of ‘Objective’: ‘The basic purpose laid down by The Organization for the forest enterprise, including the decision of policy and the choice of means for attaining the purpose (FSC 2012, 140)

157 directly to the community (Fortmann 2008; Wilmsen et al. 2008). Wulforth et al. (2008, p.33) clearly
158 state that “Community input can help to guard against experts making incorrect assumptions about the
159 values, concerns and goals of a community whom they study, as well as allow their own bias(es) to
160 influence research findings.” Accordingly, we carried out this research in partnership with the Innu First
161 Nation of Essipit in Quebec, Canada. Between Fall 2009 and Fall 2011, we worked with a team of local
162 collaborators in order to identify the research objectives and methodology, as well as to pursue funding
163 opportunities. The project received formal approval of the Essipit Band Council and the UBC
164 Behavioural Research Ethics Board.

165 We organized a strategic planning exercise with the Innu First Nation of Essipit, hereafter referred to as
166 “Essipit.” Figure 1 shows the localisation of Essipit on the Haute-Côte-Nord region of Québec (Canada),
167 as well as its traditional territory, the Nitassinan (8403 km²).

168 [INSERT FIGURE 1]

169 Essipit was chosen for this research for two main reasons. First, the community showed a keen interest
170 in participating in the strategic planning exercise as a way to envision development of its Innu Assi⁶.
171 Second, Essipit is characterized by a community development model that has been described as a social
172 and economic success (St-Georges 2009; Proulx et Gauthier 2012). In particular, Essipit has invested
173 considerable resources for the acquisition and management of six outfitters since 1983. Essipit Outfitters
174 are businesses that have exclusive rights to manage hunting, fishing and trapping activities on a defined
175 territory (385 km²), including the provision of accommodation, guides and services. Thus,

⁶ Within the process of treaty negotiations, the Innu Assi is a territorial assignment of full property (communal private land) for Essipit. The Innu Assi is expected to become the base for Essipit’s governmental autonomy and an essential part of its socio-economic development. The Innu Assi includes four of the six outfitters held by Essipit.

176 understanding the Essipit model of forest-based development will contribute to existing literature, while
177 also supporting the community's own development efforts.

178 Essipit participants in all phases of the research were 18 years old or older and had knowledge,
179 experience or interest regarding community or forest-based development, which is consistent with
180 Creswell's (1998) definition of key informants. The research project built upon earlier work by Gitane
181 St-Georges (St-Georges 2009; Beaudoin et al. 2012) on Essipit's preoccupations, values and aspirations
182 regarding its Nitassinan. Local collaborators for the current study sought out individuals who had
183 participated in the earlier study. The aim was to further develop the reflection already undertaken, but to
184 refocus it on objectives regarding forest-based development of Essipit's Innu Assi.

185 Focusing on Essipit's Innu Assi allowed us to move beyond the prevailing model of forestry and
186 develop principles and objectives based on the culture and values of Essipit people. We did not employ
187 the framework of previously reported work on C&I. By doing so, we wanted to focus on FN
188 worldviews, rather than on the sustainability debate, and how they viewed forestry from the broader,
189 more strategic perspective that informed their choices over whether and how to develop their forest
190 resources.

191 It is important to mention that Essipit, along with two other Innu First Nation communities, are
192 negotiating a comprehensive land claim settlement with the Quebec and the Federal governments. Thus,
193 the Essipit Band Council could become the sole manager (i.e. final decision-maker) over forest-based
194 activities in Essipit Innu Assi. A strategic planning exercise would provide a guide for the rest of the
195 Nitassinan where Essipit must negotiate with other forest stakeholders. In total, we met with 28 key
196 informants –14 women and 14 men – of whom 19 had participated in the research of St-Georges (2009).
197 We stopped adding participants when we reached a point of data saturation; in other words, when we

198 stopped hearing new information. The number of informants represents 14% of the 204 Band members
199 living on reserve.

200 Data collection relied on focus groups meetings (Krueger et Casey 2000), which occurred between
201 January and July 2013 during which the first author lived in the community of Essipit. The seven
202 discussion groups comprised of (see table 1): male elders, female elders, outfitter guardians, land users,
203 women, forest entrepreneurs and artisans. Groups varied in size from three to eight persons.

204 [INSERT TABLE 1]

205 We used a written guide to aid standardization of the focus groups. We started by briefly explaining the
206 context of the Innu Assi, with a map of the territory as a visual support. Before the discussions, we also
207 explained to participants the meaning of the term 'objective' and we further clarified that an objective
208 should be specific, measurable (i.e. indicators), realistic, and time-framed (e.g. 10 years). We made a
209 short presentation on existing Essipit community capacity in forest-based development as a way of
210 ensuring that all participants were equally aware of the issues. We asked semi-structured questions in
211 order to better understand the following issues: 1) their visions and objectives regarding forest-based
212 development, 2) the expected benefits, and 3) the indicators for evaluating success of future actions that
213 Essipit might take.

214 Focus groups were conducted in French, as Essipit community members do not use Innu aimun (i.e.
215 Innu language) on a daily basis. All discussions were recorded. Our local partners played an active role
216 during data collection: two of them as interviewers and one as an interviewee. In particular, the Band
217 Council's professional forester played an important role as a cultural mediator during the focus groups
218 with elders. Additionally, our local partners helped to introduce Innu aimun in this research. This was
219 important to them as a sign of acknowledgment and support of Essipit's efforts to revive Innu aimun.

Moreover, the Essipit community wants to build a forest model that shifts away from the dominant model of industrial forestry and opens space for Aboriginal worldviews. Using Innu aimun in the research process offered a way to assert the intentions underpinning this new model. Indeed, research participants did appreciate not being forced into western thinking and, in truth, they did appreciate how the results were framed into categories of their own.

Although certain themes were established in advance, we also adopted an open-coding approach based on grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin 1994) to allow the identification of new themes that better reflected the views of participants (Creswell 1998). We used NVivo 10 software to analyze the content of the focus group transcripts. Qualitative data analysis first involved open coding in order to identify objectives and indicators for forest-based development. Then, we grouped the objectives and indicators that emerged into themes, or what Babbie (2010) refers to as axial coding. Next, we organized these groupings into core principles⁷, including key goals and values, in a way that grounded the research in local perspectives. In order to achieve this, preliminary data analyses were shared and discussed with our local collaborators on a regular basis. Finally, Essipit community members validated the findings during a conference-dinner in November 2013.

4. Results

Data analysis identified 34 objectives for forest-based development of Essipit's Innu Assi. Each objective is associated with at least one indicator in order to evaluate the success of futures actions. These objectives and indicators were grouped into themes. Finally, these themes were folded into three Innu principles (which cover six principles as expressed in English): Nutshimiu-Aitun or identity-territoriality (table 2), Mishkutunam or sharing-exchange (table 3), Pakassitishum or responsibility-

⁷ We use the FSC definition of 'Principle': An essential rule or element of forest stewardship (FSC 2012, 141).

autonomy (4). A synthesis of these three principles, as well as key objectives of the research project are presented in the following section. Additional details, including indicators, are presented in tables 2-4.

4.1 Nutshimiu-Aitun (identity-territoriality)

Nutshimiu-Aitun means the reinforcement and development of Essipit people' culture and of the link between them and the land. The principle encapsulates two English-language principles, namely identity and territoriality, which were closely linked in the participants' views, because Essipit community members live their culture within the territory. Research discussions covered the following themes: forest-related knowledge, cultural transmission and awareness, land infrastructure, and land uses. For this principle, results identified 11 objectives for forest-based development (see table 2).

[INSERT TABLE 2]

As the principle "Nutshimiu-Aitun" suggests, the participants expressed a sense of a distinct identity and the desire to maintain this unique character, as illustrated by the following participant:

Innu culture is one thing, but the culture of Essipit people is another. There are things in common and things that are our own. This is what creates our values. I think we also need to transmit it to others; it's not just because you don't speak [the Innu language] that you are not Innu (W2).

This participant explained that even if Essipit people do not speak their traditional language anymore, they still embody and express a sense of a distinct culture. In particular, the success of Essipit communal system and outfitters was singled out in the discussions as strong identity markers.

While the Essipit Band Council gives its outfitters priority on the area under license in accordance with its goal of economic development⁸, focus group participants discussed various possibilities to allow Innu

⁸ Hunting and fishing activities are mainly accessible to the outfitter's clients.

Aitun practices⁹ on an individual basis in the same areas, such as: providing free and unconditional access to the Innu Assi; reserving part of the Innu Assi (e.g. an outfitter's territory) for use by Band members; and privatizing some specific sectors (e.g. cottages around lakes). At the same time, participants expressed their desire to maintain the economic benefits from outfitters (e.g. jobs and revenues). Thus, these discussions raised three major concerns with individual Innu Aitun practices: economic loss, potential nuisance for outfitters' clients, and difficulty to manage forest resources. In sum, participants found difficulty in harmonizing the commercial activities of Essipit outfitters and Innu Aitun practices on an individual basis. Notably, participants said that it is unlikely that members will leave their current sites to go on the Innu Assi as most already have access to private cottages or trap lines outside this territory. Still, shared use of the land outside the Innu Assi with non-FN peoples continues to pose its own challenges and that context makes the project of Innu Assi (i.e. territory under sole Essipit authority) attractive to participants.

Participants mentioned, however, that it would be possible for outfitters' commercial activities to coexist with Innu Aitun practices on a collective basis. As the following excerpt shows, establishing a community site and quality infrastructure in the forest would promote culture and knowledge transmission, as well as facilitate access to the land for members, in particular for those who do not presently have access:

This place of gathering would be for community events, but could also serve for knowledge transmission [...] it would be good for those who want to be introduced among other things to trapping, even too for evenings of myths and old stories from the community. I would like it! After that, it could allow everyone to go in the forest. Not everyone has a cottage or the income to go to an outfitter (W1).

⁹ Innu Aitun designates "all activities, in their traditional or modern manifestation, relating to the national culture, fundamental values and traditional lifestyle of the Innus associated with the occupation and use of Nitassinan and to the special bond they have with the land. These include in particular all practices, customs and traditions, including hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering activities for subsistence, ritual or social purposes" (Government of Quebec 2004, p.4).

283 Additionally, participants wanted to maintain cultural fishing trips that already exist for primary school
284 children and elders, as well as hunting and trapping trips for secondary school youth. However, these
285 yearly five-day trips are not sufficient for cultural transmission, notably because they do not reach
286 community members aged between 18 and 54 years. Therefore, participants suggested organizing a day
287 of intergenerational exchange. Older members of the community hold traditional knowledge relating to
288 the forest. This knowledge is not well understood by younger members and is under threat of
289 disappearing with the aging population. Thus, another objective is to document this knowledge in order
290 to preserve it and transmit it to young people and future generations. Furthermore, many participants
291 reminded us of the ongoing prejudices toward FNs and suggested organizing an intercultural exchange
292 day to raise awareness and teach outsiders about the culture and the achievements of the Essipit
293 community, notably regarding resource management practices by the outfitters.

294 The notion of respect was present in every discussion group: respect for wildlife, rivers, forest, land, and
295 other users. The following excerpt provides an example: *Respect starts with yourself. If you don't*
296 *respect fauna [...], you don't respect yourself (ME1)*. The group of land users provided another example
297 of the importance of respect by explaining that “driving around with a moose head on the hood of one’s
298 car demonstrates a lack of respect for the animal and is prohibited”. Thus, one of the objectives aims to
299 raise awareness about respect for the land and other users, either by hiring land wardens or
300 implementing a code of practice for traditional activities. According to participants, an Essipit code of
301 practice would notably include acceptable methods of practice, as well as monitoring and surveillance
302 measures.

303 The establishment of a land use policy would address all issues and objectives discussed above in a
304 coordinated manner. Such a policy, internal to the organisation of the Band Council, would formalize a
305 planning and management framework for the occupation of the land. More specifically, it would

306 establish rules for using the Innu Assi, establishing FN camps, authorizing and managing land rights,
307 and supporting Innu Aitun practices.

308 In sum, forest-based development of the Innu Assi has to promote a place of knowledge, meetings,
309 exchanges and teaching. Participants expressed hope for a vibrant culture through a strong link with the
310 land, as a woman noted:

311 *We need to look at our education. We know very well that the culture, the people, the transmission*
312 *is rooted in the land, it is alive. It is within the territory that we learn. This is the best education*
313 *we can give (W3).*

314 **4.2 Mishkutunam (sharing-exchange)**

315 Mishkutunam involves sharing and exchange of benefits from forest-based development of the Innu
316 Assi among Essipit people and with the outside world. The following themes were discussed within
317 focus groups: knowledge, workers, business environment, and levers of development. For this principle,
318 12 objectives for forest-based development were identified (see table 3).

319 [INSERT TABLE 3]

320 Participants mentioned that forestry can have negative impacts on traditional practices and outfitter
321 activities in the short term, but also recognized that some impacts are temporary and that harvesting can
322 generate economic benefits. As such, participants suggested the creation of an investment fund in order
323 to reinvest revenues from forest-based development in the Innu Assi and its peoples.

324 *The revenues from our outfitters are reinvested in our outfitters. They are not reinvested elsewhere*
325 *or whatever. They are used for job creation, improving our roads, improving the quality of the*
326 *services we offer to the people who come to hunt and fish in our outfitters (LU1).*

327 Such a fund could help serve a variety of purposes: for example, Essipit Band Council might use the
328 money to get through difficult times, improve infrastructure (e.g. roads), acquire additional skills,

329 diversify the local economy or improve quality of life for community members. However, some
330 participants reminded that “reinvesting profits” first requires “making profits”; a real challenge one said,
331 as “the forest sector is dead.”

332 For many participants, revenue diversification is an important objective in order to build economic
333 resilience, but also to access the financial resources needed to develop Essipit Innu Assi. To achieve
334 this, many potential business opportunities were discussed: professional forest management services
335 (e.g. planning, photo interpretation and monitoring), blueberry farms, as well as community sites rentals
336 to outsiders during vacant periods. Additionally, outfitters are a source of pride and an important lever
337 for economic and cultural development in the minds of all participants, as the following excerpts show:

338 *Basically, it would be to get people to know us through the outfitters (W1); At Lac Loup, we have a*
339 *camp. It's offering the possibility to go live there. There needs to be guides [...] to make our*
340 *culture known to others (W3); Yes! To stop prejudices (W2).*

341 Thus, many participants suggested the acquisition of more outfitters or diversifying the range of
342 activities offered in outfitters (e.g. snowmobile trails, outdoor activities or cultural tourism). Of course
343 market surveys are a prerequisite so as to determine the clients' needs before making strategic and
344 responsible investments. Participants also discussed the idea of expanding Essipit construction activities,
345 i.e. building infrastructures and cottages for existing outfitters. This is an important socio-economic
346 activity, because it allows for the extension of seasonal work in the outfitters.

347 Informants said that a business partnership is an essential approach for forest-based development of the
348 Innu Assi, because it can fill some gaps in expertise (e.g. where local expertise may be lacking), provide
349 important financial support and avoid the competition that comes with a new business. Moreover, forest-
350 based development of the Innu Assi has to promote local businesses in order to maximise benefits to the
351 community or the region. Furthermore, it is important to offer interesting conditions to forest companies.

352 One of the objectives aims to ensure a sufficient amount of work, through guaranteed wood supply or
353 contracts for instance, in order to raise the interest of companies or to rationalize investments. The
354 Essipit Forest Entrepreneurs group indicated that another objective has to aim for social acceptability of
355 forest operations:

356 *I'm under the impression that those who don't agree, it's because they don't know (EFE2).*

357 To correct misperceptions about forestry, Essipit members and outfitter clients need to be educated and
358 made aware of the various types of logging and the forest replacement that occurs afterward.

359 Participatory management can also contribute to social acceptability of forest operations.

360 Finally, the predominance of seasonal jobs in Essipit was of great concern to many participants. This is
361 especially so on account of the changes made by the federal government to the Employment Insurance
362 (EI) system¹⁰. Participants explained that "frequent claimants" of employment insurance must accept a
363 job with lower working conditions than if they were "long-tenured workers." Indeed, the new system
364 sets stricter conditions for receiving EI. At Essipit, economic activity is structured around seasonal jobs
365 in the fishery, tourism and forestry sectors. Employment insurance provides important financial support
366 during the off-season. The jobs offered by Essipit will be harder to fill because one perverse outcome of
367 recent changes in EI was to make it harder for workers to obtain employment insurance. Essipit workers
368 are more likely to belong to the category of "frequent claimants" and consequently forced to accept
369 undesirable jobs during the off-season. Thus, insecurity would result both for the workers themselves,
370 who could decide to find a year-round job elsewhere, and for the organization of the Band Council
371 business that might lose its workforce. Consequently, participants identified the objective of maintaining

¹⁰ The Federal government provides explanations on recent changes to Employment Insurance at:
<http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/ccaj/vignettes.shtml> (July 31 2015).

and improving jobs. To achieve this, the following possibilities were discussed: 1) extend outfitters' season with new tourism offers; 2) offer complementary jobs during low season (e.g. construction); 3) offer "year-round"¹¹ jobs, notably forest management related jobs. Another concern for some participants was the imminent retirement of some experienced workers. Thus, one of the objectives was to establish a succession plan that would identify labour needs by sector of activity; another was to implement training to ensure transfer of expertise.

4.3 Pakassitishun (autonomy-responsibility)

This principle implies the reinforcement of Essipit's capacity to take charge of managing its Innu Assi while, at the same time, assuming the responsibilities that come with it. Thus, this Innu principle covers two English-language principles, namely autonomy¹² and responsibility. Research discussions covered the following themes: expertise, practices, forest environment, and management of forest access. For this principle, 11 objectives for forest-based development were identified (see table 4).

[INSERT TABLE 4]

The following excerpt illustrates a general consensus among the participants that the dominant forestry model cannot be implemented on the Innu Assi of Essipit, due to a matter of scale and impacts on the environment, wildlife, and culture.

Basically, the problem with timber cutting that is done, it's that [forest companies] always have the economic aspect in their heads, thinking about what will be left in their pockets. The day the Band Council says we are cutting on our outfitters. It is ours, we want to keep having great wildlife, we want to promote development of all these things. Let's forget the economic and let's do it for the health of the forest, of wildlife in general. Your people will still be working. It's

¹¹ Note that the term "year-round" does not necessarily mean, in this context, jobs over a period of twelve months, as some Essipit people need a few months to practice traditional activities such as hunting and trapping.

¹² We define 'autonomy', following Prudham and Coleman: "autonomy [...] refers to the situations of individual persons or communities and to their capacity to shape the conditions under which they live" (2011, p. 5).

393 *obvious you won't be making a million a month, but you'll still cover your costs and your people*
394 *will be working and your moose survives for a time (OG6).*

395 This quotation captures the tension that profit-oriented forest companies often fail to reconcile between
396 the social and cultural benefits of forest preservation and Aboriginal community development, where
397 their focus is solely on the economic benefits. In the Essipit case, acquiring exclusive commercial rights
398 to manage wildlife is perceived as the right path to find the balance between the need for jobs and forest
399 protection. Accordingly, several participants made it clear that control over land management is a
400 fundamental objective for forest-based development of the Innu Assi. Even if the commercial wildlife
401 business does not offer as many economic benefits as forestry, they value the increase in autonomy that
402 it offers and the opportunity it can create for Essipit FN to establish its own rules and to develop its own
403 practices, thereby ensuring greater respect for their rights and values.

404 According to the female and male elders, and the outfitters groups, the first step towards gaining greater
405 control over land management is to make an inventory of current resources on the territory in order to
406 improve the general state of knowledge. Then, the next step is to determine land potentials and setting
407 quotas for harvesting wildlife and vegetation, including timber. Participants mentioned that these are
408 crucial steps in order to avoid overexploitation of resources, ensure sustainability and economic benefits,
409 as well as protect and value their distinct culture. Various management strategies that could make this
410 objective possible were discussed in order to meet objectives that are broader than only timber
411 production: optimizing certain elements within the calculation of the annual allowable cut (e.g. wildlife
412 habitat models versus harvested volume), developing a silvicultural system for deciduous and mixed
413 species stands, identifying operational guidelines for forest operations, outfitter activities and Innu Aitun
414 practices (e.g. partial cutting and calendar of operations). According to the Essipit Forest Entrepreneurs
415 group, Essipit has to be actively involved in land management, because only with a better understanding
416 of operational requirements and costs will Essipit be in a better position to obtain a fair return on its

investments or to predict the effects of different management scenarios. As the next quote shows, taking over management of the Innu Assi cannot happen without developing the capacity of community members:

At a certain point, if the community wants to manage many hectares and develop it, it takes a vision, it takes data, it takes people (EFE1).

Thus, one of the objectives aims to evaluate human resource needs and to prioritize these needs. A complementary objective aims to establish a training plan in order to meet these needs. For example, internships would train people and help youth in making career choices. In addition to building more autonomy, participants are expecting that the development of local expertise can contribute to the following aims: 1) bring local jobs, 2) develop community pride, 3) facilitate communication and consultation between the Council and its members, 4) increase community participation in management decisions; and 5) increase trust in decision-making.

The next objective, forest protection, could have been associated with the principle Nutshimiu-Aitun. Indeed, it is intertwined with the Nutshimiu-Aitun principle, because protecting the territory is essential to maintaining a strong culture in Essipit. Another way of explaining this objective is by showing the sense of responsibility apparent in the participants' discourse.

Protecting the environment, it is imperative. If we don't protect it, it is not our neighbours who will do it in our place [...] Because the Indians have always protected the environment. They have always protected things. They went fishing, they did not take all the trout. They left some for the next year [...] They lived from that and they knew how to protect them (FE4).

Similarly, this participant said that forestry on the Innu Assi has to respect the environment:

Forestry, it really has to respect the environment, if you want to continue with the other things [...] Yes it creates jobs, but I wouldn't go as far as destroying the environment. There's a lot of things to respect (OG4).

441 In relation to forest protection, participants formulated an objective of managing land access adequately.
442 From their experience, forest roads open the territory, which then leads to overexploitation of fisheries
443 and wildlife resources through hunting, fishing and other recreation activities.

444 *They build roads, but it's later that we are invaded [...] I am not against forest harvesting, but*
445 *under the condition that after the harvest, you deactivate the road or you put natural barriers so*
446 *that people can't go. You try to preserve the land a little [...] We see what land use does, in*
447 *relation to forest harvesting [in this region], but go to Lac-St-Jean region, there are cottages, it's*
448 *just like cities! The cities also bring overexploitation of the lakes over the summer,*
449 *overexploitation of wildlife [...] The invasion is too big (LU1).*

450 Protection of forests in a broader sense involves maintaining the quality of the forest environment:
451 biodiversity, peace (avoid noise pollution of machinery) and landscapes.

452 **5. Discussion**

453 “First Nation deep roots in the forests” indicates that recognition and respect for Aboriginal cultures
454 need to become an integral part of professional forestry in Canada. “Deep roots” evokes a strong sense
455 of connection to forest resources and forestlands, which is a consistent theme throughout the paper. FN
456 communities are seeking sustainable ways to develop forests, as a means of meeting their cultural,
457 social, spiritual and economic needs. The visions of “intact forest landscapes” and of a “forest industry”
458 are not necessarily antithetical – it is rather the choice of practices that creates issues and problems.
459 Evidence from across North America indicated that FN development initiatives should be designed in a
460 way that matches the local values of FN communities (Jorgensen 2007). This research translated the
461 values of the Essipit Innu First Nation into 34 observable objectives for forest-based development.
462 These objectives were gathered into three core principles defining, up front, cultural referents that
463 should be considered in forest planning. These are, namely Nutshimiu-Aitun (identity-territoriality),
464 Mishkutunam (sharing-exchange), Pakassitishun (responsibility-autonomy). Now, we show how some

465 of the key results presented in this paper relate to previous studies, as well as their relevance and
466 importance for FN communities, forest businesses and governments.

467 Participants often cited benefits such as jobs and revenues, yet the wide variety of objectives identified
468 in tables 2-4 shows that it is impossible to reduce FN forest-based development to purely economic
469 benefits. Indeed, social and cultural benefits were seen as equally important. Across all focus groups, the
470 most common topic discussed was the maintenance of a strong cultural link to the forests (see
471 Nutshimiu-Aitun objectives in table 3). With the focus group labelled “Essipit forest entrepreneurs,” we
472 expected that the discussion would mainly revolve around business opportunities and entrepreneurship
473 conditions. Instead we had a lengthy discussion on cultural objectives such as facilitating land access as
474 a mean to improve knowledge and cultural transmission. Evidence from across North America
475 highlights that nurturing a strong cultural link is fundamental to FN cultures. For instance, the
476 Atikamekw peoples in Quebec (Wyatt 2004), the Nuu-chah-nulth peoples in British Columbia (CSSP
477 1995), and the Menominee peoples in the US (Trosper 2007) though involved in forestry still emphasise
478 cultural contribution in assessing the impacts of forest practices. We have shown that this is also the case
479 with the Essipit people. However, most of the challenges that FN communities face are related to
480 integrating their cultures, values and language into forestry (Hickey and Nelson 2005; Boyd and Trosper
481 2010; Booth and Skelton 2011). Trosper et al. (2012) explain that even when the language is in danger
482 other means allow FN peoples to identify themselves as having a distinct culture. In our project,
483 participants found strong identity markers in the success of Essipit community as outfitters. We make
484 the same observation for the members’ involvement system used for setting up business projects. This
485 highlights the importance of a bottom-up approach to identify the distinct characteristics of the
486 community in question.

487 For Essipit, as elsewhere among FNs in Canada, the land represents an ancestral legacy that community
488 members must preserve for future generations. Several research participants indicated that forestry
489 practices can negatively affect the forest environment and, therefore, their cultural link to the forests. For
490 this very reason, participants want to impose certain guidelines at the onset of an industrial forestry
491 project. Our data show that timber harvesting is acceptable to the community as long as logging and
492 restoration practices are harmonised with the ongoing economic activities of the Essipit community as
493 outfitters and the Innu Aitun mode of land occupancy. For example, large-scale industrial practices
494 would be incompatible with the objectives of Essipit and be more likely to create conflicts. As one of the
495 participants (LU2) mentioned: “if there are no benefits for Essipit, there will be no logging and the forest
496 will stay intact.” This quote exemplifies the perception that mainstream forestry hardly delivers benefits
497 to FN communities (Wyatt 2015). Tables 2-4 highlight several elements for developing benefit-sharing
498 systems with FN communities, e.g. investing in the culture, in forest access or in maintaining visual
499 landscape quality.

500 Our data further indicate that the Essipit community actively seek out new forest management tools to
501 enable future projects’ initiators to achieve sustainable forest development. Similar to the Menominee,
502 (Trosper 2007), the Saulteau and West Moberly peoples (Booth and Muir 2013), Essipit people want to
503 establish a culturally-adapted allowable annual cut calculation, silviculture techniques, and management
504 plans, as well as protected forest areas to strengthen the local culture. For example, informants desire a
505 code of practice that would be used to regulate informal subsistence activities such as fishing. They also
506 want to promote community members’ participation in a local advisory panel that would diversify forest
507 management options. These findings highlight the adaptive nature embedded in the Essipit’s objectives
508 for forestry. That involves a requirement for developing skills, strategies and processes (as shown in
509 table 4) which would evolve with forestry implementation. Thus, our data concur with Booth and Muir’s

510 observation (2013 p. 164) : “The future essence of Aboriginal forestry in Canada likely rests within and
511 appreciates an ‘in progress’, adaptable approach of balancing the values”.

512 This research excluded the topic of land ownership by keeping the discussions within the scenario of an
513 Innu Assi (i.e. communal privately-owned lands). Yet our results illustrate that autonomy and control
514 are crucial for Essipit, as for other FN communities, in order to maintain a strong cultural link with the
515 territory. The same pattern prevails when it is time to decide how the benefits of forest-based
516 development can be shared equitably.

517 Our data also corroborate Nikolakis and Nelson’s findings (2015) that a complex set of objectives is
518 required to fully meet the expectations of FN communities. These authors identify four long-term and
519 strategic forestry goals (i.e. community governance, environmental stability, jurisdiction/treaty rights,
520 employment and economy). As mentioned in the Introduction, Anderson (1997) identifies three FN
521 goals that are in line with Nikolakis and Nelson’s: greater control over their lands, wealth for
522 socioeconomic improvements in their communities, as well as protection of their cultures, values and
523 languages. However, the current literature is still at an emergent stage with respect to analyses showing
524 a FN guidance system for forest-based development at the community level. With our 34 observable
525 objectives grouped into three principles we enable a progression in the analysis of FN approaches to
526 forest –based development. Our results highlight the importance of community-level research, where
527 community members engage in a collaborative approach to define a forest development which is
528 culturally meaningful to them. Three chapters in the book edited by Stevenson and Natcher (Saint-
529 Arnaud et al. 2009; Shearer et al. 2009; Webb et al. 2009) also report similar results, and provide three
530 other examples of community and researcher collaboration.

Our results, as shown in tables 2-4, further revealed several aspects that also emerged in previously reported work on C&I developed by/with First Nations (Shearer et al. 2009; St-Arnaud et al. 2009), e.g. cultural transmission, land access, community consultation, biodiversity conservation, and job creation. Our work, however, remains different. We started with the idea of identifying successful conditions for forest-based development from the Essipit inhabitants' perspective. We ended up with an Aboriginal worldview, namely the Essipit's vision that sets the stage for a promising dialogue with forest planners. Above all, our results show above all that forestry is not the finality. It could be a means to achieve a better synchronisation between humans and the forest. This is possible through a common language that formulates explicitly the needs of the community. That is how the well-being of both could improve. In comparison, FN C&I place stress on forest management, creating a baseline in order to monitor local forest changes, compare situations, and evaluate the sustainability of forest management systems. In short, the concurrence with previously reported themes in Aboriginal C & I studies strengthens the external validity of our work.

Our case study can inform forest management in a narrow sense, but it also shows a path for FN communities to apprehend their reality and to make it understandable in terms of social and economic development. Essipit's objectives are more than a "wish-list" for two main reasons. First, participants have discounted unrealistic objectives (e.g. providing free and unconditional access to the Innu Assi for individual interests). Second, Essipit is already implementing some objectives (e.g. creation of a local consultation panel within the community, development of a forest economic strategy with cultural features, analysis of non-timber forest product opportunities) demonstrating the robustness of this observable objectives approach.

Molander (2014, p.ii) argues that the dominant narrative in forestry is worth reframing, "not only since the field of forestry has lagged behind other academic disciplines in explicitly opening up decolonizing

and anti-colonial spaces, but because it has also been historically complicit in both entrenching and reproducing settler-colonial structures of domination on unceded Indigenous lands.” Smith (1999) made similar comments about decolonizing research more generally. Thus, instead of articulating our objectives around common Western principles separating environment, economy and society into three different spheres, our study proposes three FN principles that integrate across these areas. Our principles are also congruent with the six characteristics of FN cultures proposed by Trosper (Trosper 1995; Trosper 2009; Trosper et al. 2012): identity, connectedness, reciprocity, accountability, sustainability, and subsidiary role of the market economy. Our study used slightly different terms to better represent the views of our research informants. Furthermore, the work of Trosper did not explicitly single out autonomy as a characteristic. One reason is that each community is unique and one should not expect an exact fit given that Trosper distilled his characteristics from a worldwide survey of indigenous communities. Another possible reason is that American Indian tribes and Canadian FN communities are characterized by different economic, legal, constitutional and cultural contexts, where US “tribes ... have been able to retain or obtain some independence” (Trosper 1995, p.83). In sum, the case of Essipit exemplifies that FN participation in mainstream Canadian forestry models requires a more complex approach to forest-based development than the current approaches in use. Moreover there is a need to acknowledge their philosophies while enabling them to realise their long-term aspirations.

6. Conclusion

The forest industry has been promoted as an avenue to provide abundant opportunities for FN communities across Canada. Yet forestry initiatives continue to provide few benefits, leading to frustration for these communities. We know that differences in the values held by FNs and mainstream society exist, but FN communities have had limited opportunities to affirm how they want to participate in forest-based development. There have been noteworthy efforts made by FNs to engage in existing

577 forestry models or by forest managers to incorporate FN values and knowledge (Wyatt 2008). There are,
578 however, few alternative models (e.g. tenures or self-government arrangements) that are based on FN
579 values, systems, and paradigms.

580 This case study shows how objectives identified by the Essipit Innu First Nation reflect the values of
581 FNs elsewhere in relation to forest-based development. The Essipit approach enables a style of forestry
582 based on “FN deep roots in the forests”. More specifically, our method allowed the community to
583 develop a set of core principles and measurable objectives for forest-based development. The diversity
584 and scope of objectives identified in this research contribute to the argument that FN peoples have a
585 more diversified approach to forest-based development than dominant forestry models. There are
586 parallels between this case study on Essipit and previously reported work on C&I developed by/with
587 FNs, although these frameworks are tools to demonstrate forest management sustainability and they
588 should be reviewed in terms of cultural references to better reflect Innu aimun and values.

589 We acknowledge that context is important, because FN communities often have different realities. What
590 is relevant to Essipit might not be the same for another FN community. A research contribution is the
591 identification and use of the Innu language that adds to Essipit efforts to revitalize its traditional
592 language. Further research with other Innu communities will provide a better understanding of the Innu
593 concepts proposed in this paper, and of FN values and goals on their own terms. That being said, this
594 research proposes principles that are consistent with work done in other indigenous communities across
595 North America. Furthermore, this research offers a process that is transferable to other contexts,
596 representing a small but strategic step towards a greater FN participation in forest-based development.
597 We suggest that it constitutes a road map, with specific details about how to meet the expectations of FN
598 communities. It provides an organizing framework for prioritizing and selecting forest-based
599 development projects, as well as for monitoring and evaluation purposes. Notably, developing such a

framework can help forest companies develop a good working understanding and relationship with FN communities and their interests related to forest-based development in their territories. Understanding the forest through Aboriginal concepts can be a stepping stone to successfully incorporate the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). As pointed out by Smith (2015, p.25) such an approach “has the potential to open up new avenues for conservation and development, rather than relying on colonial approaches where both governments and other stakeholders (ENGOS and industry) decide that they know what is best for First Nations.” In sum, this paper proposes a way to move beyond consultation and accommodation processes, and to show how FN communities can successfully engage in forest-based development.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the First Nation of Essipit for their support and collaboration on this research. We also thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Faculty of Forestry at UBC, the Hampton Fund, and Mitacs for their financial support.

References

- Adam MC, Kneeshaw D. 2008. Local level criteria and indicator frameworks: A tool used to assess Aboriginal forest ecosystem values. *Forest Ecology and Management* 255 (7): 2024–2037.
- Anderson RB. 1997. Corporate/indigenous Partnerships in Economic Development: The First Nations in Canada. *World Development* 25 (9): 1483-1503.
- Barbier EB. 1987. The Concept of Sustainable Economic Development. *Environmental Conservation* 14 (2): 101-110.
- Beaudoin JM. 2014. *Growing Deep Roots: Learning From the Essipit's Culturally Adapted Model of Aboriginal Forestry*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of British Columbia.
- Beaudoin JM, LeBel L, Bouthillier L. 2009. Aboriginal forestry entrepreneurship: A case study in Mashteuiatsh Innu Nation. *The Forestry Chronicle* 85 (5): 783-788.
- Beaudoin JM. 2012. Aboriginal economic development of forest resources: How can we think outside the wood box? *Forestry Chronicle* 88(5): 571–577.

- 626 Beaudoin JM, St-Georges G, Wyatt S. 2012. Valeurs autochtones et modèles forestiers: Le cas de la
627 Première Nation des Innus d'Essipit. *Recherches amérindiennes de Québec XLII* (2-3): 97-109.
- 628 Beckley TM. 1998. Moving toward consensus-based forest management: A comparison of industrial,
629 co-managed, community and small private forests in Canada. *The Forestry Chronicle* 74 (5):
630 736-744.
- 631 Berkes F, Davidson-Hunt I. 2006. Biodiversity, traditional management systems, and cultural
632 landscapes: examples from the boreal forest of Canada. *International Social Science Journal* 58
633 (187): 35-47.
- 634 Booth AL, Skelton NW. 2011. "There's a Conflict Right There": Integrating Indigenous Community
635 Values into Commercial Forestry in the Tl'azt'en First Nation. *Society & Natural Resources*, 24
636 (4): 368-383.
- 637 Booth AL, Muir BR. 2013. "How far do you have to walk to find peace again?" A case study of First
638 Nations' operational values for a community forest in Northeast British Columbia, Canada.
639 *Natural Resources Forum* 37(3): 153-166.
- 640 Bouthillier L. 2001. Quebec : Consolidation and Movement towards Sustainability. In: *Canadian Forest*
641 *Policy: Adapting to change*, Howlett M (ed), Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- 642 Boyd J, Trosper R. 2010. The use of joint ventures to accomplish Aboriginal economic development:
643 Two examples from British Columbia. *International Journal of the Commons* 4 (1): 36-55.
- 644 Canadian Council of Forest Minister. 2006. Criteria and Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management in
645 Canada: National Status 2005. Ottawa: Natural Resources Canada.
- 646 Chiasson G, Leclerc É. 2013. *La gouvernance locale des forêts publiques québécoises: une avenue de*
647 *développement des régions périphériques?* Presses de l'Université du Québec. Québec.
- 648 Clayoquot Sound Scientific Panel (CSSP). 1995. Report 3: First Nations Perspective Relating to Forest
649 Practices Standards in Clayoquot Sound, <http://www.cortex.ca/Rep3.pdf> (January 11, 2015).
- 650 Conseil tribal Mamuitun mak Nutashkuan (CTMN). 2005. *Mémoire du Conseil tribal Mamuitun mak*
651 *Nutashkuan – Consultation sur le projet du Plan de développement durable du Québec*. Conseil
652 tribal Mamuitun mak Nutashkuan.
- 653 Creswell JW. 1998. *Qualitative inquiry and research design : choosing among five traditions*. Sage
654 Publications. Thousand Oaks.
- 655 Dana LP. 2015. Indigenous entrepreneurship: an emerging field of research. *International Journal of*
656 *Business and Globalisation* 14 (2): 158-169.
- 657 Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 2014. Sustainable Forest Management.
658 <http://www.fao.org/forestry/sfm/85084/en/> (December 8 2015).

- 659 Forest Products Association of Canada (FPAC). 2014. *Vision2020 report card: 2010 to 2012*. FPAC.
660 Ottawa.
- 661 Fortmann L. 2008. Participatory research in conservation and rural livelihoods : doing science together.
662 Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 663 Government of Canada. 2015. Aboriginal Forestry Initiatives. [https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/forests/federal-](https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/forests/federal-programs/13125)
664 [programs/13125](https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/forests/federal-programs/13125) (March 23 2015).
- 665 Gouvernement of Québec. 2011. Faire le Nord ensemble: Le chantier d'une generation.
666 <ftp://ftp.mrn.gouv.qc.ca/Public/Bibliointer/Mono/2011/08/1078659.pdf> (July 27 2015).
- 667 Gysbers J, Lee P. 2003. *Aboriginal Communities in Forest Regions in Canada: Disparities in Socio-*
668 *Economic Conditions*. Global Forest Watch. Edmonton.
- 669 Hickey C, Nelson M. 2005. *Partnerships Between First Nations and the Forest Sector: A National*
670 *Survey*. Sustainable Forest Management Network. Edmonton.
- 671 Holm T, Pearson J, Chavis B. 2003. Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American
672 Indian Studies. *Wicazo Sa Review* 18 (1): 7-24.
- 673 Hornborg A. 1994. Environmentalism, ethnicity and sacred places: Reflections. *The Canadian Review of*
674 *Sociology and Anthropology* 31 (3): 245-267.
- 675 Howlett M, Rayner J. 2001. The business and government nexus: principal elements and dynamics of
676 the Canadian forest policy regime. In: *Canadian forest policy: Adapting to change*, Howlett M.,
677 Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- 678 Jorgensen M. 2007. *Rebuilding Native Nations : Strategies for governance and development*. University
679 of Arizona Press. Tucson.
- 680 Karjala MK, Sherry EE, Dewhurst SM. 2004. Criteria and indicators for sustainable forest planning: a
681 framework for recording Aboriginal resource and social values. *Forest Pol. Econ.* 6: 95–110.
- 682 Kopra K, Severson M. 2008. *Aboriginal community-based criteria and indicators: A localised*
683 *approach*. Edmonton: Sustainable Forest Management Network.
- 684 Krueger RA, Casey MA. 2000. *Focus Group. A Practical Guide For Applied Research*. 3rd edn. Sage
685 Publications. Thousand Oaks.
- 686 Molander MG. 2014. *Decolonizing the mind in forestry: centring settler-colonial dispossession and*
687 *mutually contested sovereignties in British Columbia's forestry landscape and narrative*. MSc
688 thesis. The University of British Columbia.
- 689 Nadeau S, Shindler BA, Kakoyannis C. 2003. Beyond the Economic Model: Assessing Sustainability In:
690 *Two Paths towards Sustainable Forests: Public Values in Canada and the United States*,
691 Shindler B, Beckley T, Finley M (eds), Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.

- 692 Natcher D, Hickey C. 2002. Putting the Community Back Into Community-Based Resource
693 Management: A Criteria and Indicators Approach to Sustainability. *Human Organization* 61 (4):
694 350-363.
- 695 National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA). 1995. *An Aboriginal Criterion for Sustainable*
696 *Forest Management*. National Aboriginal Forestry Association. Ottawa.
- 697 National Aboriginal Forestry Association (NAFA). 2007. *Second Report on First Nation-Held Forest*
698 *Tenures in Canada*. National Aboriginal Forestry Association. Ottawa.
- 699 Nikolakis W, Nelson H. (in press). To Log or Not to Log? How Forestry Fits with the Goals of First
700 Nations in British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*.
- 701 Parkins J, Stedman R, Patriquin M, Burns M. 2006. Strong policies, poor outcomes: longitudinal
702 analysis of forest sector contributions to Aboriginal communities in Canada. *The Journal of*
703 *Aboriginal Economic Development* 5 (1): 61-73.
- 704 Parsons R, Prest G. 2003. Aboriginal forestry in Canada. *The Forestry Chronicle* 79 (4): 779-784.
- 705 Porter ME. 2000. Location, Competition, and Economic Development: Local Clusters in a Global
706 Economy. *Economic Development Quarterly* 14 (1): 15-34.
- 707 Proulx MU, Gauthier J. 2012. *Regards sur l'économie des collectivités autochtones du Québec*. Presses
708 de l'Université du Québec. Québec.
- 709 Rodon T. 2003. *En partenariat avec l'état: les expériences de cogestion des autochtones du Canada*.
710 Presses de l'Université Laval. Québec.
- 711 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). 1996. Report of the Royal Commission on
712 Aboriginal Peoples. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Ottawa.
- 713 Saint-Arnaud M, Papatie C. 2012. Eligawîn: la foresterie à la croisée des chemins pour les gens de
714 Kitcisakik. *Recherches amérindiennes au Québec* XLII (2-3): 111-128.
- 715 Saint-Arnaud M, Asselin H, Dubé C, Croteau Y, Papatie C. 2009. Developing criteria and Indicators for
716 Aboriginal Forestry: Mutual Learning Through Collaborative Research. In: *Changing the*
717 *Culture of Forestry in Canada: Building Effective Institution for Aboriginal Engagement in*
718 *Sustainable Forest Management*, Stevenson M, Natcher D (eds), Edmonton: CCI Press and
719 Sustainable Forest Management Network.
- 720 Shearer J, Peters P, Davidson-Hunt I. Co-producing a Whitefeather Forest Cultural Landscape
721 Monitoring Framework. In: *Changing the Culture of Forestry in Canada: Building Effective*
722 *Institution for Aboriginal Engagement in Sustainable Forest Management*, Stevenson M,
723 Natcher D (eds), Edmonton: CCI Press and Sustainable Forest Management Network.
- 724 Sherry E, Halseth R, Fondahl G, Karjala M, Leon B. 2005. Local-level criteria and indicators: An
725 Aboriginal perspective on sustainable forest management. *Forestry* 78(5) : 513-539.

- 726 Simard, J.-J. 2003. *La réduction. L'Autochtone inventé et les Amérindiens d'aujourd'hui*. Septentrion.
727 Sillery.
- 728 Smith LT. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books. London.
- 729 Smith MA. 2015. Reflection on First Nations in their Boreal Homelands in Ontario: Between a Rock
730 and a Caribou. *Conservation and Society* 13 (1) : 23-38.
- 731 Smith MA, Symington E, Allen S. 2010. First Nations' Criteria and indicators of sustainable Forest
732 Management: A Review. In : *Planning Co-Existence: Aboriginal Issues in Forest and Land Use*
733 *Planning*, Stevenson M, Natcher D (eds), Edmonton: CCI Press.
- 734 St-Georges G. 2009. *Préoccupations, valeurs et aspirations des Innus d'Essipit relativement à leur*
735 *territoire ancestral, le Nitassinan*. MSc thesis. Université Laval.
- 736 Stevenson MG, Natcher DC. 2009. *Changing the Culture of Forestry in Canada: Building Effective*
737 *Institution for Aboriginal Engagement in Sustainable Forest Management*. CCI Press and
738 Sustainable Forest Management Network. Edmonton.
- 739 Strauss A, Corbin J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.),
740 *Handbook of qualitative research*. Sage. Thousand Oaks.
- 741 Tindall DB, Trospers RL, Perreault P. 2013. *Aboriginal Peoples and Forest Lands in Canada*,
742 Vancouver: UBC Press.
- 743 Trospers, R.L. 1988. Multicriterion decision-making in a tribal context. *Policy Studies Journal* 16 (4):
744 826-842.
- 745 Trospers R. 1995. Traditional American Indian Economic Policy. *American Indian Culture and Research*
746 *Journal* 19 (1): 65-95.
- 747 Trospers R. 2007. Indigenous Influence on Forest Management on the Menominee Indian Reservation
748 *Forest Ecology and Management* 249: 134-139.
- 749 Trospers R. 2009. *Resilience, Reciprocity and Ecological Economics: Northwest Coast Sustainability*.
750 Taylor & Francis. New York.
- 751 Trospers R, Parrotta J, Agnoletti M, Bocharnikov V, Feary S, Gabay M, Gamborg C, Latorre J, Johann E,
752 Laletin A, Fui L, Oteng-Yeboah A, Pinedo-Vasquez M, Ramakrishnan P, Yeo-Chang Y. 2012.
753 The Unique Character of Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge: Threats and Challenges Ahead.
754 In *Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge: Sustaining Communities, Ecosystems and Biocultural*
755 *Diversity*, Parrotta JA, Trospers RL (eds.), Springer, New York.
- 756 Webb J, Sewepagaham H, Sewepagaham C. 2009. Negotiating Cultural Sustainability: Deep
757 Consultation and the Little Red River Cree in the Wabasca-Mikkwa Lowlands, Alberta. In:
758 *Changing the Culture of Forestry in Canada: Building Effective Institution for Aboriginal*
759 *Engagement in Sustainable Forest Management*, Stevenson M, Natcher D (eds), Edmonton: CCI
760 Press and Sustainable Forest Management Network.

- 761 Wilmsen C, Elmendorf W, Fisher L, Ross J, Sarathy B, Wells G. 2008. *Partnerships for Empowerment:*
762 *Participatory Research for Community-based Natural Resource Management*. London:
763 Earthscan.
- 764 Wulffhorst JD, Eisenhauer BW, Gripne SL, Ward JM. 2008. Core Criteria and Assessment of
765 Participatory Research. In: *Partnerships for Empowerment: Participatory Research for*
766 *Community-based Natural Resource Management*, Wilmsen C, Elmendorf W, Fisher L, Ross J,
767 Sarathy B, G. W (eds), London: Earthscan.
- 768 Working Group on Natural Resource Development (WGNRD). 2015. *First Nations and Natural*
769 *Resource Development: Advancing Positive, Impactful Change*. WGNRD.
- 770 Wyatt S. 2004. *Co-existence of Atikamekw and industrial forestry paradigms Occupation and*
771 *management of forestlands in the St-Maurice river basin, Québec*. Ph.D. Thesis. Université
772 Laval.
- 773 Wyatt S. 2008. First Nations, forest lands, and “Aboriginal forestry” in Canada: from exclusion to
774 comanagement and beyond. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 38 (2): 171-180.
- 775 Wyatt S, Kessels M, Laerhoven F. (in press). Indigenous Peoples’ Expectations for Forestry in New
776 Brunswick: Are Rights Enough? *Society & Natural Resources: An International Journal*.

777

778 **Table 1. Description of focus groups**

Groups	Descriptions	Citation codes	Number	
			Male	Female
Male elders	Men over 55 years	ME	4	0
Female elders	Women over 55 years	FE	0	5
Outfitter guardians	Members working for Essipit Outfitters	OG	4	1
Land users	Members occupying the territory significantly, especially for the practice of traditional activities	LU	4	0
Women	Women between 18 and 54 years	W	0	5
Essipit forest entrepreneurs	Members who are forest entrepreneurs or aspiring entrepreneurs	EFE	2	1
Artisans	Members working as artisans	A	0	2
Number of participants per gender			14	14
Total number of participants			28	

Table 2. Essipit nutshimiu-aitun objectives for forest-based development

NUTSHIMIU-AITUN IDENTITY – TERRITORIALITY	
Goal 1 – Maintain a vibrant and strong culture on the land	
Goal 2 – Facilitate access to the land	
<div>Knowledge about the forest</div> <div>Document knowledge about forest</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of ongoing research projects <div>Practices and cultural transmission</div> <div>Allow Innu Aitun practices</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establish an accessibility system for hunting, fishing and trapping <div>Maintain cultural trips</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of organized trips<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Fishing trip for primary school children○ Hunting and trapping trip for secondary school youth○ Fishing trip with elders <div>Organise a day of intergenerational exchange</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of organized activities<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Organised community activity (e.g. community hunting) <div>Protect traditional and community sites</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of sites protected by a buffer zone (including Lac Bernier, Lac Mont Grain, Lac Loup) <div>Awareness</div> <div>Organize a day of intercultural exchange</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of organized days <div>Raise awareness towards respect of the land and of other users</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Code of practice for the land• Number of land wardens	<div>Sites and infrastructure on land</div> <div>Offer Essipit people access to some community sites</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Availability period• Number of available sites<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Rustic site○ Developed site <div>Offer Essipit people quality infrastructure in the forest</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of camps• Meeting room• Km of managed trails <div>Maintain quality access to land</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proportion of roads in good condition• Percentage of intersections with traffic signs <div>Land use</div> <div>Increase land use by implementing policy and program</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of implemented policies and programs<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A policy about land use○ A land use assistance program

Table 3. Essipit mishkutunam objectives for forest-based development

MISHKUTUNAM SHARING - EXCHANGE	
Goal 3 – Offer benefits to Essipit people	
Goal 4 – Offer a promising environment to companies and partnerships	
Knowledge	Workers
Know customer needs to maintain supply of quality services	Maintain and improve on-land jobs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up with customers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension of the duration of seasonal jobs Maintain or increase number of yearly jobs Maintain or increase salaries and workers benefits
Levers of development	Ensure transfer of expertise
Promote sustainable forest-based development by reinvesting in the Innu Assi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of days of training linked to targeted expertise
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish and maintain an investment and savings fund Percentage (by sector of activities) of revenues reinvested in the land 	Ensure sufficient recruitment
Diversify sources of revenue for more economic stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment plan : Identify recruitment objectives by sector of activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of revenue/contracts by sector of activities 	Business environment
Maintain benefits at the local level by promoting local businesses	Offer stability to forest companies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of contracts given to local businesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wood supply or contracts guaranteed for a certain period (e.g. 5 years)
Acquire new outfitters	Promote social acceptability of forest operations within the population
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of outfitters bought 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of information tools (brochures, interpretive signs) Train outfitter staff in order to educate customers Activities offered at the outfitters to increase awareness
Diversify the activities offered in the outfitters by developing recreation and tourism sectors	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Km of managed trails 	
Rent community sites to people or organizations outside of the community during non-occupied periods	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of days rented/occupied 	

Table

4. Essipit pakassitishun objectives of forest-based development

PAKASSITISHUN AUTONOMY - RESPONSIBILITY	
Goal 5 – Strengthen Essipit’s capacity Goal 6 – Maintain forest quality	
<div>Expertise</div> <div>Improve knowledge of the land’s potential</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Complete a forest inventory• Number of research projects <div>Know land use of Essipit people</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Complete an Innu Aitum follow-up <div>Know the skill needs</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training plan (needs by sector and priorities) <div>Develop local expertise for managing the Innu Assi</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Customized training program• Number of days of training per person per year <div>Develop partnerships allowing transfer of expertise and capacity building</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of jointly realised projects <div>Access management</div> <div>Manage land access adequately</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of « illegal occupants »• Number of closed roads	<div>Practices</div> <div>Develop a forest management model better adapted to enhancing Essipit’s wil management and culture</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existence of an allowable annual cut• Existence of a management plan<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ Silviculture guide for deciduous and mixed stands <div>Promote participation in forest management choices</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implementation of a consultation process (panel) with community members• management scenarios to members• follow-up <div>Forest environment</div> <div>Protect the forest and its biodiversity</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of protected sites• Numbers of protected species• Create and manage the Akumunan biodiversity reserve (moose and old gro <div>Maintain sound quality of occupied areas</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existence of an operations and cultural activities calendar <div>Protect landscape visual quality</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• indicator

Fig. 1. Location of Essipit reserve and Nitassinan in Quebec (Source: Essipit Band Council 2013)