



GRRB Strategic Planning **2013-2018**

Workshop Report

December 12, 2012

GWICH'IN RENEWABLE RESOURCE BOARD

2nd Floor, Alex Moses Greenland Building
105 Veteran's Way P.O. Box 2240
Inuvik, NT CANADA X0E 0T0

BACKGROUND

The Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB) is the main instrument of fish, forestry and wildlife management within the Gwich'in Settlement Area. The GRRB is responsible for working with partners and the public to ensure renewable resources in the Gwich'in Settlement Area (GSA) are managed in a sustainable manner.

Established as a result of the *Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Settlement Agreement* (GCLCA) in 1992, the Board is entering its 20th year of operation. Building on its last five-year strategic plan (2008-13), the Board met from September 19th to 21st in Fort McPherson to review the achievements, challenges and lessons learned over the last five years and to establish the Board's strategic focus for the next strategic plan.

The Board members, Board staff and representatives of each of the four Gwich'in Renewable Resources Councils (RRCs) participated in a structure facilitated discussion which is the basis for the following document. Co-management partners and other stakeholders were invited but most were unable to attend. A representative from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada was present for a portion of the session and written input was provided by a local representative of the GNWT's Department of Environment and Natural Resources in Inuvik (Forestry and Wildlife), which is reflected in this document. It is important to note, however, that the views of all key partners were sought in a full-day discussion on Research Priorities earlier the same week in Inuvik and this input was taken into account during the strategic planning discussion and are detailed in separate report to the GRRB.

The Planning Process

The three-day facilitated session that produced this strategic plan was structured as follows.

Day 1 – The Past Five Years

- Review GRRB mandate and how it informs the strategic planning process
- Review and confirm boards vision and mission
- Review strategic planning goals and key successes and challenges related to each
- What have we learned from the past five years (best practices, lessons learned?)
- Presentation of 10-year implementation plan document

Day 2 – The Planning Context

- Current Board Capacity and resourcing requests
- Input from Research Priorities Workshop
- Assessment of the internal and external planning environment (including: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats)
- Vision, mission and strategic planning goals for next five years

Day 3 – Strategic Plan Development

- Confirm goal statements for the next five years
- Action planning by goal (based on 10-year plan)

WORKSHOP PARTICIPATION

The Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB) is a co-management board composed of representatives nominated by the Gwich'in Tribal Council, the Government of Canada and the Government of the Northwest Territories. The GRRB was established under the guidance of the *Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement (GCLCA)* to be the main instrument of fish, forestry and wildlife management within the Gwich'in Settlement Area.

The composition of the GRRB is prescribed in the *GLCLA* (section 12.8.3). The Board is made up of six members and six alternates in total. There are three members and three alternates from the GTC as well as three members and three alternates from the territorial and federal governments (DFO, Environment Canada (EC) and the GNWT). All current GRRB Board Members were present at the strategic planning session, as follows:

- Joel Ingram (Alternate member - EC)
- Johnny Charlie (Member - GTC)
- Cindy Allen (Alternate member - GTC)
- Charlie Snowshoe (Alternate member - GTC)
- Dan Topolniski (Member - DFO)
- Jozef Carnogursky (Alternate member - GNWT)

** Eugene Pascal (Alternate member - GTC) and George Low (Alternate member – DFO) were not in attendance.*

The Board Chairperson position is currently vacant. Eugene Pascal is serving as Interim Chairperson.

All GRRB staff members were present for this session and lent their considerable technical and on-the-ground knowledge to the strategic planning exercise.

- Executive Director, Amy Thompson
- Office Manager, Cheryl Greenland
- Wildlife Biologist, Kristen Callaghan
- Fisheries Biologist, Kris Maier
- Janet Boxwell, Renewable Resources Manager

The Board also works in conjunction with Renewable Resource Council Coordinators (RRC coordinators). Each of the four Gwich'in Communities in the GSA have a coordinator who lives/works in the community. The four RRCs were represented at the strategic planning by the following individuals:

- Gwichya Gwich'in Renewable Resource Council (Tsiigehtchic): John Norbert and Thomas Kendo
- Ehdiiat Renewable Resource Council (Aklavik): , Fanny Greenland
- Nihtat Gwich'in Renewable Resource Council (Inuvik): Barry Greenland and William Francis

- Tetlit Gwich'in Renewable Resource Council (Fort McPherson): Peter Kay and Abraham Stewart

In addition, Steve Kokelj of the Cumulative Impacts Monitoring Program (AANDC/GNWT) and two members of the public: Jane Charlie and Laura Firth were also present for some parts of the discussion.

STRATEGIC PLANNING CONTEXT

Twice since 1995/96, the GRRB has undertaken increasingly formalized strategic planning exercise to guide and focus the work it does in support of its mandate. The current plan expires March 31st, 2013.

Before moving forward to set the agenda for the next five years, participants in the strategic planning workshop took the time to review achievements, challenges and lessons learned from the past five years and to examine the Board's current planning environment and operational realities.

Looking Back: Assessing Progress on the Current Strategic Plan

The **GRRB Strategic Plan (2008 – 2013)** was based on the following vision, mission and goals.

Vision: We believe that people in the Gwich'in Settlement Area are responsible for using, protecting and conserving their resources, as well as, active partners with the Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board in managing their resources

Mission: To conserve and manage renewable resources within the Gwich'in Settlement Area in a sustainable manner to meet the needs of the public today and in the future

Goals:

1. Establish and maintain strong, positive relationships with all partners and stakeholders
2. Complete, update and maintain as a public file the Settlement Area Harvest Study in order to provide necessary information for the Board and Government to effectively manage wildlife; and to establish *Gwich'in Minimum Needs Levels*
3. Where required, establish or amend total allowable harvest levels for species of concern, and allocate any allowable harvest amongst user groups in excess of the Gwich'in Needs Level.
4. Ensure an effective capacity to develop wildlife management plans and to respond to proposed Federal or Territorial plans, guidelines, regulations and designations concerning wildlife, conservation areas and parks for Board approval.

5. Strengthen the Gwich'in role in renewable resource management, ensure the use of traditional knowledge in management planning and decision-making, and facilitate community-based management of renewable resources in the GSA.
6. Provide responsive advice to Government agencies and to the Gwich'in Tribal Council on legislation, policies or plans that might affect wildlife or wildlife habitat in the settlement area.
7. Provide quality public service in wildlife and wildlife habitat management.

In order to build the next five-year plan, participants took the time to review these foundational elements to assess progress over the past-five years and continued relevance going forward.

Overall, participants felt that the vision and mission needed updating to be more focused and representative of the Board's evolution and current perspective. Many of the goals were determined to be relevant, though there was a recognition that with some key milestones achieved (e.g. management plans completed, policies in place), there was a need to re-assess where the Board's time and resources were best targeted. Participants observed that the Board currently has limited resources and a wide range of identified activities and there was benefit in consolidating a focus on areas that are likely to produce results in support of the mandate.

The following summarizes points made during the review of the seven goals that made up the current strategic plan.

Goal 1: Establish and maintain strong, positive relationships with all partners and stakeholders	
Progress Made	On-going Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A work in progress • Local relationships with government partners is better, but it is more challenging when dealing with staff in Yellowknife or other centres • Planned MOUs and protocols with partners were not necessarily achieved, but the relationship-building that took place is more important (relationships are built first between individuals) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still very relevant • Focus on strengthening relationship with GTC, GLUPB, GLWB and federal departments • Orientation is important to relationships at the RRC level • As the number of government staff physically working in the GSA is reduced some productive relationships could be negatively impacted • Need to be strategic in relationship-building, which partners are most important to GRRB objectives

Goal 2: Complete, update and maintain as a public file the Settlement Area Harvest Study in order to provide necessary information for the Board and Government to effectively manage wildlife; and to establish *Gwich'in Minimum Needs Levels (GMNLs)*

Progress Made	On-going Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harvest Study: completed and maintained Harvest Study updates: not fully achieved due to financial limitations, but some was done on a smaller scale; there is some community fatigue here Rules for public hearings were drafted, staff learned by attending other hearings Definition of commercial use was drafted GMNLs have been drafted in the past but not actively pursued, some exist for Cape-Bathurst Caribou 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GMNLs are a mandate item, but are they a strategic need/priority over the next five years? This goal was more of a step towards Goal 3. Full scale work on this goal is not practical or necessary. Better to focus on specific populations as per management plans More important to target maintaining our capacity to be responsive if a conservation concern arises This goal was in part driven by a hope that funding would be allocated. Some funding was received to develop policies, but there are no dedicated on-going resources available.

Goal 3: Where required, establish or amend total allowable harvest levels for species of concern, and allocate any allowable harvest amongst user groups in excess of the *Gwich'in Needs Level*

Progress Made	On-going Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GMNLs were not formally set, so total allowable harvests were not formally required If a conservation concern arises, the tools are now in place to address it: GRRB Consultation Policy; GCLCA; rules for public hearings; staff learning from attending other public hearings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Now that the tools are in place, if there still a strategic goal needed here? GRRB should focus on voluntary allocation process as a first measure whenever possible

Goal 4: Ensure an effective capacity to develop wildlife management plans and to respond to proposed Federal or Territorial plans, guidelines, regulations and designations concerning wildlife, conservation areas and parks for Board approval

Progress Made	On-going Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial progress was made, particularly in terms of establishing priorities for management and talking with partners The planning process is now well understood and is working well More work is needed on protocols and MOUs (not completed) but improvements made through informal means (e.g. ENR, DFO) More work needed with CWS as there is no Inuvik office Plans have been developed and is on-going Concern that the on-going commitment required from the GRRB and RRCs to implement plans may not be well understood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity to respond to emerging issues is a concern going forward (i.e. <i>Species at Risk</i>) GRRB staff are stretched on the advice-side and there is more coming with legislative and policy changes such as the changes to the <i>Fisheries Act</i> Some plans still require “finishing work” and there are items requiring RRC attention Should getting “final sign off” on draft plans still be a focus? We may need to evaluate the relevance and priority of some management plan actions based on changing circumstances (can we be more strategic?) Focus on implementing plans we have before considering developing any new plans

Goal 5: Strengthen the Gwich'in role in renewable resource management, ensure the use of traditional knowledge in management planning and decision-making, and facilitate community-based management of renewable resources in the GSA

Progress Made	On-going Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A work in progress, would like to have accomplished more • Success in offering training opportunities to Gwich'in (i.e. summer students, work assistant programs, Gwich'in fieldworkers) • Employment objectives limited by funding, funding for training positions that was available from DFN, ENR and GTC is no longer available • On-the-land programs are sometimes limited by lack of funding • Some curriculum work done on Dolly Varden and Dall's Sheep • Good progress on TK, but requires on-going efforts to integrate TK into research and decision-making; more work with the GSCI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong on-going relevance and importance • More educational activities are needed, particularly in terms of curriculum • Employment objectives remain a priority. Need to seek new sources of funding; look at job-shadowing and mentoring opportunities • TK remains a priority, particularly integrating into research and decision-making

Goal 6: Provide responsive advice to Government agencies and to the Gwich'in Tribal Council on legislation, policies or plans that might affect wildlife or wildlife habitat in the settlement area

Progress Made	On-going Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity has been a persistent challenge. • Progress made in terms of establishing policies and protocols, notably with the completion of the Consultation Policy – very helpful to GRRB and partners. The policy is available, known and adhered to. • Much more challenging to respond to governments' requests for input and advice, GRRB are not properly informed and timelines are not realistic for input. The Cumulative Impacts Monitoring Program (CIMP) is one of the few successes here • GRRB is a small organisation in large national processes, some of which are politically driven from distant decision-making centres • Board members and staff are well aligned to provide advice and engage in processes, but not clear how the Board as an organisation will be engaged by governments going forward • Budget is set in March, but requirements come up through the year to connect/maximize provision of advice – staff have to make ad hoc decisions • Good news on Beaufort Regional Environmental Assessment (BREA), Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), Beaufort-Delta Partnership, etc.... all staff-driven efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This remains a priority for the Board and demand will continue to be high • GRRB voice has "weight" in the federal government there are opportunities to set the agenda more • Land claim calls for governments to engage the Gwich'in on initiatives and this could create significant demand going forward, it will be up to the Board to determine how it manages this aspect of the land claim going forward • Staff need more direction on what processes and advice to prioritize

Goal 7: Provide quality public service in wildlife and wildlife habitat management

Progress Made	On-going Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good progress • Team is well-aligned and the GRRB is functioning well • Staffing policies and staff evaluation processes are in place • Key indicator of success is a more stable staff (two years or more for all staff) • Board members are impressed with the leadership and performance of staff • Procedures are good enough to maintain continuity • Still working on being more competitive as an employer • Governments and other groups look at the Char monitoring and harvest program as a good example (this speaks to the quality of public service of the GRRB) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued focus required • Continue to improve competitiveness as an employer • Address pressure of workload and time/resource constraints • More staff training and development would be valuable • Objective 6 should be worded more clearly to focus on staff development and, rather than looking at course development with Aurora Colleague and the Arctic Research Institute, consider looking “outward” (i.e. Yukon or other locations)

The current status of all **management plans** was also reviewed with participants as follows.

- Integrated Fisheries Management Plan for northern form Dolly Varden – *approved 2010*
- Porcupine Caribou Harvest Management Plan – *approved 2011 (GRRB is not a party)*
 - Implementation plan – *approved 2011 (GRRB is not a party but is involved with implementation)*
- Grizzly Bear Management Agreement and Grizzly Bear Management Plan – *approved by GRRB and RRCs, but not likely to be formally approved*
- Bluenose West/Bluenose East/Cape Bathurst Caribou Management Plan – *draft*
- Dall’s Sheep Management Plan – *draft*
- Moose Management Plan – *GRRB and RRCs approved 2000 (not approved by governments at this time)*
- Gwich’in Forest Management Plan – *approved by all but never officially recommended*
- Coney Management Plan – *approved 2000 by GRRB, RRCs and DFO*

Looking Back: GRRB Performance Overall

For this portion of the workshop, participants were broken into two discussion groups. One group included representatives from the RRCs to get input into what the Board has done well and where improvements are needed. During this time, Board members, staff and Steve Kokelj from the CIMP program had a separate discussion to look at key successes, challenges and lessons learned for the board over the past five years. The following summarizes the outcome of those discussions.

RRC feedback on GRRB performance

RRC members felt the GRRB and its staff are doing a good job overall. Appreciation was expressed for the work from a community perspective. Feedback was provided with the understanding that it was just to help the GRRB do an even better job.

- The GRRB plays an important management role because it provides a place for important information to be collected, coordinated and stored.
- The idea of the voluntary harvest limits is good, but it can be abused. More education and communication and enforcement are needed.
- The Board is important to communities and those who have “on the land” knowledge because the Board can put that information into writing and communicate it to decision-makers and provide the technical knowledge needed to fill any gaps.
- It can be hard for communities to participate in some processes because of the volume and complexity of the information. Plain language materials are very important. The land claim is a large, complex document, but there are a number of good plain language resources available to help understand and interpret it. That would be a valuable thing to do for the Board to do as well for some of its materials.
- There is some concern that people don’t understand that muskox can be eaten and have traditionally traveled with caribou. More communication/education is needed in this area.
- Harvest studies are useful, but there is so much information in them that they aren’t useful to people in the communities. At the end, people no longer know where their input ended up in the process. The technical information is important, but it is not always accessible because of the language.
- Straight population research is sometimes less useful than an understanding of distribution and where they are going. For example with Caribou, we are wasting time looking at population numbers when what is important is changes in migration patterns and Elders in the communities may have ideas. Animals’ patterns are changing. It may be due to fires, we aren’t sure.
- Don’t forget to talk to both younger Elders and older Elders – it is important to talk to both. That could be happening more, particularly in terms of the work the Board does in education. Elders need to be involved more.
- There was a general recognition that it is difficult to engage with people and organisations at the community level. People need more orientation and training to their roles and responsibilities and how they relate to other organisations.

- I can be hard to get people out to meetings and it can make it difficult for RRC representatives to get the input they need. Any assistance the Board can give RRCs to help RRCs in this respect would be appreciated.
- RRCs recognized that when there is no quorum, it was hard to get things done.
- RRCs also see that the Board needs more money. Anything the Board can do to find resources is appreciated.
- It was noted that the work the Board does to engage youth is appreciated. The youth look forward to those opportunities and jobs that come up. There is a real hope that the Board will continue to focus on that. The Board should continue to encourage and press researchers to use young people so they can learn about the land, about what the researchers are doing and the value of learning. We need to make sure young people in the community get those opportunities. By getting these opportunities, young people learn three ways: 1) technical knowledge; 2) time on the land, and 3) learning what kind of work they may want to do in the future.
- RRC members emphasized the importance of training and employing local people in general because they have the knowledge of the land, the animals and the people.
- There was a strong concern expressed that sometimes there are community concerns that are not being heard. For example, communities are very concerned about the impact otters are having and want the Board to address this concern. The otters are eating muskrats, beavers, fish, etc. RRC participants felt strongly that something needs to be done about them and feel that their concern has not been taken seriously by the Board so far. They wonder if a more formal action is required (a motion or a letter, for example). In the case of wolf over-population in the past, there was a bounty put in place and the issue was resolved. Could that be the solution for otters as well?
- There was a lot of conversation about the different kinds of studies. There is a recognition that the Board has to make choices about what they study and when, it is important to be sure that the community understands why the choices are made and what the long term plan is for the other things on the list.
- There is a need to be clear about how the research money is allocated and how decisions are made in this respect. There was a concern expressed that by the time you get to the meeting, the allocation decisions have been made, so the process is not perceived as open.
- More clear and transparent processes overall would be appreciated. The focus and timing of various research projects and the reason behind these decisions is important for communities to know.

GRRB Successes, Challenges and Best Practices

Successes	Challenge
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority-setting process • Community based management (e.g. char monitoring) • Harvest Data Collection • Partnerships with communities and RRCs • Consultation Policy – development and implementation • Two management plans approved • AANDC assesses GRRB a low financial risk organisation • Management of the Wildlife Studies Fund (preservation of capital is good and the spending rate is conservative) • Research partnerships • GRRB is acknowledged beyond the GSA as taking the lead, see the GRRB used as an example of effective co-management • Co-management here is more effective than processes in the South • Developing management plans with the communities has been successful • Recruiting and maintaining high quality staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental changes – climate changes • Finalizing management plans • Implementing management plan • Little flexibility in operations re time and money – capacity is an issue • Board does not have funds to hire full-time communications coordinator, do work planning, etc. • External processes: delays in government appointment processes; requests for advice increasing and timelines are shorter • Getting formal RRC input can be a challenge, although getting participation at meetings is good • Communications capacity • RRC capacity and turnover. When terms of RRC members expire – orientation of new members can be a challenge • National recognition and respect of the Board’s mandate, we need to work with similar Boards to tackle the challenge of being small piece of national puzzle • Management of Wildlife Studies fund: current market conditions
Best Practices	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation Policy: includes how partners are involved • Bottom up approach works • Follow the <i>GCLCA</i> • Operating Procedures Manual • Teleconferences between face-to-face meetings provides good direction • Constructive positive approach to partnership (with mutual respect) • TK is the backbone of our work – it is so valuable 	

Looking Forward

Some key points were with respect to the forward planning environment for the Board to consider.

GCLCA implementation planning overlap

- GRRB receives its core funding through Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC). The amount of funding the Board receives is set through a 10-year Gwich'in Implementation Plan. The plan is negotiated through the Gwich'in Implementation Committee which is comprised of representation from the GTC, AANDC and GNWT. The current Gwich'in implementation plan will be completed in March 2013 so the Gwich'in Implementation Committee is negotiating its renewal with the federal government.
- On March 23, 2012, the Board received a letter from the Gwich'in Implementation Committee requesting a presentation on the Board's current and future activities, concerns and funding requirements to feed into the next implementation period (2014-2023). Input was required by April 2012.
- In January 2012, the Board had decided to update its strategic plan by holding a fall workshop with its partners. The planning process is the Board's preferred method to identify its future activities in a collaborative way with its partners. The Board asked the committee to allow the fall strategic planning workshop to take place before detailed information was submitted. The Committee acknowledged the board's wishes but due to their time constraints required the details sooner. The Board was required to submit a detailed implementation proposal in June 2012.
- The Board struck a working group to review the current plan and re-ranked the strategic planning goals based on current and foreseen pressures. The outcome of this analysis was provided to the Executive Director, who developed a detailed 10-year work plan using existing documents (current implementation plan, GRRB strategic plan, research priorities, consultation policy and the land claim). A financial advisor was contracted to add the resources required for each work plan item. The result was a 12 page document, which was shared with the participants in the strategic planning workshop.
- The implementation proposal was submitted on June 29, 2012.
- The proposal assumes no funding or capacity limitation and requested a 54% increase in funding for the first year of the next implementation period. This would allow the board to do all the work it is responsible for and would allow the Board to hire three additional full-time staff (2 Senior Biologists and a Communications Manager). No response had been received at the time of the strategic planning session.

Funding Scenarios

- Participants agreed that the strategic plan needs to take into account three potential funding scenarios:
 1. The GRRB receives some or all of the requested funding increase
 2. The GRRB's funding is maintained at, or close to the current level
 3. The GRRB's funding is reduced
- The Board's current internal capacity is limited to 5 full-time staff (Executive Director, 3 technical staff (2 biologist and 1 resource manager staff) and one administrative staff)
- The Board's core budget for 2012-2013 is \$763,903 for 2012-2013. Budget increases minimally each year to account for inflation. The board's budget is based on operating costs (i.e. staffing, board and office expenses)
- Wildlife Studies Fund (WSF) has recently been allocating funds to help support internal capacity to develop management plans, youth programs and communication materials.
- The rest of the Board's work requires outside funding through:
 - Ongoing projects/programs
 - Harvest collection – Received money from CIMP, WSF and ENR. We received notification that CIMP will no longer fund this project as it does not fit within their priority list anymore
 - Youth program – solely through GRRB's WSF
 - Conservation calendar – ENR, DFO, GRRB. Have to seek funding each year
 - Summer student – service Canada, ECE. Have to seek funding each year
 - Newsletters – ENR, WSF. Have to seek funding & capacity each year
 - Bluenose caribou management – WSF. Have to seek funding each year
 - Conference attendance – DFO, ENR, ECE try to secure outside funds
 - Other priority projects always require staff to secure outside funds
 - Species specific initiatives (i.e. Dall's sheep surveys, moose surveys) require proposal writing. These are identified in the management plan as an action the Board commits to and is related to its role. They are scheduled for every so many years based on the population status.
 - Emerging concerns (i.e. muskox, climate change)

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)

Participants worked in groups to identify the GRRB's current Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats and reported back to the group. The following chart summarizes the outcome of this work.

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claim establishes the Board in law • Co-management is effective • Good financial management • Quorum • Management plans • Consultation Policy – provides process for development of management plans • Good local partner relations • Toolkit of powers • MVRMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower capacity than there is work • Not enough funding or funding options • High turnover at RRCs and DGOs • RRC and DGO lacking orientation and training (coordinators not effective, need more training) • Community engagement challenges • Community understanding of management plans etc. • No chair in place • Lack of knowledge of land claim and roles of different organization by communities and/or partners • Communication effectiveness with communities is uneven • Reliance on partners • Some partner relationships are weaker – GTC and CWS
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared office space with Land Use Planning Board and Land and Water Board • Strategic Plan – next five years • GRRB is seen as a model • GTC partnership can be strengthened • Research creates opportunities for employment and training • Scheduled reviews of management plans allow for adjustment • Implementation review = funding could go up • GRRB and RRC working groups on specific topics = better understanding about solutions; provide direction on how to address community concerns • RRC Committee could help with coordination and support to RRCs (if it continues) • Opportunity to do more strategic communication to help people understand better what the GRRB is doing and why, use more plain language • Explore opportunities to for Renewable Resource development/use that benefit communities (e.g. Muskox, sport fishing, Grizzly Bear) • Programs that partners are running can help us coordinate and plan to get our work done more efficiently (e.g. CIMP) • New RPs information and process • GTC orientation for DGOs and RRCs, have one manual to help standardize how they do things • Forums where similarly mandated Boards meet and collaborate (e.g. Board Forum, ACCWM, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of TK holders • Partners resources are decreasing • GRRB does not have as much control over transboundary issues • Pressures/demands on co-management boards by government processes and decisions • Uncertainty with respect to government initiatives like changes to the Fisheries Act, Species at Risk, NWT Wildlife Act, changes to the MVRMA (structure, timelines, consultation approaches) • Funding levels are not certain • Board appointments process can be slow • Lack of understanding of environmental changes we are seeing and how they will impact management of wildlife in the GSA (e.g. climate change) • Development initiatives and the processes they require (e.g. Tuk Road, MGP, Mackenzie Valley highway) • Community fatigue from many demands • Growing number of transboundary issues • GRRB and GSA are small players in big national processes • Changing government priorities at territorial and federal levels • Too many people “coordinating” multiple processes, hard to work with other organisations

OUTCOMES

On the final day of the workshop, participants were able to bring together all the elements of the first two days to the key elements of a strategic plan for the next five years, including a vision, mission and goals, as well as key objectives and outcomes for each goal.

This information was pulled together and presented as a draft Strategic Plan by the workshop facilitator as separate document. The plan, once finalized and approved by the Board, will guide the work of the Board in two important ways.

- As a decision-making tool to help the Board members and staff target limited time and resources to best effect
- As a way to communicate the GRRB's priorities to co-management partners, communities, other stakeholders and the public.

The strategic plan is not a prescriptive work plan. It is intended to be high-level in nature so that it allows the Board to respond to its changing environment (e.g. funding, government priorities, climate change), yet clear enough to give the GRRB staff clear guidance on how to prioritize the Board's annual work plans and day-to-day activities.