

Hunt, Deanne

From: MacDonald, Sheree P.
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 12:05 PM
To: Hunt, Deanne
Subject: FW: Innu Round Table
Importance: High
Attachments: Chiefs' letter to Ministers July 2011 Page 1.jpg; Chiefs' letter to Ministers July 2011 Page 2.jpg; Roundtable Proposal for Canada July 8 2011.doc

pp

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: July 14, 2011 11:57 AM
To: MacDonald, Sheree P.; Rose, Baxter; Cooper, Bruce; Burrage, Don
Subject: Fw: Innu Round Table
Importance: High

This is just for your information - Innu proposal to the federal government on the Innu Round Table. There are subcommittees proposed on CYFS, income support, health/healing, and justice/policing.

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Harvey, Brian
To: Nippard, Melissa; Dutton, Sean; Gover, Aubrey
Sent: Wed Jul 13 14:43:38 2011
Subject: Fw: Innu Round Table

Melissa, please log.
Best,
Brian

Brian RM. Harvey
Director, Policy & Planning (A) - Aboriginal Affairs
Department of Labrador & Aboriginal Affairs
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
(709) 729-1487 (w)
(709) 693-1612 (c)

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: John Higham <John.Higham@chignectogroup.com>
To: Harvey, Brian
Sent: Wed Jul 13 14:37:24 2011
Subject: FW: Innu Round Table

7/14/2011

BRIAN

I noticed when preparing to send the message below that the provincial Minister was left off the list, with yourself as the sole provincial contact. Rather than try to get it rectified and secure approval from the Chiefs again, I went ahead with distribution as it was.

I trust that you will be able to deliver materials to the appropriate Minister(s). When doing so please convey my apologies for not ensuring the correct protocol was followed on this.

If you prefer I can send a follow-up note directly to whichever Official(s) you suggest in the provincial government. Let me know how best to proceed.

Thanks,

John Higham
Chignecto Consulting Group
14 Weldon Street
Sackville NB
E4L 4N2

506-536-2378
www.chignectogroup.com

From: John Higham [mailto:John.Higham@chignectogroup.com]
Sent: July-13-11 1:51 PM
To: 'john.duncan@parl.gc.ca'; 'leona.aglukkaq@parl.gc.ca'
Cc: Sebastien Benuen (chiefsbenuen@sifn.ca); Simeon Tshakapesh (simeon@mushuau.ca); Simeon Tshakapesh (stshakapesh@gmail.com); Josef Riche (jriche@innu.ca); George Rich (grich@innu.ca); Dougal MacDonald (MacDonaldC@inac-ainc.gc.ca); 'simon.dentremont@hc-sc.gc.ca'; Debra.Keays-White@hc-sc.gc.ca; 'Steven Joudry'; Harvey, Brian
Subject: Innu Round Table

Ministers Duncan and Aglukkaq:

The Innu Chiefs of Labrador asked me to transmit the attached package on their behalf to your offices and to those others noted on the cover letter. A hard copy has also been FAXED to both of your parliamentary offices today.

As you will see it is in follow-up to earlier exchanges about refining the former Main Table process to better fit the new stage of the relationship between the Innu, Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador, and it proposes a new approach called an Innu Round Table.

If you have any issues with transmission of this material please contact me. All other questions can be directed to the signators of the attached, Chief Simeon Tshakapesh (Mushuau Innu First Nation) and Chief Sebastien Benuen (Sheshatshiu Innu First Nation).

(For others receiving electronic copies of this message, please know that no follow-up hard copies will be provided.)

Sincerely,

7/14/2011

John Higham
Chignecto Consulting Group
14 Weldon Street
Sackville NB
E4L 4N2

506-536-2378
www.chignectogroup.com

MacDonald, Sheree P.

From: MacDonald, Sheree P.
Sent: July 14, 2011 10:52 AM
To: Dutton, Sean
Cc: Companion, Lori Anne; Shallow, Michelle; Mitchell, Kimberley; 'lyla.andrew@lghealth.ca'; Harvey, Brian; Lundrigan, Wanda
Subject: FW: Devolution Strategy session invite
Attachments: Flip chart from ST John's IS meeting - ILLUSTRATION OF DEVOLUTION FACTORS.docx; Flip charts from St John CYFS Planning session.docx; G Rich letter of April 25 to N&L on Meeting to Review IS Act.docx; Flip charts from St John Income Support Planning session.docx

Sean,

Thanks for sending me these materials. Based on the content, it appears that, in addition to the main focus of the group which is devolution, there is a great deal of discussion at this table about the "model" for CYFS. This is understandable as the two are obviously linked, However, I believe we need to be clear on how this table and the working group, CYFS are establishing, are linked so we don't have duplicative processes... or worse conflicting work on the model. We had some discussion with our Steering Committee, which included Innu leadership, on the linkages when we met with them in November and they seemed to support the approach and the development of the Working Group.

As Brian is not available after Monday for a couple of weeks and when he gets back, I am gone, I will try to arrange a meeting (with the folks cc'ed above and yourself) on Monday to have a discussion on the linkages. I had planned to confirm members of the Working Group next week, however I do not want to proceed on this until we have a clear understanding ourselves internally first on how the process will work ...as we certainly want this to be a process the Innu support and participate fully in.

If you are not available perhaps Aubrey could join us.

sheree

From: Harvey, Brian
To: Dutton, Sean; Gover, Aubrey; Galgay, Taracetta
Sent: Sat Jul 09 10:33:40 2011
Subject: Fw: Devolution Strategy session invite

FYI

Brian RM. Harvey
Director, Policy & Planning (A) - Aboriginal Affairs
Department of Labrador & Aboriginal Affairs
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
(709) 729-1487 (w)
(709) 693-1612 (c)

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: John Higham <John.Higham@chignectogroup.com>
To: Jack Penashue <jpenashue@sifn.ca>; Marcel Ashini <mashini@sifn.ca>; Aminda Clough <aclough@sifn.ca>; 'Stella Rich' <srich@sifn.ca>; wendywhite72@yahoo.ca <wendywhite72@yahoo.ca>;

14/07/2011

Barbara Robinson <Barbara.J.Robinson@inac-ainc.gc.ca>; 'Steven Joudry' <steven.joudry@hc-sc.gc.ca>; John Anthony <john.d.anthony@ca.pwc.com>; Bernard Green <bernardgreen213@gmail.com>; 'Lyla Andrew' <lyla.andrew@lghealth.ca>; Drover, Agnes; Harvey, Brian; Mitchell, Kimberley; Shallow, Michelle; Erin Rumbolt <Erin.Rumbolt@inac-ainc.gc.ca>
Cc: Garry O'Brien <garry@garryobrienlaw.com>; Garrett (Garry) O'Brien <gobrien@mushuau.ca>
Sent: Sat Jul 09 10:09:59 2011
Subject: RE: Devolution Strategy session invite

As described in past messages about the Tuesday July 12 sessions in Halifax (see below), they are designed to build consensus on priority actions that can be undertaken while the "governance" of the process is being worked out. The actions identified should be those that participants feel would be required to advance devolution under any type of organizational structure.

The previous meetings in St John's N&L in late April, took a similar approach and some possible steps were identified at the time. I am attaching the flip charts compiled during the sessions on Income Support and CYFS in April.

A third session in April also provides insight to possible actions for IS. This session discussed with provincial officials, the Innu and N&L relationships over the program as part of the Province's scheduled review of the Act.

More specific operational points were raised in that context, and the idea of a joint Demonstration project was also brought forward. Much of this was captured in George Rich 's follow-up letter from that session to provincial officials. You will find that letter attached as well.

All the attached material is for your information only, as no decisions to undertake them in the devolution context have been made.

See you Tuesday morning

John Higham
Chignecto Consulting Group
14 Weldon Street
Sackville NB
E4L 4N2

506-536-2378
www.chignectogroup.com

Strategy Session
Tuesday July 12th, Halifax
Making Progress on Innu Devolution in Uncertain Times

PURPOSE:

Innu Leadership is immersed in consideration of three major agreements—Land claims, Lower Churchill development, and Upper Churchill redress. At the same time an Innu Round Table proposal to oversee healing renewal awaits final approval and sending to the Ministers. Both of these have major implications for how Innu

related activities will proceed. However, implementation of either may be some weeks or even months away. Waiting for results will mean no substantive devolution action for far too long.

In the interim, the Committees on CYFS and Income Support (as well as the development of healing plans in each community) all have mandates and funds to proceed. The April planning sessions in St John's also provided ideas on activities for Committees that could be pursued under any future organizational format.

This meeting is to bring together a small number of devolution participants to consider Committee workplans, recent on-the-ground actions and results, and suggestions for actions. Then to take a strategic look at what might be undertaken without prejudice to overall organizational options, that would help push devolution forward during the uncertainty of the next months.

As the meeting is only about strategy and creating suggestions, the invitation list is small. It seeks to bring Innu staff, former Committee chairs, and other participants together on short notice in order to ensure devolution action continues over summer. All results would be taken to the existing Committee memberships for approval before action.

AGENDA

Morning Tuesday July 12th

Income Support Devolution

- Main Table /Round Table Update

- Transition coordinator

- Workplan Review

- Funding status

- Participants

- ST John's Input & Demonstration Project Idea

- Strategic Priorities for action

- Next Steps

LUNCH Provided

Afternoon Tuesday July 12th

Child, Youth and Family Services Devolution

- Main Table /Round Table Update

- Transition coordinator

- Workplan Review

- Funding status
- Participants
- ST John's meetings input
- Strategic Priorities for action
- Next Steps

Wendy White

**Flip charts and related notes from St John's Child Youth and Family Services –
Innu Devolution Planning Sessions Delta Hotel April 13, 2011**

The new provincial Act has a different focus than the last one.

① Outside social workers must be complemented by front line workers that know the family, language, culture, history and local services.

② Can community front line workers have more authority or roles under the new Law and structure? And can such a role be carried over into devolution ?

There is a need to “build” more qualified Innu social workers; what is the best method? And should it be part of Committee work ?
(someone should explore experiences of special Aboriginal social work programs)

Need action on social issues before developments like lower Churchill create even more impacts on Innu

③ Practice should be to minimize out-of-family time for youth; and to directly address family issues creating the situation

④ Ensure the capacity exists in each community to provide integrated services to the families that are able to address real causes of situations

Will Innu lose access to related services that are presently provided, after devolution is in place?

(Should consider if an agreement of some type covering complementary services and access post devolution is necessary)

~~_____~~ What will be the policy context after devolution? It is required that it deliver on the best interest of the child after devolution; will the policy context allow that standard to be met?

~~_____~~ A Joint Agency is a good method but its members must also have a Joint understanding of prevention and how to do it in the Innu context.

“Enhanced Prevention” fits in with the way Innu see Healing; community development, and service integration.

— Need to take early and immediate action on a Joint Board.

- Use devolution time to build capacity and common understanding of board members;
- Give Board members opportunity to influence the direction of what they will become responsible for;
- Allow board appointees to influence how the province is implementing its new structures
- Ensure clarity and consensus on fundamental concepts and approaches at the earliest stages;

Does the new legislation still allow for a Joint Board as the previous one was amended to do? This needs clarity ASAP

— CYFS Devolution requires a tripartite approach and working Committee. Recommend tri-Chairs rather than Co chairs

— CYFS devolution will require a full time Transition Coordinator . (much discussion over how to engage this position, what is in the job description, who this person reports to and how Committee direction is relayed to them.)

— Based on the discussions, the group suggested a corporation with a senior manager responsible for engaged staff like a CYFS Transition coordinator and for facilitating devolution talks and implementation of actions; may be a good method to consider.

— Group considered the idea of community-based healing plans as the Innu had proposed in the past. A sketch of possible organizational structure including a Corporation was developed.

Any healing structure must allow flexibility in use of fund; there is a need to support family-related services in the communities that they do not have under existing systems.

Any Devolution structure should adopt Jordan’s Principle as a guide to all decisions and actions

There is partial implementation of Jordan’s principle as within provincial agencies it is followed CHECK THIS ???? but not in intergovernmental situations CHECK ??? ?