

**Workshop: Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development Project**  
**Monday November 5th, 2018**  
**OECD Headquarters, Paris**



**Record of comments from participants**

**Purpose**

- To provide an overview of comments provided by countries that will inform the re-draft of the thematic/global report that will be considered by the Regional Development Policy Committee.

**Background**

- On Monday November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2018, the Regional Development and Tourism Division of the OECD convened a workshop on the *Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development Project*.
- The objective of the workshop was to review the draft chapters of the thematic/ global report for the project on the following topics:
  - Indigenous economic development and well-being: trends and statistics;
  - Indigenous lands: recognition, management, and development;
  - Promoting Indigenous business growth and community economic development in a rural context; and,
  - Implementing a place-based approach to Indigenous economic development.

- The workshop was attended by representatives from Australia, Canada, Chile, Finland, the European Commission, France, Mexico, Peru, and Sweden. Colombia, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation and the United States were apologies.
- Joaquim Olivera Martins, Deputy Director CFE introduced the workshop. Joaquim emphasised the importance of a place-based approach to Indigenous economic development, and the need for us to learn from Indigenous peoples and incorporate their knowledge and values into policies and regional development frameworks.
- The workshop had a dedicated session for each chapter, along with a discussion about next steps for the project, and a briefing from other areas of the OECD working on Indigenous topics. The workshop was closed by Alain Dupeyras who thanked delegates for their valuable input and welcomed interest in continuing this work by the Regional Development Policy Committee.

**Specific requests from countries for the re-draft by 30<sup>th</sup> November (data and additional information):**

- The Secretariat would like some Indigenous leaders from OECD countries to write a foreword to the thematic report, and is seeking support and advice on that from countries.
- Advice on any language / terminology in the report which is insensitive to Indigenous peoples in your jurisdiction.
- Any data or research on Indigenous population movements between locations, and the factors shaping them.
- The Secretariat would also like to include testimonies from Indigenous leaders about their connections to land, and is seeking support from countries to ask Indigenous leaders: *what does land and water means to them?* We propose this be included as a box at the beginning of the chapter, and ask if countries can identify some Indigenous leaders who could provide this input.
- Any examples of increasing the provision of private capital for the Indigenous business sector e.g. the role of mainstream banks (building scale, addressing discrimination, and partnerships with Indigenous financial institutions).
- The Secretariat also requests USA and Canada verify the procurement data at the end of Chapter 3, and Australia provides similar data.

**Comments by section of the thematic report**

Chapter 1: Indigenous economic development and well-being: trends and statistics

- Be careful with language and nuance in terms of what it may mean in different jurisdiction (e.g. using the language of conquest or colonisation). OECD Secretariat will do sensitivity test – advice from jurisdictions appreciate on this (this applies to all chapters)
- The chapter should also have a stronger emphasis on opportunity and what societies can learn from Indigenous peoples in terms of economic development and well-being, including where they already bring value (propose to include this in the key findings up-front)

- The chapter finds better outcomes for Indigenous peoples in urban areas. Make sure we are clear on the implications here, which is not to facilitate the migration of Indigenous peoples from rural to urban areas. Rather to help facilitate appropriate development opportunities for Indigenous peoples in their traditional territories.
- The Australian Productivity Commission’s report on closing the gap was cited as a good practice example, along with the Closing the Gap refresh engagement with Indigenous communities, and these should be included in a box.
- In the case of Canada, urbanisation of the Indigenous population appears to be the result increasing propensity to self-identify. The Secretariat asked for countries to provide any data or research on Indigenous population movements, and the factors shaping them.
- Self-identification is a critical issue. Some discussion on how this is monitored/ regulated in different jurisdictions is warranted, and this does not translate into legal or constitutional protections.
- The discussion on “Indigenousing” measures on well-being is welcome. It should also include discussion of food security issues. The chapter should problematise the neutrality of well-being measurements and mention pathways for inclusion of IP perspectives in the design of indicators and measurement tools, and the need to have a more open and participatory approach to measuring well-being.
- The issue of data sovereignty should be emphasised. The Secretariat should also explore how digital technologies may create opportunities to improve data for Indigenous peoples (have a look at work done within the OECD through Statistics Directorate and the Science, Technology and Innovation Directorate).
- The discussion on definitions could also be improved through a short discussion on the differences between minority groups and Indigenous, which is related to the legal rights.
- The Secretariat will also add some analysis regarding the relevance and differences of this analysis for non-member countries at different levels of development. This includes regional distributions (end of section 1.2), in terms of national well-being outcomes (1.3.2), and Section 1.5.2 (incorporating Indigenous values and perspectives into well-being measures)
- A short discussion will also be added in terms of the well-being of the Sami (where data is available) as the situation may be different in terms of socio-economic status than countries such as Australia and Canada

## Chapter 2: Indigenous lands: recognition, management, and development

- Indigenous peoples have different conceptions of land and water. The Secretariat should give consideration to strengthening discussion about the spiritual value of land and water at the beginning of the chapter. Secretariat will include a figure up front about different conceptions of Indigenous lands and water, and discussion about being a steward and owner of land. The Secretariat would also like to include testimonies from Indigenous leaders about their connections to land, and is seeking support from countries to ask Indigenous leaders: *what does land and water means to them?* We propose this be included as a box at the beginning of the chapter, and ask if countries can identify some Indigenous leaders who could provide this input.

- The Secretariat will incorporate some elements of history, e.g. the doctrine of discovery, whilst being attentive to the fact that writing a global history of Indigenous Peoples may not be possible, and that important contextual differences exist.
- There is also the issue of how Indigenous peoples related to their demarcated “reserve” and their wider traditional territories. This point will be incorporated into the chapter and relates to the mechanisms that are established to give Indigenous peoples a say over natural resource management (e.g. the case of Lapponia in Sweden)
- Point should also be made that if you clarify or reach a settlement future rights to land and resources are normally extinguished. This is a contentious issue, and will be addressed by the Secretariat.
- Sub-surface rights – identify where it does occur and what have been the impacts on development outcomes. The Secretariat will do some investigation where this is the case (e.g. Northern Territory, Alaska, and Nunavut).
- FPIC – Clarify it is an obligation to be met by sub-national governments as well. The Secretariat will identify some examples of this.
- The Secretariat will include a discussion about individual vs. collective rights, which is more nuanced than what is currently in chapter.
- The point about human rights defenders was raised and whether this should be in the recommendations. Secretariat raised this is a public safety / law and order issue, and raised whether this is out of scope for the chapter. The Secretariat will give it further consideration.
- In the case of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) make sure the OECD uses the same language as it, when referring to the principle of free, informed and prior consent (FPIC) (this applies to all the chapters).

### Chapter 3: Promoting Indigenous business growth and community economic development in a rural context

- Indigenous business support tends to be more effective when it combines different elements in one package (capital and capacity building/ strategy support), and also flexibility in relation to social enterprises. The Secretariat recognises that it is important the chapter strongly emphasises this message.
- In section 1.6.1, the chapter needs to be stronger on the point that public capital is scarce, and there is a need to increase private sector capital in the Indigenous business sector. In terms of building scale and private sector – have a look at the First Nations Bank of Canada and Peace Hills Trust. There is also a need for the chapter to look at the role of mainstream banks (building scale, addressing discrimination, and partnerships). Canada will provide some additional advice on this.
- The chapter needs to be stronger on the issues of Community Trusts (Section 1.3.3). The Secretariat will examine the model in New Zealand, which was identified as a leading practice.
- The Chapter also needs to emphasise that there is a spectrum of support. The Secretariat will do this and include some discussion on the Sami issues (e.g. through the rural development program).

- Section 1.4 should also arts and culture as an economic opportunity (in terms of earning revenues and cultural self-expression).
- The Secretariat will also make the following changes: Section 1.3 will include a stronger discussion on the role of social enterprises, in Section 1.6.3, include the sub-heading “defining the problem” as per other sub-sections, incorporate more of the research literature on Indigenous access to finance in Section 1.6.1, in the section “Targeted business development programs” including a paragraph of the adaption of mainstream rural and regional development for Indigenous peoples (cases from USA, Sweden and Canada).
- The Secretariat will also include discussion that some policy instruments may not apply in different contexts (e.g. smaller, dispersed population in the case of the Sami), or in the case of procurement which doesn’t work well in sparsely populated areas.
- The Secretariat will change the example of Box 1.5 (CAPE initiative), after Canada offered to provide other examples of leading practices.
- The Secretariat also requests USA, Canada and Australia verify the procurement data.

#### Chapter 4: Implementing a place-based approach to Indigenous economic development.

- The chapter should emphasise that the key policy task is to strengthen the capacity of existing institutions – particularly Indigenous-led intermediaries (rather than creating new one’s). The chapter should also include some discussion about the growing strength of Indigenous leaders and how this has changed over time. The Secretariat will address these issues.
- Delegates raised a question about further discussion on legislative barriers to Indigenous governance scope and capacities. The Secretariat noted this varies greatly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction; however, we could highlight some examples, and will be discussed in greater depth in the country case studies.
- Delegates raised a question about how to create platforms so Indigenous communities can share good lessons and practices and facilitate policy experimentation. Examples of this from countries would be appreciated.
- The discussion about the incentives for co-operation and building capacity should be strengthened, and the Secretariat agrees and will give consideration to this.
- It is important that the discussion about policy coherence / outcome measures, also incorporates indigenous values and perspective, and some discussion about how it can help break down policy silos (to reinforce discussion on integrated approaches to well-being in Chapter 1).

#### **Next steps for the project**

- Representatives from countries were presented with four options to continue work on the *Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development Project* within the framework of the Regional Development Policy Committee (RDPC):
  - Option 1: Policy workshops in countries throughout 2019 on the global findings and holding events to provide opportunities for dialogue between Indigenous leaders, government authorities, and industry on high level policy implications and possible

ways of implementation. The OECD could produce some short proceedings from these workshops/ roundtables.

- Option 2: 2 to 4 countries participate in a 2<sup>nd</sup> round of country case studies and peer review. This could commence in the first half of 2019, depending upon interest and commitment.
  - Option 3: OECD Secretariat undertakes deeper technical work on agreed topics of interest between countries to identify leading practices and provide recommendations (e.g. Indigenous business data, measuring and comparing well-being outcomes, public procurement, benefit sharing).
- Canada suggested a fourth option to develop a global network of Indigenous capacity building institutions focussed on economic development, which was supported by Australia.
  - There was also discussion about the option of having a side meeting on the *Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development Project* and Indigenous economic development at the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (22 April until the 3 May) in New York. Canada will follow up on this with other countries along with the OECD Secretariat to seek support and input.
  - The Secretariat will follow-up bilaterally with countries in regards to Options 1 and 2, and develop a more detailed proposal on Option 4.

### Other OECD work on Indigenous issues

- Country representatives were briefed on other work for Indigenous peoples across the OECD:
  - OECD Reviews on local job creation ([https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/fr/employment/indigenous-employment-and-skills-strategies-in-canada\\_9789264300477-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/fr/employment/indigenous-employment-and-skills-strategies-in-canada_9789264300477-en)), key contact: [jonathan.barr@oecd.org](mailto:jonathan.barr@oecd.org)
  - Promising practices in supporting success for Indigenous students (<http://search.oecd.org/fr/education/promising-practices-in-supporting-success-for-indigenous-students-9789264279421-en.htm>), key contact [Rowena.phair@oecd.org](mailto:Rowena.phair@oecd.org)
  - Diversity in statistics, key contact ([https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/diversity-statistics-in-the-oecd\\_89bae654-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/diversity-statistics-in-the-oecd_89bae654-en)): [Lara.FLEISCHER@oecd.org](mailto:Lara.FLEISCHER@oecd.org)
  - Access to justice (<http://www.oecd.org/fr/gov/access-to-justice.htm>), key contact: [Chloe.LELIEVRE@oecd.org](mailto:Chloe.LELIEVRE@oecd.org)
- The Environment Directorate who have undertaken work related to Indigenous topics in their Environmental Performance Reviews were an apology.



- Delegates welcomed these presentations and emphasised the importance of a coordinated approach to these issues within the OECD, and the need to work together to increase the visibility and voice of Indigenous peoples within the OECD.