

Analysis of the Policy Environment for Aboriginal Co-operative Development

The following analysis of federal, provincial, and territorial programme and policy environments surrounding the development of co-operatives by Aboriginal people is presented in three parts:

- a summary of key issues, gaps, and opportunities according to senior policy officials in each region (part 1); and
- an overview of government economic and community development programmes and policies that could be instrumental for the Aboriginal co-operative sector (parts 2 and 3: federal and provincial/territorial initiatives respectively).

Part 1: Perspectives of Regional Officials

In order to understand the nature and extent of Aboriginal co-operative development as it is working “on the ground,” interviews were held with provincial and territorial officials to access first-hand perspectives on the types of challenges, trends, and possibilities currently being faced in this sector. Telephone interviews with more than twenty-five officials were held from April to June of 2000 (see Annex 1, following this portion of Appendix B, for a list of contacts).¹ Respondents included senior officials in provincial and territorial ministries responsible for co-operative enterprise and in the ministries of Aboriginal Affairs. In all provinces, these areas are functionally and organizationally discrete and no formal corporate relations have been established. The participation and insights of these respondents were invaluable to forming this analysis, and respondents are thanked for contributing their time, wisdom, and enthusiasm to this project.

The interview approach was based on informal guided discussions. This allowed respondents to engage in open dialogue on their field of expertise and to freely share their opinions and insights on the potential and limitations to further development of the Aboriginal co-operative sector. In preparation for the discussions on what is working; what isn't; and what to do about

¹ Excluding officials in Québec (Co-operative and Aboriginal Affairs contacts) due to scheduling problems. Contacts in Ontario and Alberta (Aboriginal Affairs ministries only) declined participation.

this, respondents were each given the “Terms of Reference” for the overall research project, a working definition of Aboriginal co-operatives, and the following general points for discussion:

- Describe the current policy environment and organizational mandate.
- What policies in your (province/territory/department) have increased the take-up and success of Aboriginal co-operative enterprise/development—either directly or indirectly? Include mention of policies and programmes that are targeted to:
 - the general population (include communities in need);
 - Aboriginal people; and/or
 - the on-reserve population, or exclusively for First Nations or status Indians.
- What do you think are the greatest barriers to co-operative development on-reserve? In urban areas? In the North and/or remote areas?
- Can you think of some good examples of how Aboriginal people/First Nations have overcome these barriers?

These thirty- to forty-minute interviews with federal and provincial officials involved in co-operatives *and* in Aboriginal Affairs produced an extensively rich and detailed body of notes. These notes have been carefully analyzed to draw out the main points, commonalities, gaps, and innovations in each region. The following analysis is based exclusively on these notes and is organized around the research questions. Findings are presented thematically according to the issues and examples that were raised by respondents themselves. For reasons of confidentiality, respondents were assured that their specific comments would remain anonymous, except where unique approaches or solutions were raised.

Organizational and Policy Context

The Aboriginal Development Corporations play a central role in controlling decisions over Aboriginal community development. Development corporations have been supported as a primary mechanism to dispense and manage federal transfers and settlements of land claims and self-government negotiations. As nonprofit development agencies, they are very active in supporting new Aboriginal business and economic ventures, such as quarries and fisheries in Labrador or tourism in the Yukon. They decide what types of investments and business models to pursue and tend to prefer a collective approach over individual initiative. The co-operative model, however, is not being promoted. These development corporations play a crucial role in the success of co-operative enterprise and their views on co-operatives should be included as part of the overall research project.

Governments no longer hold exclusive authority over Aboriginal economic and community affairs. The combined effect of self-government and programme devolution means that First Nations and Aboriginal organizations hold the lead influence and decision-making role over economic and community development. Federal, provincial, and territorial governments have only limited influence and authority over Aboriginal policy choices, although it must be acknowledged that these choices are always influenced by broader government policy frameworks and priorities such as regional economic development initiatives.

Defining Aboriginal co-operatives is problematic. While there are no Aboriginal-specific co-operative programmes or policies in most provinces, co-operative services and supports are available to Aboriginal peoples as they are to all other citizens. It is difficult to define “Aboriginal co-operatives” outside the reserve context since many co-ops operate in neighbourhoods with high Aboriginal populations, such as in Labrador and inner-city areas in Saskatchewan. In these cases, many board representatives and members are Aboriginal people.

Placement within organizational structure shapes mandate and function. In most provinces and territories, the co-operative function is housed in an administrative or central service ministry such as Finance, Corporate Services, or Justice, and these serve primarily an administrative role. In these cases, the co-operative unit is responsible for applying regulatory requirements and documenting applications. These provinces and territories do, of course, share information on co-operative development, but with a lack of resources and no functional mandate for development activities, they operate on a passive “on request” basis. Many provinces and territories also provide core funding to local co-operative networks and provincial federations, which play an active role in co-operative development, promotion, training, recruitment, and public education activities.

In the few provinces and territories where the co-operative unit is housed in a programming ministry such as Economic Development, Community Development and Volunteer Sector, or Industry and Trades, policy and programme approaches are more proactive and dynamic. In Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia, the co-operative branch is directly tied to and actively part of economic and business development activities. The role and mandate of these branches is active information and programming support for co-operative development. In these provinces and territories, the co-op model is included among other options for business and entrepreneurship.

The co-operative function in territorial governments shares many of the same issues and challenges of their provincial counterparts, yet the North has a unique and long history of helping to serve the most remote and disparate populations in the country. At this time, the Yukon does not have any formal legislation, policy or organizational support

for co-operatives but the model is recognized as an option. The new territory of Nunavut is currently borrowing NWT legislation and policy framework, but plans to review and customize the approach within the year.

Factors for Success: What Is Working

There are a great variety of economic, social, and cultural advantages to the co-operative model, and it is working as a viable business option in many cases. In some provinces, co-ops are hugely successful and competitive businesses. In Saskatchewan, for example, twenty of the top one hundred businesses are co-operatives.

In the Aboriginal context, co-operatives are viewed by many as the middle option between band-run business and private enterprise. This is particularly true for rural and remote areas, where a full competitive economy is unlikely. Small and contained communities have a solid consumer base, keeping funds in the community. For example, the Torengatt fish producers co-op in Newfoundland, created in response to collapsed groundfish strategy, has two-thirds Inuit members and serves all five Inuit communities in Labrador. And although it operates in a remote area with a weak economic base and limited human capital, the co-operative made more than \$100,000 in net profits last year for its 650 members.

Co-operatives have served remote and isolated communities well, sharing scarce resources, creating employment, sharing cash dividends, and helping each other. All territorial respondents recognize the potential that co-operatives offer as a longer-term and sustainable economic alternative to major chains and megastores. While the NWT and Nunavut do not have Aboriginal-specific programmes, the majority of the population is Inuit and hence most members and board representatives are Aboriginal. These territories offer active business development support through loan programmes and contributions, with some follow-up advisory services. They have co-op development funds, dedicated co-op lending programmes, and business credit programmes. However, it is not clear to what extent the co-op model is promoted or being utilized by potential co-ops as part of general economic and community development. The northern co-operative federation, Arctic Co-operatives Limited, has been very successful and effective in supporting co-operatives by having one strong central organization to bid on opportunities, thereby capitalizing on economies of scale and competing against private firms and megastores. Pond Inlet, for example, has several initiatives within one co-op organization: housing, tourism, construction, gas, and a post office.

Aboriginal co-operatives have come up with innovative alternatives to overcome financing barriers. In Nova Scotia, the province has been working with Aboriginal organizations to explore alternative financing arrangements, whereby social assistance contributions are used to pool benefits for equity in co-op development. A tax credit programme is also being considered,

where 30 percent of self-directed RRSPs can be directed to equity in co-ops, although this would have its limits for First Nations without a tax base. In Ontario, some Aboriginal co-operatives have overcome the barrier to private capital by securing ministerial guarantees and band resolutions as a guarantee for collateral (in lieu of private property, which they do not own in many cases because they live on Crown land).

Active consultation and business-advisory support services are crucial to the success of co-operative ventures. Manitoba has an especially engaged and proactive approach to business and co-operative development. The province has dedicated staff who take a “problem-solving” approach with community leaders and economic developers to assessing local needs, capacity, and potential for Aboriginal co-operatives. This includes a range of assistance and support, with key business and planning functions: feasibility assessments, scoping out business opportunities, identifying training and skill requirements, providing links to funders and capital, explaining the co-op model and what is required, and helping with set-up and implementation. The approach starts with the community’s current situation, strengths, and needs (interests, education level, experience) and considers co-ops as one among many models from which to choose. In addition to these supports, the expertise and longstanding relationship of staff with these communities have been instrumental to success.

Co-ops can offer an innovative alternative for groups that would not normally have access to capital or business support. By pooling resources, unlikely groups have come together to share costs and expenses. An unusual example is a new artists’ co-op for Aboriginal inmates in Manitoba [see www.inmateart.homesead.com/inmateart.html].

The inclusive governance structure of co-operatives responds to Aboriginal demands for greater involvement in decision making over their own affairs. Unlike most private business models, the active responsibilities of board and members allow direct and transparent control over financial and management decisions, and shared influence over reinvestment and the setting of priorities.

In terms of legitimacy and accountability structures, the co-op model has built-in transparency and reporting requirements to members. The board structure requires shared capital and regular communication and accounting. Members are democratically involved in decisions about reinvesting profits and setting future directions. In many cases, this has served to build trust where previously, family politics and nepotism could have impeded good business practices.

There are many spin-off benefits of co-ops that are directly tied to developing human and social capital. The collective management requirements of co-operatives have long served as development opportunities for staff who later move to senior posts in government and private-

sector initiatives. By involving people in governing their own affairs, co-op operators and members learn new skills and training, develop specific trades, and gain experience in problem solving and decision making. The co-operative federations in each region act as ongoing support systems for the training, recruitment, and operational needs of co-operatives.

Beyond the balance sheet and pooling of profits, co-ops offer much-needed social and community services. Co-ops are a good forum through which to provide products and services to members based on the needs of the community by producing actual services such as day care, goods, and products. In the North, co-ops have worked well. More than retail chains, they have been a social movement.

Culturally, co-operatives are seen to be naturally compatible with Aboriginal values of collaborative and supportive community planning. The co-operative structure has a long history of practising the management values of “partnerships” and “horizontal relationships” with stakeholders. Collective principles require co-ops to be innovative and to collaborate with others with shared interests. The inclusiveness of this business model invites a shared approach to business planning, ventures, and pooled resources. The drawback of this kind of flexibility, of course, is that it takes more time to consult and deal with the interests of many, but the shared commitment makes for a solid outcome.

Barriers to Progress: What Are the Challenges?

Several of the barriers to Aboriginal co-operative development are challenges faced by any co-operative. Most problems, however, are systemic barriers unique to the Aboriginal population. A complicated political and policy environment is acting as a general barrier to economic and community development in all provinces and territories, although in different ways depending on provincial and territorial context. These barriers may help explain the mixed success rate and low take-up of the co-op model over the past few years.

Overall, there may be a general lack of awareness and understanding of the co-operative model. What is a co-operative, how do they work, how do they differ from other businesses, what kind of commitment is involved? There may also be assumptions that the co-op model is a “soft” business model and will not hold favour over the growing emphasis on the private enterprise model of economic development. Some may also hold unrealistic expectations of quick, high profits for few people.

By and large, the co-op model is not coming up as an option for Aboriginal economic development or on-reserve initiatives. Co-operative units do not deal directly with Aboriginal

communities and Aboriginal policy units are not familiar with the co-operative model.

Some Aboriginal businesses may functionally operate or appear as quasi-co-operatives. Band-owned stores that operate as not-for-profit corporations with shares held by the band might be seen as de facto co-operatives. In some cases, this might also involve collective decision making, but without the underlying co-operative values and principles, shared interests, and commitment to collective enterprise, they may not actually be co-operatives.

Aboriginal communities are in need of educational and development material on co-operatives, customized to their reality and culture, and examples of Aboriginal co-operatives. Most provinces and territories suggested that the co-op federations need to do more work in outreach and advocacy. Others pointed to the need for new resources for Aboriginal staff, and specialists in First Nation economies to make links and promote the model to communities. Alternatively, promotion and co-op development on-reserve relies on personal experience and the interests of staff rather than on being a corporate priority.

The lack of promotion and development activities in some provinces and territories may be tied to what is seen as waning support for co-op philosophy and principles. Widespread ownership and maintenance of co-op principles and values by all members is essential for a co-op's success and sustainability in the long run. As owners of the co-op, members are responsible for the future of the enterprise. There is a real need to create a loyal customer base with commitment to co-operative philosophy. For similar reasons, where there have been successful and lucrative co-ops, they have often been taken over by development corporations or private enterprise. Many successful private businesses started out as co-ops; in some cases, co-op employees have left to run their own business, and in other cases, co-operatives evolved into private ownership.

The co-operative demands unique values and skills. Several longstanding co-ops are thought to have failed in the past few years because producers were not attached to the organization, and there was a lack of member commitment and connection with co-operative principles. Some have underestimated the amount of time and effort that the co-operative approach requires for communication, shared planning, and collective management. Some suggest that failed co-ops in the recent past are due partly to a lack of commitment to the underlying principles and partly to the negative effects of a dependency cycle. Instead of addressing issues on their own and taking responsibility for their problems, co-op owners have turned to governments for help.

The respondents expressed some cynicism or doubt that the model holds the caché it has had in the past. On the one hand, there is a general trend towards simple business models that promote individual choice and freedom, such as partnerships or limited partnerships. On the other hand, there is a growing recognition that quick and simple does not necessarily equal successful, and there is a renewed interest in the co-operative model in many places.

There need to be formal links between co-operative federations and Aboriginal development corporations, particularly in the North. Some respondents speculated that several heads of these corporations are former co-op managers and leaders, although no joint ventures have emerged. The views and priorities of these development corporations in regards to co-operative enterprise should be included in the next phase of research.

In the northern context, there was some concern that the northern co-operative federation needs to have a physical presence in the North and in all three territories. Yukon currently does not have co-operative legislation, yet there are many opportunities for development down the road. While Arctic Co-ops Ltd.'s (ACL) operations out of its southern location have allowed for better organization of supply and services, the lack of local presence and direct understanding of northern context is seen to defeat the co-op principle of local involvement and ownership. There was some concern that the federation's priorities could be better balanced to go beyond administration and accounting towards more development and promotion activities.

Without criticizing the valuable and positive contribution ACL has had on northern co-operatives, there was some discussion about the limits of a unitary system. The approach of tolerating only one co-op per community might not be effective in stimulating the development of new co-ops, or in promoting innovation and new membership. The emphasis on consumer co-ops may also serve to overlook the potential for producer co-ops and the need to allow for different roles and opportunities for a variety of co-ops. It might be difficult to make co-ops grow if they are confined to one model or organization per community. The model can become entrenched and inflexible and not as innovative or dynamic in meeting new needs, generating new ideas, or in inviting others to get involved. There was also some concern that the federation is supporting nonviable ventures, which could be a drain on scarce resources.

There are several general barriers that are unique to Aboriginal economies and hamper development; these apply equally to co-operative development.

Ongoing jurisdictional debates hamper the ability of different levels of government and Aboriginal polities to work together effectively. In each and every region, however, there are examples of ways to move forward and make progress while political processes unfold. More problematic is the uncertainty over rights and unsettled claims, which act as a barrier to

commercial development, particularly in areas of the resource sector such as forestry and fishery development. In many provinces and territories, tripartite fora are addressing joint problems, but outstanding court decisions continue to stand against entrepreneurial initiative. The political situation remains a barrier for private entrepreneurs, discouraging the private sector from wanting to invest or work with First Nations.

The instability and insecurity of outstanding land claims and self-government negotiations are consuming community resources and priorities. This leaves no human or financial resources to dedicate to economic and social development. Many communities are dealing with pressing health and social needs, or laying the foundation for governance structures, before embarking on economic development.

The complicated and cumbersome regulatory environment under the Indian Act places restrictions on the economic and entrepreneurial environment, particularly on-reserve. Regulations are unclear and complicated; rules on ownership, autonomy, and the complex mix of individual band by-laws and standards discourage investment and entrepreneurial initiative. The land ownership structure also acts as a barrier against First Nations accessing private capital. Because they live on Crown land and do not own private property as collateral, they are unable to access financing from banks or other financial institutions. This often means resorting to government sources, which maintains dependency and can hamper initiative. As was mentioned earlier, there are many cases where bands have overcome this through ministerial guarantees or band resolutions, which have been accepted as securities by private funders.

Aboriginal groups have limited access to capital and start-up funding. Some Aboriginal groups have greater access to resources than others, since most federal programmes apply to status Indian and Inuit people but not to Metis. However, in all provinces and territories there are several untapped sources to be capitalized upon (see part three of this appendix: “Provincial/Territorial Initiatives”). Generally speaking, Aboriginal entrepreneurs are not using provincial economic development and business development programming, for which they are eligible as provincial citizens. In the North, there are a range of financing options available and a good availability of capital, but it is unclear as to whether co-ops are tapping into this. For historical reasons, First Nations tend to rely more on federal programmes under Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and Industry Canada. These sources may also be seen as more lucrative and less stringent in terms of reporting and management requirements than provincial sources. At the same time, provinces do not have outreach programmes. This is partly for jurisdictional reasons and partly due to lack of resources and few positive experiences.

Federal economic development programmes are not seen to be relevant to the reality of the small-business needs of rural and remote areas in the North. Specifically, programmes for

youth, or in high tech, market expansion, and trade are irrelevant to most First Nations. These programmes may also undermine the co-op model of getting together, pooling resources, and solving problems as a group. The territories saw little relevance for many national programmes in the northern context.

An ongoing problem is the weak, albeit improving, stock of entrepreneurial and human capital in Aboriginal communities. Businesses continue to struggle with a weak skills base to operate and manage businesses and co-operative services. High drop-out rates will make it harder and harder for Aboriginal youth to compete, especially in the high tech and knowledge sectors, where knowledge gaps are growing.

Business culture and entrepreneurial skills need to be improved. Problems with accountability and finances have led to failed co-operative ventures. Although some progress has been made, the general experience is that business plans, project proposals, and front-end preparation do not measure up to professional standards. In some cases, naive entrepreneurial skills misdirect ideas and energy towards extensive public consultation and involvement, but for nonviable ventures. Efforts by Arctic Co-operative Ltd and flexible approaches such as in BC have helped with planning business cases, budgets, and project design. ACL has also been helpful in improving operations and assisting with recruitment and training. In Saskatchewan, opening a credit union near a reserve created new lending and banking services.

The small and disparate population makes for a difficult business environment. Most Aboriginal communities are in rural and remote areas with no neighbours or business base to draw upon. Such small markets and a small, scattered population base make it hard to run a business, especially when only a minority of people have a steady income. Opportunities are scarce and competition for resources is fierce.

Many Aboriginal governance and leadership structures are highly politicized with high turnover rates. As one province explained, “When a political chief becomes head of a co-op, this creates poor economic and investment conditions on-reserve and undermines the co-operative business model and democratic business principles.” Another cultural dimension that may complicate the success of co-ops is that, while collaborative, the cultural constructs of some Aboriginal groups are also hierarchical, which is counter-productive to the co-operative principles of a shared and egalitarian approach.

The absence of a private sector on-reserve and the nature of many band-operated industries are undermining economic progress. One quote sums up a widely held view: “Community ownership by a band can mean nobody owns and nobody is responsible and nobody decides ... family and clan ‘club’ mentality is highly political and ineffective and not conducive to business

development.” In several provinces and territories, failed co-ops were tied to management problems where one or two family members did everything and burned out.

Finally, it appears that there is a serious case of “too much information” on economic development options and paradigms. In the past, governments have tended to “push” models as opposed to explaining them and providing information and support. In the 1960s it was the co-operative model, then development corporations, and now increasing numbers of band-run numbered companies have emerged, all with varying levels of success. The overwhelming number of models being enthusiastically brought forward to Aboriginal people make for a difficult decision making and planning environment.

Opportunities to Develop the Niche

All respondents saw that there was room for improvement, and that this niche is ripe for attention and development. The following suggestions are based on respondents’ ideas for areas that merit further work or attention and would, of course, require varying leadership, mandates, and resources.

Improving Awareness and Promotion of the Co-operative Model in the Aboriginal Context

Co-op federations could pay specific attention to the needs and potential of the Aboriginal co-op sector. Proactive outreach and advocacy to the Aboriginal economic development community and with Aboriginal development corporations and existing tripartite fora on Aboriginal economic development could go a long way to stimulate take-up of co-ops on-reserve and in urban areas.

Several provinces suggested that a region-wide, or national, support system along the lines of Arctic Co-op Ltd.’s role in the North would be very useful. Such an organization could foster co-operation among Aboriginal co-ops for marketing, distribution, production, and overall promotion and development activities.

For those provinces with an active programming role, targeted and culturally appropriate information kits could be very helpful.

Staff advisors with expertise in Aboriginal economics could help implement development and promotion activities more effectively. The approach to business, consultation, advocacy, and advice on co-operative development used in the province of Manitoba could be considered as a model approach (see above, “Factors for Success: What Is Working”).

Target Training and Skills Development

Following from the above suggestion, there is a need for specific training on and about Aboriginal co-operatives. This could be built into existing training, or alternatively, be a component of existing Aboriginal economic development training through organizations such as Canadian Economic Development Officers.

Greater Partnership between Stakeholders

Development of this niche will require parties from both the co-operative and the Aboriginal economic development sector to come together. This would include non-governmental organizations (co-op federations and Aboriginal development corporations), community-level advocates and representatives (Aboriginal organizations), and government departments.

There are many existing tripartite (federal-provincial/territorial-Aboriginal) fora that already exist; some are national and some operate on a regional basis.

Tapping into “Special” Economic Initiatives

In most provinces and territories, new initiatives have been launched to address the economic and community development needs of certain aspects of the population. There may be opportunities for Aboriginal co-operatives to capitalize on rural/small community development initiatives, such as in Prince Edward Island, or for communities at risk or in greater need of economic support, such as in Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia.

Assessing Business Opportunities and Co-op Feasibility Studies

There is a need for economic analysis and business case studies to examine the potential for new economic development enterprises. This could assess where the co-operative model fits into sustainable economic futures of Aboriginal communities. The timing is ideal to inform and influence options under new self-government arrangements such as among the Nisga’a, or as part of planned co-op policy reviews such as in Nunavut. Suggestions of areas ripe for co-operative development include eco-tourism, high tech, housing, consumer, arts and crafts, fishing, gas and oil.

Publicizing This Research

Several respondents are members of a national Federal-Provincial-Territorial-Aboriginal Working Group that is exploring opportunities for greater integration of Aboriginal people into the Canadian economy. This research could be tabled with the working group as part of their examination of best practices in Aboriginal economic and community development.

Other regional fora might find this study useful, such as the Joint Economic Development Initiative (JEDI) and development corporations. Co-op federations and councils, including those that are “non-CCA members” could also find this research valuable.

A N N E X 1

List of Interview Respondents

Provincial and Territorial Government Officials
Ministries of Co-operative Development and/or
Ministries of Aboriginal Affairs
April–June 2000

Newfoundland and Labrador

Gerald Stone, Registrar
Department of Government Services and Lands

Doug Smith, Assistant Deputy Minister
Brian Walsh, Senior Analyst
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs

Prince Edward Island

Edison Shea, Director of Corporations
Department of Community Affairs, and Attorney General

Gerry Steele, Consultant
Aboriginal and Constitutional Affairs

Nova Scotia

Fred A. Pierce, Director of Co-operatives
Jeff MacCallum, A/Inspector of Co-operatives
Economic Development and Tourism

Ernest Walker, Senior Policy Analyst
Office of Aboriginal Affairs

New Brunswick

Pierre Leblanc, Director
Claire Gagnon, A/Registrar
Credit Unions, Co-operatives, and Trust Companies Branch
Department of Justice

Gary Bruce, Research and Planning Officer
Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat

Ontario

Michael Ksiezopolski, A/Manager, Licensing and Analysis
Diane Ratman, A/Financial Analyst
Credit Unions and Co-operatives Branch
Financial Services Commission of Ontario

Manitoba

Tony Romeo, Director
Janet Fontaine, Consultant, Small Business Services
Al Char, Consultant, Co-operative Development Services
Small Business and Co-operatives
Department of Industry, Trades, and Mines

Harvey Bostrom, Executive Director
Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat

Saskatchewan

Wayne Thrasher, Manager
Co-operative Development
Department of Economic and Co-operative Development

Donovan Young, Executive Director
Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs

Alberta

Ray Zotzman, A/ Director
Industry Standards and Co-operative Activities
Department of Government Services

British Columbia

Barbara Coyne, Manager, Co-operative Development
Ministry of Community Development, Co-operatives, and Volunteers

Lisa Nye, Director, Governance
Janel Quiring, Analyst
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs

Northwest Territories

Doug Doan, Executive Director
Department of Resources, Wildlife, and Economic Development, and
Supervisor for Co-operatives

Yukon

Lesley McCullough, Co-ordinator, Land Claims Implementation

Mike Kenney, Co-ordinator, Economic Development

(Aboriginal file)

Government of Yukon

Nunavut

Ed McKenna

Supervisor of Co-operative Associations

Department of Sustainable Development