



Sustainable Development  
Working Group



ARCTIC COUNCIL

# GOOD PRACTICES

For Environmental Impact Assessment  
and Meaningful Engagement in the Arctic

INCLUDING GOOD PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS



# Arctic EIA project

worked under the auspices of the Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) of the Arctic Council during the Finnish Chairmanship 2017-2019.



## Leads of the project

*Finland*

*Canada*

*Kingdom of Denmark*

*Gwich'in Council International*



Sustainable Development  
Working Group



ARCTIC COUNCIL



# ARCTIC COUNCIL

*Canada*

*Finland*

*Iceland*

*Kingdom of Denmark: Greenland  
and Faroe Islands*

*Norway*

*Russian Federation*

*Sweden*

*United States*

*Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC)*

*Saami Council*

*Gwich'in Council International (GCI)*

*Aleut International Association (AIA)*

*Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC)*

*Russian Association of Indigenous  
Peoples of the North (RAIPON)*



## MEANINGFUL ENGAGEMENT



## USE OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE



## TRANSBOUNDARY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

© Terry Kruger

© Mads Peter Heide-Jørgensen

### GOOD PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 Seek true dialogue to meaningfully engage
- 2 Utilize Indigenous knowledge and local knowledge
- 3 Build internal capacity and provide resources to meaningfully engage in EIA
- 4 Allow EIA to influence project design and decision-making process
- 5 Strengthen circumpolar cooperation on transboundary EIA

# CASES

## Good Practise Examples Across the Arctic

Models for Meaningful Engagement of Indigenous Peoples

Indigenous-led Impact Assessment

Indigenous Knowledge-based Impact Assessment

Specific Impact Assessments

Collaborative Mitigation

# RECOMMEN- DATIONS

1

Seek true dialogue to  
meaningfully engage

.....

2

Utilize Indigenous knowledge  
and local knowledge

.....

3

Build internal capacity and provide  
resources to meaningfully engage in EIA

4

Allow EIA to influence project design  
and decision-making process

.....

5

Strengthen circumpolar cooperation  
on transboundary EIA

## RECOMMENDATIONS

.....

# 1

## Seek true dialogue to meaningfully engage

Start building a relationship with the affected communities at the earliest possible stage.

Find out in cooperation with communities what kind of engagement would be meaningful for them.

Commit to continuous dialogue.

## RECOMMENDATIONS



# 2

## Utilize Indigenous knowledge and local knowledge

Take steps to become more familiar with the principles of Indigenous knowledge systems.

Find sources of local knowledge.

Be inclusive of experts from different knowledge systems.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

.....

# 3

## Build internal capacity and provide resources to meaningfully engage in EIA

Authorities and proponents, with their consultants, should be trained to work with Arctic communities.

Authorities and proponents should increase the capacity and resources of communities.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

.....

# 4

## **Allow EIA to influence project design and decision-making process**

Engagement with communities, their views and the inclusion of complementary knowledge should be well documented and influence in a transparent manner project design choices and the final decision.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

.....

# 5

## Strengthen circumpolar cooperation on transboundary EIA

Apply the principles of the UNECE Espoo Convention.

Draft agreements or Memorandums of Understanding to guide transboundary processes.

Strengthen cooperation under the Espoo Convention.

# CASES

## 17 Good Practice Cases Across the Arctic



## GOOD PRACTICE CASES

- The Case Examples highlight elements of what has been regarded as good practice. They are intended to give ideas and inspiration for future EIA processes in the Arctic.
- The collection of good practice examples are based on: an online good practice questionnaire, information exchange at the three workshops held by the Arctic EIA project, background work done by the Editorial Group of the Arctic EIA project, representing all Arctic countries and Permanent Participants of the Arctic Council. Ultimately the Editorial Group selected and validated the cases in the report.
- The cases focus mainly on specific parts or phases of the EIA that have been found successful, without taking a stand on the project as a whole being a good practice example.

CASE 3



## Impact Assessment on Acoustic Disturbance | Alaska, USA

- The research project *Traditional Ecological Knowledge on Acoustic Disturbance* was run by Statoil (now Equinor) and conducted in partnership with the Native governments of three villages on the Chukchi Sea coast.
- Prior to the study, there was no known written knowledge of the reactions of marine mammal behavior to sound that captured Native Alaskan's extensive knowledge built over thousands of years of subsistence hunting.
- Input was sought from Alaskan Native Organizations including co-management groups, community leadership, elders and other Traditional ecological knowledge holders.
- The study produced a semi-quantitative description of marine mammal reactions to noise that was not documented before.

## CASE 10



### Dundas Ilmenite Project | Greenland

- In Greenland, Dundas Titanium A/S is developing a mining project called Dundas Ilmenite Project, which plans to collect ilmenite sand from a beach at Moriusaq (an abandoned settlement). The proponent hired a Greenlandic consultant company early in the EIA process (during the scoping and pre-consultation phase), Orbicon Arctic, to assist in the EIA.
- While the company has Greenlandic employees, who understand Greenlandic culture and the overall context, they also chose to hire a local guide and translator from Qaanaaq to assist with community consultations. In addition to translating, the guide helped by identifying who should be consulted, who the relevant knowledge holders could be and how and where to advertise and organize the consultation meetings.
- Typically the role of a translator or guide is thought of as a fairly superficial one, but in this case, the role became more akin to that of the lead in stakeholder mapping and facilitator of a more robust analysis, and hence, a more complete and accurate EIA documentation.

## CASE 14



## Koppera Wind Power Plant | Norway with impacts to Sweden

- The Norwegian authority notified Sweden in 2012 in accordance with the Espoo convention regarding an extensive wind power farm very close to the Swedish border.
- Early in the EIA-procedure there was an information meeting in the nearby tourist village, Storlien, on the Swedish side, and after the EIA report was submitted, the interest groups from the Swedish side were invited to a joint meeting on the Norwegian side in Meråker.
- The comments from the Swedish side were very negative regarding the project, even after the design had been changed and the most critical wind power plants were removed and rearranged. The comments from Sweden focused on the harm to the Sami community, nature conservation, outdoor recreation, the arctic landscape, as well as endangered species and tourism.
- As a result, the project was rejected both from the Norwegian permit authority and, after appealed by the proponent, also by the final decision-maker, the Norwegian Ministry of Petroleum and Energy in 2017. In the decision statements, local, regional and central authorities in Sweden were given a heavy weight.

Find the report:  
[www.sdwg.org](http://www.sdwg.org)

THANK YOU!

