Yukon River Panel Restoration and Enhancement Fund

Guidance for Stewardship Proposals

This guidance document has been adopted by the Panel on a trial basis. The Panel invites proponents to provide feedback regarding the content, clarity, and utility of the guidance in preparing effective proposals. Please email yukonfund@psc.org to provide your views.

The intent of this document is to assist proponents in the development of stewardship proposals and to assist the Yukon River Panel's Joint Technical Committee's (JTC) reviewers in the evaluation of stewardship proposals and concepts. Reference to this document is not mandatory or prescriptive. Instead, it simply provides guidance on how to write a strong Stewardship proposal. Proponents are encouraged to draw on the suggestions provided here. Each category of the scoring matrix is addressed in this document.

A note on terminology

There is often confusion around the terms IK (Indigenous Knowledge), TK (Traditional Knowledge), TEK (Traditional Ecological Knowledge), LK (Local Knowledge), and LTK (Local Traditional Knowledge), etc. Each of these terms have formal definitions (which may vary among sources), and those definitions may differ from how they are used by specific First Nations Governments, Tribal Governments, communities, and agencies. Proponents that use these terms in Restoration and Enhancement (R&E) proposals must understand that they have specific meaning, they are not all interchangeable, and choice of terminology must be done so mindfully. Generally, these terms can be grouped into two categories, those that are exclusive to IK holders and those that may also include non-indigenous voices. Much of the formal literature agrees that IK, TK, or TEK are interchangeable and refer to knowledge held by indigenous people that is passed down from generation to generation. This type of knowledge differs from LK or LTK, which may include non-indigenous voices. For this guidance document, the terms IK and LK have been chosen to represent the two types of knowledge that is unique to a given culture or society. The choice of these terms is for brevity only, where IK is used to represent all terms that is exclusive to IK holders, and LK represents all terms that includes non-indigenous voices. **Proponents of R&E proposals should clearly define the terminology they have chosen and demonstrate that it is appropriate for the work they are proposing**.

Usually, IK and LK are local in scale but is extremely valuable and critically important to incorporate into decision making and to evaluate alongside other forms of knowledge. Challenges in developing and scoring proposals that incorporate or use IK or LK, usually result from the complexity associated with the concept or methods of documenting/analyzing it. IK and LK should not be valued differently than other types of knowledge. Instead, IK and LK "should be promoted on its merits, scrutinized as other information is scrutinized and applied in those instances where it makes a difference in the quality of research, the effectiveness of management and the involvement of resource users in decisions that affect them" (Huntington 2000). IK and LK often provide a counterpoint to more broad-based scientifically produced knowledge. The entire salmon system, and the communities dependent on that system, will benefit from the documentation, evaluation, and incorporation of all relevant information into the existing salmon management regime.

For more information about social science research methods and the global efforts to document and incorporate IK and LK into decision making and research design, please see the accompanying *Annotated Bibliography for Proponents of Stewardship Proposals*. For thorough guidance on Yukon First Nations' approach to stewardship please see the "Guide to Heritage Stewardship for Yukon First Nation Governments"[1], which is a living document developed by the Yukon First Nations' Heritage Group. *Section 1.3* in the "Guide to Heritage Stewardship…" provides additional context on the use of the term IK.

For Proponents Developing Proposals

While stewardship projects can have scientific components, the goals and nature of stewardship projects differ from other R&E projects. This document provides information on three common approaches to stewardship proposals:

1) **Education and Outreach**: projects that include a strong community engagement component that provides a foundation for understanding and supporting salmon systems.
2) **Documentation of Indigenous Knowledge (IK) or Local Knowledge (LK):** involving the collection and analysis of ethnographic, local information and/or knowledge to benefit and inform local communities, management, or other groups.
3) **Promoting and/or Maintaining Cultural Connections with Salmon**

Stewardship projects may include one or more elements or draw on elements outside of these typical approaches. This document seeks to assist proponents in clearly describing the relevance and significance of their project both to the Yukon River Panel's (YRP) Near-Term Priorities and to their own communities. Additionally, it will help proponents develop both the technical and qualitative merit of their proposal to ensure that goals, objectives, and methods are clearly defined.

Part 1: Relevance and Significance – Stewardship projects

The proponent should explain how the project responds to the near-term priorities listed in the current call for proposals. Proponents should use the overview section to briefly describe the project and articulate the project goals and objectives. Goals and objectives should be clear and measurable. Goals tend to be broad statements that represent a desired outcome while objectives are measurable, action oriented, and linked to project results.

*Example: The **goal** for a culture camp might be to foster a sense of connection between youth and their cultural identities to develop a sense of responsibility for the longevity of salmon. The **objective** for the same culture camp might be to have up to 10 youth spend 6-8 hours as a group at an elder's fish camp and listen to stories, learn to cut fish, and assist with preparing the fish to be dried.*

1) **Education and outreach** proponents should identify the target group or audience (e.g., preK, K-12, or adult) and setting (e.g., classrooms, community building, city park, fish camp etc.). Proponents should demonstrate specific learning objectives and how those objectives will be evaluated. Proponents should demonstrate they are familiar with existing education or outreach efforts similar to their own to ensure an existing need has been identified and discuss how the proposed work will contribute to or compliment broader education and outreach efforts. Proponents should also demonstrate education/ outreach experience in delivering the project.

2) **Documentation of IK or LK** proponents should provide a "background" statement or descriptive summary of the available information based on review of relevant literature on the proposed inquiry. Proponents should assess the contributions and/or limitations of previous analyses and state how the proposed research will build on previous efforts or address limitations.

   Proponents should demonstrate they are familiar with existing projects, documented knowledge, or efforts similar to their own, to ensure an existing need has been identified and how the proposed work will contribute to filling that need. Proponents, including those who are based in the community (or communities) where the project is to take place, should specify their cultural experience and/ or understanding of the group or audience they are planning to work with.

Part 2: Technical Merit – Approach/Methods

The following section is intended to provide advice and direction regarding methodological details that should be included when completing the *Approach* section of the project application form. The proponent is essentially answering the question, "What are you going to do and how will you do it?". Methods should be linked directly to specific objectives. Proponents who do not describe their methods fully will receive a reduced score.

All social science research should be guided by the dual principles of confidentiality and free, prior, and informed consent[2]. Principles in each of these guidelines highlight the overarching importance of involving First Nation Governments, Tribal Governments, and communities commencing at the research question development stage, following with the approval of the research design. Informed consent and confidentiality need to be discussed with the appropriate approving authorities and study participants. Participants should be fully informed of how their knowledge will be used or shared. Be aware that First Nation governments, Tribal Governments, and communities will need sufficient lead time to review and approve research proposals and methods, as well as to participate meaningfully.

Proponents seeking to conduct work in Canada should be aware of the First Nations principles of ownership, control, access, and possession (also known as OCAP). This asserts that First Nations have control over how data is collected and recognizes that they own and control how this information can be used. Please recognize that in addition to those principles, individual First Nation Governments may have distinct customary laws and policies as to how their knowledge is held, shared, and passed on.

As noted above, for proponents working in indigenous communities, relevant policies, customs, or traditional laws regarding how IK is gathered, shared, or distributed should be described and included. That is, proponents should not proceed through their own organization's ethical review process without first accessing and abiding by the local First Nation governments', Tribal Government, or communities established protocols. For example, if a First Nation Government has established protocols for conducting IK research, the proponent must demonstrate awareness of these protocols and policies and how they will ensure compliance with them.

If audio-visual recordings are made it is important to discuss how they will be stored, how/if it is intended to be shared, and who owns the various intellectual property rights. It is also important to recognize that many knowledge holders prefer to take responsibility for the information they provide. Some participants may appreciate being acknowledged by name for their contribution, while others may

prefer their name remain confidential. In short, participants should be fully informed of how their knowledge will be used, stored, or shared. Please see accompanying supplemental list of topics that should be addressed to solicit consent.

While the provision of honoraria and/or gifts to Elders or other project participants is commonplace, it is important to ensure that the honoraria is respectful and is in keeping with local customs. Some First Nation Governments, Tribal Governments, and communities may have existing policies or guidance on how or what to provide as honoraria. Be aware that many potential participants have fixed incomes and that honoraria (including cash payments, pre-paid credit cards, gas cards and gift cards) can have unintended financial implications, and should be closely coordinated with First Nation Governments, Tribal Governments, and communities responsible for approving the project.

Finally, the project should incorporate a review and validation of the draft study findings by the appropriate First Nation Governments, Tribal Governments, and communities prior to publication, and study findings should be submitted after the conclusion of the research.

1) **Education and outreach** projects:
    a. Learning objectives
        i. Identify key concepts participants will learn and demonstrate while engaged in the proposed project; i.e., *what will they learn*?
        ii. Outline education/outreach activities that will be used. Examples may include observation, participation in an activity, language acquisition, skill development, etc.; i.e. *how will they learn?*
        iii. Evaluate student learning throughout the process. Evaluation may be formal or informal. Examples include pre- and post-testing, demonstrating skill development, and presenting new knowledge; i.e. *how do you know they did or did not learn?*

2) **Documentation of IK or LK** projects. Specific social science methods to gather data might include:
    a. Oral history archival review – data collections may already exist that can be built upon rather than commencing with additional or repetitive interviews or surveys.
    b. Key respondent interviews
        i. Semi-directed – systematic data collection on set topics but allows for a range of experience and knowledge.
        ii. Sampling strategy: how many interviews and respondent criteria (age, sex, profession, kinship membership, etc.) to demonstrate systematic data collection across relevant segments of a group.
        iii. Describe archiving and storage – audio-recorded? How will the recordings be stored? Will they be transcribed?
    c. Participant observation – “learn by doing”; allows researcher to describe details of knowledge that are largely experiential and hard to describe in an interview.
    d. Mapping (e.g., spatial use area documentation).
    e. Linguistic or local taxonomy documentation – language reflects worldview, thus documenting linguistic features or local taxonomies (e.g., how the language describes fish life phases, different fish species, seasonal body conditions, etc.,) provides important cultural insights.

f. Surveys - may capture information from a single year or multiple years to understand changes over time.
g. Questionnaire- typically a short paper instrument that allows respondents to answer a series of closed-ended questions. They can be self-administered or administered to a group and conducted in-person, by mail, by telephone, or online.
h. Workshops or group interviews

3) **Methods of Analysis for IK or LK**. *Gathering information is only a first step. Successful proponents should be able to explain to the funder, stakeholders, and other interested groups why this information matters and how it should be used by decision makers*. Specific methods to analyze data include (but are not limited to):
    a. Narrative analysis (assessing data to look for patterns, findings, organization of knowledge, etc.) – can include Qualitative Data Analysis software such as *Atlas.ti* (among others) to provide structures for coding interviews or other data, analyzing patterns in the data, and quantifying those patterns.
    b. Social network analysis can quantify how one or multiple variables affect or connect social networks that characterize communities or groups.
    c. Cultural consensus analysis measures levels of agreement among members of the same social group on an issue.
    d. GIS analysis of spatial data.

Note: Reporting back to communities and participants prior to report finalization or publications is a critical step in conducting social science research. Giving communities and participants a chance to review and comment on draft results should be considered part of any methodological approach.

Part 3: Capacity to Deliver – Coordination and consultation

This section should explain the proponent's qualifications and past experiences that will promote successful implementation of the project or program. Whether a stewardship project proposal is submitted by proponents based in the community (whether an individual, consultant, First Nation Government representative, Tribal Government representative, etc.) or from outside of the community, the proponent should still describe similar work they have been involved in and the success of that work. Additionally, this section should explain the ways the project plans to consult and collaborate with other entities including (but not limited to) First Nation Governments, agencies, tribal entities, nonprofits, and community-based organizations (see R&E Detailed proposal form for reference).

Building partnerships and explaining these efforts strengthens proposals by ensuring they are bringing together the best possible team of people and are not being administered in isolation. Stewardship proposals rely heavily on individuals and groups that are familiar with and committed to the success of the project or program. At a community level for example, local experts are often involved in the planning and administration of short- and long-term projects. This expertise should be conveyed.

Part 4: Benefits – Measures of Success and Monitoring/Assessment

This section does not reiterate the "benefits" or need for the project that was described in the "Relevance and Significance" section.

Proponents should describe the expected duration of the benefits of the project, and how the tangible results of the project will be monitored, maintained, and protected over the long-term. Explain how project outcomes will be presented and evaluated. Specifically, what is the anticipated outcome? What would define the success of the project?

1) **Education and outreach** projects: - Several options exist to measure success in education and outreach projects. For example: a proponent partnered with a school district so youth receive academic credit for project participation could specify requirements to receive the credit, and the target number of successful participants.
    a. **Learning objectives (relate to objectives under Technical Merit)** should be summarized and will include specific examples. These may include examples like photography if photo waivers are included, pre- and post-results (i.e., assessment of students/youth or other participants knowledge before and after participation in the project/program), or student work such as art, tools, or written or drawn pieces about their experience.
    b. **Long-term Impacts** if feasible and permitted, the proponent should interview a select number of students several months or years after the experience to identify key learning concepts (knowledge and skills) that the student credits as coming from project participation.

2) **Documentation of IK or LK** projects. Success may include the numbers of respondents, participants, students, etc., coupled with results of the data collection as well as participant feedback, local knowledge revitalization achieved and/or management objectives achieved.

Part 5: Cost Effectiveness

In addition to the Project Budge Form, proponents should describe any cost sharing arrangements and be able to articulate the duration of the project (e.g., how long do you hope to run this project and how many years do you expect to apply for R&E funds?), including plans for the future.

[1] For more information, see the living document developed by the Yukon First Nations Heritage Group: Guide to Yukon First Nations Heritage Stewardship 2018 (https://heritagebc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/YFN-heritage-guide-feb-21.pdf).

[2] For more information, see: (1) the Alaska Federation of Natives in its Guidelines for Research (Alaska Native Knowledge Network 1993; http://ankn.uaf.edu/IKS/afnguide.html), (2) the National Science Foundation, Office of Polar Programs; Principles for the Conduct of Research in the Arctic (National Science Foundation Interagency Social Science Task Force 2012: https://www.nsf.gov/geo/opp/arctic/conduct.jsp), (3) The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf