

**Community Collaboration Project
Year I Review
1999 - 2000**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION.....	4
PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	4
PROJECT CHRONOLOGY	6
INITIAL DISCUSSIONS – MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	6
NORTHERN MANITOBA.....	6
<i>SLL Regional Round Table Meetings.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>SLL Regional Round Table Presentations</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>SLL Determinants of Success</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>SLL Use of Technology-Based Tools</i>	<i>10</i>
FRANCO-MANITOBA.....	11
AGRO-MANITOBA	12
OTHER MANITOBA COMMUNITIES/REGIONS	12
DATA COLLECTION METHOD.....	13
LESSONS LEARNED	15
<i>Communities Engaged.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Community Collaboration.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Provincial and Federal Collaboration.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Management Committee Role</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Regional Awareness and Utilization of Partners and Resources</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Regional Awareness of Sustainability Issues</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Regional Awareness and Utilization of Potential Partnerships and Funding Programs</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Introduction, Sharing and Use of Information Resources</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Identification of Regional Vision, Priorities and Projects.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Regional Identification and Coordination of Problems and Solutions.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Improved Use of Government Programs and Services</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>SLL Determinants of Success</i>	<i>24</i>
NEXT STEPS	25

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	<i>Community Collaboration Project/Regional Round Table Logic Model</i>
APPENDIX B	<i>Community Collaboration Project Review Framework</i>
APPENDIX C	<i>Key Informant Interview Tools</i>

Executive Summary

This *Review and Lessons Learned* report documents the process, activities and lessons learned of Year I of the Community Collaboration Project (CCP). The project is a collaborative arrangement between the communities involved, Rural Development Institute, and the Federal and Provincial agencies that provide services to those communities. Agency partners of the project include Health Canada, Environment Canada, Rural Secretariat (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada), Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs and Community Futures Partners of Manitoba.

The overall goal of the Community Collaboration Project is to design and model a multi-agency cooperative approach to initiate joint planning and project development activities within an agreed upon process for a regional social, environmental and economic community development plan. Facilitating Federal and Provincial governments working together and looking at ways for governments to better serve rural and remote communities are the main objectives of the project.

Data for the review report was collected through file review and key informant interviews with members of the management committee, Northern-Manitoba resource personnel and Northern-Manitoba community representatives. Interviews with key informants involved in this project, combined with information from the file review, provided some indication as to the level of success of the process.

At the completion of Year I, three communities / regions were successfully engaged in the Community Collaboration Project through a Regional Round Table (RRT) process. The three communities / regions are:

- ***Northern Manitoba*** – consisting of South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids;
- ***Agro-Manitoba*** – consisting of the southwestern communities of Boissevain, Deloraine, Killarney and Souris; and
- ***Franco-Manitoba*** – consisting of the francophone communities of Somerset and Saint-Claude.

The CCP / RRT process has been delivered to the target groups as originally proposed. However, the three target groups for involvement in the CCP / RRT have been engaged in varying degrees. The Northern communities of South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids (SLL) have advanced to a greater degree in the process than the Agro and Franco-Manitoba communities. Overall the management committee implemented the CCP / RRT process as intended and with the anticipated effort. All key informants reported that the CCP / RRT process was progressing “quite well”. The bringing together of community/regional citizens and government personnel was reported as the most important aspect of the project. Facilitation, funding, coordination and management committee expertise were provided to the community / regions and proved invaluable. Resources were seen as crucial to the success of the project.

The main areas for improvement identified by key informants include the need for ongoing commitment to the project. This commitment should come from both the management committee and regional representatives. Major areas surrounding project commitment include funding, time, volunteers and other identified resources. Key informants have suggested that

there is a need to better articulate the process for both the communities and government departments.

Provincial and Federal collaboration was perceived as “improved” through the Community Collaboration Project via the management committee. However, improvements could be made to the relationship by further clarifying the various Provincial and Federal mandates, roles and commitments. There was also the opinion that each department should support the project regardless of whether or not individual departmental mandates were supported.

The CCP / RRT helped “somewhat” in improving the awareness and utilization of partners, resources and funding programs. This process was seen as ongoing in all three regions. The provision of this information in a more systematic and/or formal fashion (i.e. inventory of government resources, contact names and funding programs) was seen as a potential way of improving this aspect of the project. Nonetheless, all key informants felt that as a result of the process, there would be an improved use of government programs and services.

With the Northern RRT, there appeared to be a regional awareness of sustainability issues as a result of the project. This aspect of the project was seen as a learning process for all of the regions, and it would take time to foster this awareness with the communities involved.

The introduction and sharing of information resources for community participants is viewed as an essential component of the project. SLL has started to utilize technology-based tools for community planning purposes as a result of their RRT process. Information resources have been introduced with Agro-Manitoba, but this has not yet been undertaken with the Franco group.

SLL has produced regional priorities and potential projects, and a regional profile that is posted on a web site designed for the purpose of sharing information. SLL has also identified a number of determinants of success for the CCP / RRT process. SLL key informants indicated at least some realization of their identified determinants of success. It was felt that all the determinants of success would eventually be addressed through the RRT process.

Franco and Agro-Manitoba, as of the writing of this report, are in the infancy stage of their processes. Both have begun to address organizational issues such as appropriate membership and have started to identify regional priorities including areas of common interest.

The Regional Round Table process is the first operational example of a collaborative program delivery model that meets the needs of federal, provincial and municipal departments and local communities. Additionally, the use of web-based utilities to access, analyze and report information throughout the planning process is a unique approach.

The CCP / RRT project has the support from both communities and collaborating government departments for Year II of the process. The process is perceived as flexible and transferable to other regions in the province and across Canada.

Introduction

This report documents the process, activities and lessons learned of Year I, 1999-2000 of the Community Collaboration Project (CCP). The project is a collaborative arrangement between the communities involved, Rural Development Institute, and the Federal and Provincial agencies that provide services to those communities. Agency partners of the project include Health Canada, Environment Canada, Rural Secretariat (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada), Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs and Community Futures Partners of Manitoba.

The overall goal of the CCP / Regional Round Tables (RRT) is to design and model a multi-agency, cooperative approach intended to assist groupings of communities and to initiate joint planning and project development activities within an agreed upon process for a regional social, environmental and economic regional community development plan. Objectives of the project include looking at ways for governments to better serve rural and remote communities, and facilitating Federal and Provincial governments working together. Throughout the project, the aim is to build an understanding of sustainability, build capacity for community-based sustainability, identify and access information resources for community sustainability, and build understanding of and improving access to government programs and services.

WESTARC Group Inc. conducted this review under the direction of Robert Annis, Director, Rural Development Institute. As part of the development of this review document, the Community Collaboration Project components/activities, partners, and anticipated results were summarized in a CCP / RRT logic model. The logic model is attached as Appendix A.

Project Background

The Community Collaboration Project's multi-community approach is supported by the Community Animation Program (CAP), a jointly funded initiative of Health Canada and Environment Canada, with additional assistance provided through the Rural Dialogue component of the Canadian Rural Partnership Initiative.

The Community Animation Program, introduced in December 1994, is a part of Health Canada's Healthy Environment Program (HEP) and Environment Canada's EcoAction 2000. CAP is designed to address the interrelationship between human health and sustainable environments. CAP activities must have a health as well as an environmental dimension, build on community talent and resources, be driven by community needs as defined by the community, and be consistent with the principles of sustainability. CAP provides support to communities as they identify their own needs, set priorities, share and access resources, and work together to accomplish common goals.

The Canadian Rural Partnership (CRP) was designed to support rural community development by adopting new approaches and practices to respond to rural development issues and concerns. A key component of the CRP is the Rural Dialogue. The objective of the Rural Dialogue is to better understand local and regional issues and to identify the appropriate role for the Federal government in addressing key rural issues. The Rural Dialogue allows the Federal government to engage rural Canadians and listen to their needs. The Rural Dialogue has been designed to

facilitate broad participation, while respecting the need for managing expectations. It builds on existing consultation networks and Federal government regional infrastructures.

From 1991-1999, Manitoba's Department of Intergovernmental Affairs' Community Choices Program established about 100 Community Round Tables across the province. Through the Community Round Table process, communities produced vision statements, community goals and action plans involving social, environmental and economic issues and opportunities. Community goals and priorities were identified within the context of sustainability, local control, consensus, local support, and transfer of skills and information. Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs wishes to promote a new chapter in Community Choices by working with organizations and Round Tables to turn visions to actions and encourage broadening in scope from the community to regional and provincial perspectives. To assist with the Community Collaboration Project, in-kind contributions were provided from Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs including travel and accommodation costs, management committee involvement, assistance with facilitating the process, and local resource support.

Brandon University's Rural Development Institute provided coordination, facilitation, support and management for the Community Collaboration Project. The Institute's three main goals are to conduct studies into the needs, concerns, problems and potential of rural life; to co-operate with all aspects of rural society, and all levels of government, in studying such vital areas as health, education, economic development, quality of life, cultural matters, and natural resources management; and to be the communication link through which rural residents and their leaders may share their undertakings and achievements with a view to common improvement.

The CCP / RRT entails examining horizontal cooperation between departments and encouraging partnerships to increase the federal profile in ways that reflect local and national priorities, thereby enhancing community capacity building and promoting sustainable community development. This may involve the following:

- Increasing horizontal cooperation by departments based on shared principles in order to coordinate community-based programs linked to national priorities;
- Engaging in partnerships with local community government, businesses, NGOs, voluntary sector, etc.; and
- Undertaking citizen engagement exercises, as citizens expect open consultations and often direct involvement in how decisions are made, how programs are designed and how policy is formulated.

The process is intended to build on existing frameworks, strategies, programs and pilots. The Regional Round Table process is the first operational example of a collaborative program delivery model that meets the needs of federal, provincial and municipal departments and local communities. Additionally, the use of web-based utilities to access, analyze and report information throughout the planning process is a unique approach.

Project Chronology

The chronology of events and activities that follows was conducted through a content analysis of existing files and documents of the project, including minutes of meetings, correspondence, etc. The chronology was supplemented by discussions with the Director of the Rural Development Institute, Robert Annis, and through attendance at a Rural Forum presentation given by a representative of South Indian Lake, Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake. The three regions included in Year I of the project - Northern Manitoba, Franco-Manitoba and Agro-Manitoba - form the main basis of this review. Brandon University's Rural Development Institute served as facilitator to work with two of the three communities to develop a common vision of sustainable communities. An external, francophone facilitator was utilized within the Franco-Manitoba communities.

Initial Discussions – Management Committee

Several management committee meetings were held prior to the community discussion groups. These management meetings laid the necessary groundwork for approaching and entering the various communities. It was felt that a major benefit to initiating a Regional Round Table process would be better integration of government programs and services, and streamlining them for ease of access and improved availability.

Members of the management committee include the following representatives of Federal and Provincial government departments:

- Rural Secretariat, Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada;
- Health Promotion and Programs Branch (Health Canada);
- Environment Canada;
- Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs;
- Community Futures Partners of Manitoba; and
- The Department of Rural Development, Brandon University.

Northern Manitoba

The first communities to become engaged in the Community Collaboration Project were the Manitoba communities of South Indian Lake, Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake. Each of these three communities held its own Community Round Table (CRT) through Intergovernmental Affairs Community Choices Program prior to coming together in a Regional Round Table discussion. South Indian Lake's Community Round Table was already one year old at the time of the Regional Round Table. Leaf Rapids completed a draft vision in March 1998 as a result of its CRT, and Lynn Lake started its process in September 1998.

SLL Regional Round Table Meetings

The first joint community meeting took place on October 27, 1999 in Leaf Rapids. CRT members from each of the three communities participated, together with the mayors of the communities and representatives from the Federal departments of Environment, Health and

Agriculture and Agri-Food, and the Province of Manitoba Department of Intergovernmental Affairs and Rural Development Institute. The intent of the session was to explore the formation of a Northern Regional Round Table to promote a regional social, environmental and economic regional community development plan — a common vision of sustainable communities.

Major activities covered during this initial meeting included the review of CRT activities within the three communities, an overview of what each government department would like to see come out of the CCP / RRT process, SLL establishment and organization issues, and the formation of the determinants of success. At this first meeting, it was acknowledged that the three communities were already working together on joint tourism activities, and they unanimously endorsed the establishment of the SLL Regional Round Table. Those in attendance agreed to ask each of the three Community Round Tables to name three to five members per community to form the SLL Regional Round Table. It was decided that subsequent meetings were to be rotated between the communities and chaired by the local CRT Chair. As a result of this meeting, a press release was issued indicating that the first Regional Round Table Process with the Northern communities had been initiated.

During these first meetings Dr. Robert Annis, Director of Rural Development Institute, provided initial facilitation services with assistance from government resource person, Craig Hanley. Craig Hanley, Senior Community Development Officer, Community Economic Development Services (Thompson) also provided supports to the CCP / RRT, including organization of meetings, production of meeting minutes and agendas.

The second meeting was held in Lynn Lake on December 2, 1999. Those in attendance included representatives from the communities of South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids. Resource personnel included a representative of the Burntwood Regional Health Authority, Manitoba Aboriginal and Northern Affairs, Health Canada, Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs, Rural Development Institute and Brandon University.

The key items covered during the December meeting included a brainstorming of the issues that should form the focus for the RRT and identification of the principles against which actions should be measured. The SLL Regional Round Table representatives discussed how they could work together effectively. They also identified the areas where they could work collaboratively and of those which were regional priorities. Also covered at this meeting was a presentation of the technological resources that are available to assist with community capacity building (i.e. web-based and GIS technology).

The third meeting was a two-day strategic planning workshop that was held in South Indian Lake on January 26 and 27, 2000. This workshop resulted in the development of an action plan and organizational approach for the SLL group. Each member community discussed potential value-added opportunities, as well as those that would be effective at a regional level. SLL members made several plans actionable by deciding who would assume responsibility for identified initiatives. Several presentations were also made during the workshop, including updates from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Burntwood Regional Health Authority, and South Indian Lake Employment and Training.

The fourth meeting was also a weekend working session, held on April 7 and 8, 2000 in Leaf Rapids. Representatives in attendance provided updates on the decisions and actions that arose from the January session. A regional vision and operational guidelines were discussed, but

development of these was held over for a tentative June 2000 meeting. Several reports were also heard by the SLL members, including updates on youth initiatives, tourism, the SLL web site and fisheries. SLL representatives decided to create a second press release as a result of this meeting. The release is intended to update the communities of SLL on progress and activities. Also decided at this meeting was which SLL representatives would attend and make presentations at the *Rural Forum* in Brandon and the *National Rural Conference* in Québec.

As was intended by the Community Collaboration Project management committee, the transfer of roles and responsibilities from key resource persons to SLL members was initiated. Over the course of the four RRT meetings, SLL representatives took on the activities that had initially been supported by Robert Annis and Craig Hanley, including facilitation, meeting organization, scheduling, minute taking and overall management.

SLL Regional Round Table Presentations

A representative of SLL presented the regional “story” at the *Rural Forum* in Brandon, Manitoba on April 28th, 2000. *Rural Forum* is an important business, community and networking event for Western Canada with an annual attendance of close to 10,000 people. *Rural Forum 2000* provided an excellent opportunity for communities to discuss ideas, learn through seminars and interaction, and showcase their success and economic opportunities. The SLL member presented during the *Northern and Healthy Community Development Workshop* component of the forum. This special full day session was packed with special topics and speakers discussing various approaches to community development.

The SLL presentation included an overview of the three communities involved, a regional description (history, population, geological, geographical, industry, agriculture, etc.), creation of the RRT, use of information resources and technology, and lessons learned. During the presentation, SLL identified the need for diversifying the economy and the sharing of resources; and the importance of not working in isolation and of having personnel (representatives of community-based government, regional health authority, mines, etc.) as the driving forces behind the creation of the RRT. Lessons learned that were shared with workshop participants include:

- The awareness that no one could do sustainable development better than the people who live within the region;
- Cultural diversity is important;
- To be patient;
- To stop looking for scape goats and take responsibility for development;
- Do not go to government for funds without plans;
- Local development requires community ownership;
- Need to reach consensus and to work as a collaborative team (inclusive); and
- Most importantly, to have fun, laugh and maintain a sense of humor.

The SLL Regional Round Table was also chosen to speak about their experience at the *National Rural Conference: Building Our Future Together*. The conference was held April 27 - 30, 2000

in Magog-Orford, Québec. The objectives of this conference included the sharing of citizens' initiatives and experiences, highlights of the Government of Canada's commitment and achievements, and the identification of joint actions to address remaining challenges. The conference and its exhibits offered participants a chance to showcase their communities. It also allowed the participants the opportunity to continue the dialogue with the Government of Canada on its work in rural and remote regions – what's right and what needs to change.

WESTARC staff contacted the SLL representative who attended the conference in order to gain feedback about the event. The delegate delivered the SLL presentation a total of four times (twice on April 28, 2000 and twice on April 29, 2000) within the *Sharing Lessons Learned* component of the conference (health category - concurrent breakout sessions format).

The SLL presentation for the *National Rural Conference* included an overview of why the SLL Regional Round Table was created; a history and profile of the communities involved; the personnel involved from the three communities; funding of the RRT process; issues of concern to the RRT; the SLL Internet site; and the hopes and dreams of the SLL RRT members. The presenter also provided a synopsis of the economic condition of the three communities and the north in general and the historical relationship between first nations and mining communities. The need to diversify the economies of SLL and the requirement to share resources and develop new strategies together in order to ensure long term sustainability were offered as the reasons why the RRT was created. Personnel involved with the SLL project included the town Mayors, resource staff from the government (Federal/Provincial), private industry/mining and fishing, Chief Administrative Officers and Community Development Officers. It was noted for conference participants that the SLL Regional Round Table was the first time that the Mayors of the three communities had been in the same room together let alone working together to develop new initiatives.

During the presentation, funding and support from Health Canada, Environment Canada and Rural Development Institute were discussed, as well as the need for ongoing Federal and Provincial support. SLL issues were summarized as including: similarities between mining and fishing industries; socio-economic issues; cultural issues; and new ideas and promotion of new initiatives to address old issues (roads, tourism, youth, cultural recreation etc.). The SLL Internet site was also mentioned as a mechanism for utilizing new technology to empower communities through information. The presentation was summarized with a sharing of SLL's future hopes and dreams for the RRT. These included:

- The continued success of the SLL RRT;
- Further development of existing initiatives;
- Development of new and innovative ideas for the northern economy;
- Becoming an economic power house in the region due to factors other than resource based industry;
- An increase in population;
- A decrease in the “Brain Drain”;
- Increased average income; and
- Healthy vibrant communities.

WESTARC also asked the SLL representative for general impressions of the conference. The SLL member indicated that the experience was quite enjoyable and that he had gained a number of new ideas to take back to the other RRT members. He was overwhelmed and impressed by the size of the event and the quality of delegates – high ranking bureaucrats, professors, cabinet ministers and other important persons. He also indicated his appreciation for all the introductions to persons at the conference that were facilitated by Robert Annis, Rural Development Institute. With regards to the sessions, the SLL delegate felt that the allotted fifteen minutes was too short and that the SLL presentation would have been better served in a different topic area (i.e. in an economic area). (The SLL presentation was slotted in the health topic area, there were mostly doctors/nurses in the room.)

SLL Determinants of Success

Over the course of these regional meetings, the three communities have been working on blueprints for their futures and improving regional cooperation. During the process, SLL identified several factors that would determine the success of their Regional Round Table process. These identified determinants of success are:

- Efficient use of the region's resources;
- Improved infrastructure and community resources;
- Local, regional decision-making;
- Maximized utilization of government programs and services;
- Effectiveness of the Regional Round Table as a proactive forum for regional development;
- Increased knowledge and evidence in linking human health and the environment; and
- The extent to which the communities are enabled to take action on human health and environmental issues.

SLL Use of Technology-Based Tools

As previously mentioned, technology-based tools were discussed throughout the SLL RRT process. A community information resource database has been identified as a crucial part of the RRT process. SLL members were presented with information about the resources available, including web-based and GIS technology. As a result of these presentations, SLL, with the assistance of Sustainable Resource Management Information System (SRMIS) of Brandon University, is in the process of developing a regional web site utilizing the Community Information Manager (CIM) utility. (This activity is funded separately by *Knowledge Integration Branch, Environmental Conservation Service, Environment Canada.*) To date, the site includes the region's current initiatives, resources (including some government department programs and services information), a regional map, RRT meeting information and minutes and communications. SLL continues to refine the contents to ensure the site reflects the needs of the region.

The CIM utility is intended to enhance the technical capacity of SLL by enabling the members of the communities to create their own web content. The site is intended to give SLL an opportunity to work together to tell the story of their regional community to the world. The purpose of the

CIM is to allow SLL to create an online centralized framework of community-based information. CIM seeks to provide SLL with increased capacity and tools to:

- Develop quality information to support sustainable community development;
- Create data sharing linkages with other online communities to address local and regional issues;
- Access search utilities such as Community Information Access Network (CIAN) to find quality information resources based on geographic and issue criteria;
- Facilitate access, retrieval, storage and use of information resources and geographic maps provided by Federal, Provincial, and Municipal government departments; and
- Enable SLL to organize content into an information management framework, which provides structure / classification to community content and allows connectivity to CIM utilities such as mapping (GIS) tools.

Franco-Manitoba

During 1999, the management committee discussed engaging francophone communities in the Community Collaboration process. An issue identified in the early stages of the process was the need to find an appropriate, French-speaking consultant who could work in these communities as a translator.

In August 1999, discussions began between the project management committee and the Economic Development Council for Manitoba Bilingual Municipalities (CDEM) to identify some Franco-Manitoba communities that were almost at the same stage as the SLL communities and that were prepared to begin discussions around the Regional Round Table process.

CDEM was formed to act as the spark for renewed financial prosperity in the member communities of the Manitoba Association of Bilingual Municipalities. CDEM is built around the understanding that Manitoba's bilingual communities are an important asset, one to be nurtured and preserved for the province's cultural and economic well being.

As a result of CCP / RRT management committee meetings and meetings between the committee and CDEM, it was decided that CDEM should proceed with initiating the Round Table process with two francophone communities. Over the course of February to April 2000, CDEM was able to engage two francophone communities: Somerset and Saint-Claude. CDEM started the CCP / RRT process in the community of Somerset. To date, CDEM has completed three meetings of French-speaking community representatives in Somerset. The facilitation of these meetings supported the necessary exchanges and discussions to help in the setting-up of a local community development corporation (CDC Somerset). During the meetings, community members were made aware of the factors of population health concepts (“healthy communities”) and sustainable development. Community representatives of Somerset also identified regional priorities, community priority projects, problems, challenges and possible solutions.

CDEM indicated that the process was proceeding well, and in the near future (May / June 2000), the francophone communities intended to start the development of a vision, including the identified priorities, implementation steps, the principal players, and the actions to be undertaken.

Agro-Manitoba

The Agro-Manitoba region for the Community Collaboration Project encompasses the southwestern area of the province. Management committee members and Agro-Manitoba project stakeholders first met in Winnipeg on January 28, 2000.

The initial meeting of the Agro-Manitoba communities took place on February 17, 2000 in Boissevain. More than 30 representatives from the communities of Boissevain, Deloraine, Killarney and Souris as well as Federal government members of Health Canada, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, and Environment Canada, met to discuss the possibility of forming a Regional Round Table in Southwestern Manitoba.

The second meeting took place on April 12, 2000 in Deloraine. A brief overview of the February meeting was provided to participants as well as background to the concept of the Regional Round Table process. The Rural Development Institute provided some background on the progress made in the Northern communities (SLL) and the beginning of a Franco-group. The representatives decided to proceed with the Regional Round Table process and began discussing organizational approaches, mission and goals, and the region's issues and concerns. The Rural Development Institute offered resources to the Southwest Regional Round Table process including assistance with facilitation.

The next meeting was scheduled for May 15, 2000 in Souris. The agenda topics slated for the May meeting include: organizational issues, roles and responsibilities, determination of the geographic region, regional issues and concerns, goals, development of a vision / mission statement and projects / actions to be undertaken by the RRT.

Other Manitoba Communities/Regions

During Year I of the CCP / RRT, the management committee received requests of interest in the process from two other Manitoba communities / regions. Northern Bay Line communities (four communities) made one of the requests via the telephone. This request originated with Robert Bushey, Department of Northern Affairs and was directed to management committee member Robert Annis, Rural Development Institute. The other request came from the Parkland region through a letter addressed to management committee member Ross Thompson, Intergovernmental Affairs (dated April 18, 2000).

The Parkland request originated with a group called the Parkland Practitioners. The Parkland Practitioners are an informal group comprised of resource personnel from the region. The letter indicated their desire to facilitate a Regional Round Table with representatives from the numerous municipalities within the regions and requested assistance in undertaking the initiative.

As the proposed three communities / regions have already been engaged in the process during Year I, no actions have been taken with regards to these additional requests. It is anticipated that these requests could be examined further by the management committee as the project enters Year II.

Data Collection Method

The framework for this review was developed from the CCP / RRT logic model (see Appendix A). The review framework established the process goals to be examined; the review questions / measures; the corresponding indicators; and the data collection techniques to be employed. The review framework for the Year I review is attached as Appendix B. The data collection method for the review of Year I of the Community Collaboration Project included a file review, key informant interviews, and attendance at a Rural Forum presentation. The file review included examining a number of documents and Internet web-sites supplemented by discussions with Robert Annis, Rural Development Institute. As the review progressed, WESTARC shared drafts of the logic model, review framework and the review document with management committee members in order to elicit their feedback and input. The information reviewed includes the following:

1) Background Information

- a) Health Canada and Environment Canada – Community Animation Program (CAP)
- b) Canadian Rural Partnership (CRP) – Rural Dialogue – Rural Secretariat
- c) Rural Development Institute
- d) Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs – Community Choices Program, Community Round Table process

2) Management Committee discussions / meetings

- a) Discussions with Robert Annis, RDI
- b) Sharing of review draft documents with management committee members

3) Meeting minutes / agendas / information / progress reports

- a) *Northern and Remote: SLL*
 - i) October 27, 1999
 - ii) October 27, 1999 Press Release
 - iii) December 2, 1999
 - iv) January 26 and 27, 2000
 - v) April 7 and 8, 2000
 - vi) Web site – Community Information Manager (SRMIS)
 - vii) Rural Forum / Québec presentations
- b) *Franco-Manitoba: (CDEM, Somerset, Saint-Claude)*
 - i) February 2000
 - ii) April 6, 2000
- c) *Agro-Manitoba: (Boissevain, Killarney, Deloraine, Souris)*
 - i) February 17, 2000
 - ii) April 12, 2000
 - iii) May 15, 2000 (agenda)

4) Requests/interest from other communities/regions

- a) April 18, 2000 (Letter from Parkland Practitioners)
- b) Telephone call from Bay line communities

Key informant interviews were designed to complement and supplement the information from the file review by asking questions of management committee members, a government resource person (to SLL) and selected representatives of the Northern RRT (SLL). Through discussions with Robert Annis, Rural Development Institute and the CCP management committee, it was decided to conduct key informants with all six committee members, six SLL representatives (2 from each community), and one SLL resource person. Key informant interviews were not conducted with representatives of Agro and Franco-Manitoba due to the early stages of these two processes. The three key informant interview tools are attached to this report as Appendix C.

Management committee interviews were conducted by WESTARC between April 27, 2000 and May 4, 2000. Half of the interviews were conducted in person, and the other half were completed via the telephone. SLL representative and resource person interviews were conducted between April 28, 2000 and May 23, 2000. The majority of SLL key informants were conducted via the telephone. The names of the 13 individuals who participated in the key informant interviews are listed below.

1) Management committee members

- a) Rick Slasor, Departmental Affairs, Prairie and Northern Region, Environment Canada
- b) Pat Hope, Health Promotion & Programs Branch, Manitoba / Saskatchewan Region, Health Canada
- c) Maurice Bouvier, Community Futures Partners of Manitoba Inc.
- d) Darell Pack, Rural Secretariat, Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada
- e) Ross Thompson, Intergovernmental Affairs, Province of Manitoba
- f) Robert Annis, Department of Rural Development, Brandon University

2) SLL representatives

- a) Frank Bloodworth, Leaf Rapids
- b) Barbara Bloodworth, Mayor, Leaf Rapids
- c) Darren Ottaway, South Indian Lake
- d) Joan Soulier, Mayor, South Indian Lake
- e) Brad Stoneman, Lynn Lake
- f) Audie Dulewich, Mayor, Lynn Lake

3) SLL Resource person

- a) Craig Hanley, Community Economic Development Services, Intergovernmental Affairs

Lessons Learned

The following section summarizes the lessons learned arising from the file review and feedback from Community Collaboration Project participants, resource personnel and management committee members. This input / lessons learned has been organized in to a number of major theme areas. These themes are:

- The engagement of communities
- Community collaboration / Regional Round Table process
- Collaboration of Provincial and Federal government departments
- The role of the management committee
- Regional awareness and utilization of partners and resources
- Regional awareness of sustainability issues
- Regional awareness and utilization of potential partnerships and funding programs
- Introduction, sharing and use of information resources
- Identification of regional vision, priorities and projects
- Regional identification and coordination of problems and solutions
- Improved use of government programs and services
- SLL determinants of success

Communities Engaged

As a result of Year I of the Community Collaboration Project, three regions were engaged in the process. The three regions engaged include community representatives of Northern Manitoba, Franco-Manitoba and Agro-Manitoba.

The Northern RRT consists of the communities of South Indian Lake, Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake (SLL). SLL has established their RRT process and has already undertaken several regional meetings and activities. Management committee respondents indicated that they felt that the SLL process was progressing “quite well”.

Franco-Manitoba consists of two communities, Somerset and Saint-Claude. The CDEM group is facilitating this process, which appears to be unfolding differently than that of the Northern and Agro communities; its focus appears to be more culturally based rather than geographically based. Some committee respondents felt that the Franco communities already had a process of their own and that the management committee had not “listened” to their different needs. A couple of management committee respondents suggested that with this group, the management committee members would have to learn “how to fit in” to the Franco process and schedule.

Agro-Manitoba (southwestern Manitoba) has met twice and endorsed the concept of the RRT process. The communities involved to date are Boissevain, Deloraine, Killarney and Souris. At this early stage of the process, management committee members believe that Agro representatives seem to be struggling with membership issues (who should be involved, why they should be involved, etc.), but that the process will occur.

Community Collaboration

Within the Northern and Agro RRT processes, government departments outlined each of their respective and potential roles within the process. This included a brief verbal overview of their mandate, programs, and activities. The Rural Development Institute also explained its role as facilitator to the process. Some government departments shared specific information with the Northern RRT members in the form of discussions at meetings and resource material distribution.

Overall, all management committee members indicated that they feel the community collaboration process is progressing “quite well.” Management committee members perceive the Community Collaboration Project and Regional Round Table process as being delivered as intended, with the anticipated effort and to the proposed target groups. Several committee members believe that the process is moving more slowly than they had originally anticipated. Some committee respondents indicated that outside facilitation has been a key aspect to the project. Others management committee respondents suggest that the process needs to be further articulated by clarifying an operational model. Committee member comments include:

Have not yet articulated the process – [it] is hard to sell something when you don't have a product to sell - this needs to come out of this review. [We] need to articulate the RRT process for communities and government departments.

Outside facilitation is key – Bob [Annis, RDI] is viewed as an honest broker.

SLL respondents also indicated that the RRT process has worked “quite well.” There was a general view that the SLL group had accomplished a great deal within a short time. SLL respondents echoed some of the comments made by the management committee members, including the value of the facilitation provided. A couple of the SLL respondents mentioned that the process had changed the attitudes and approaches of the three communities. All three communities now look at things regionally, as opposed to community only.

Management committee and SLL key informant respondents were also asked to identify the challenges and barriers to the process that had emerged during Year I. Challenges identified by key informants with regards to SLL were those of distance, the difficulty of “getting people together,” volunteer commitment, time and the challenge of reaching consensus. Several SLL respondents mentioned the need for more funding and resources for the RRT and its identified activities as critical to their continuation. SLL respondent comments include:

Reaching alignment/consensus within the group is important. It is hard to get all the work done in half a day, need more like 2 days.

[SLL needs further] funding – so the process can continue. We [SLL members] were led to believe that there was funding – have not seen more at this point.

It will be a challenge to maintain momentum. The key here is setting regular meetings and sticking to it. Programs and activities have to benefit all 3 communities.

For Agro-Manitoba, the management committee identified barriers such as the mere size of the region; and for Franco-Manitoba, there are cultural challenges and some skepticism surrounding the management committee's intentions. Overall, the challenges mentioned by the committee

respondents included: skepticism around government intentions; maintaining volunteer engagement in the process; and the difficulties in getting some communities to “work together.” One committee member mentioned the immediate challenge of “articulating the operational framework / model including the use of technology.”

Management committee members and SLL representatives were asked what they believed was the most useful aspect of the CCP / RRT process. The majority of key informant respondents indicated the most useful aspect was simply “bringing the communities together.” Several respondents mentioned that most of the SLL participants had never before been in the same room, let alone gathered to discuss common issues. Comments include:

Bringing like-minded communities together – to achieve goals. [Getting communities] talking about pooling resources (monetary, human, etc.).

[The RRT process] builds upon expertise already existing in the community. Provides a mechanism for the community to understand what information is missing and how to go get it.

[Communities] are given the opportunity to find joint projects. [The process] breaks down the competition between communities.

[The RRT] draws together all the various players around the table to see how they can contribute – [provides] an understanding that initiatives should come from the community and then be supported by government as opposed to just rolling out a program.

Round table is the bedrock of the community – we are there to support that.

First time ever that the three mayors [of SLL] were in the same room together.

Management committee and SLL respondents were also asked what aspect of the process had been the least useful. Most felt that the process has been quite successful; however, respondents mentioned a number of areas for improvement. Several SLL respondents mentioned that the funding supplied had been insufficient and as a result activities were not happening quickly enough or were being left undone. Another SLL respondent felt that some of the government members could have contributed more during meetings with regards to the identification of funding sources and other resources, and to idea generation. Management committee respondents identified the need for ongoing commitment to the project (time, funding, volunteer and other necessary resources); an operational regional framework for the process; and clarification of federal and provincial roles and supports. Key informant comments include:

[The communities] need to have the idea that we’re [management committee] going to stay for a while.

Need to develop a vision for RRT – operational use of that demonstrates advantage of participating. Each group has to see utility in the process. Need operational process that provides regional framework that works with existing groups and does not step on their toes.

Provincial government has to articulate their priorities for rural – difficult to do additional planning without this.

Need a clearer definition of the program support from Federal government. No long-term ability to develop budgets and supports for regional RRT. There does not seem to be a consistent approach/level of communication between the three regions.

Have to make sure that we [SLL representatives] always include each community. It is important to have input on every issue from each community. [SLL has to be] sensitive to each community's issues – perhaps could have community involved via teleconference if they cannot attend.

Need government representatives who can make decisions to come to the table, not just inform us about programs/services.

Recognition that when you start this process it is ongoing for the communities involved. [A potential] risk is that the more successful the committee is, there is a greater need for resources – need to ensure that the committee does not get burned out. Who is going to be there in 3 months or 6 months from now to be an effective resource to the committee? Do not want to start another organization without time and commitment from management committee members to nurture RRT committees.

All management committee members felt that the CCP / RRT process could be transferred to other regions across Canada. Committee members mentioned that the flexibility of the process would be a key factor in transferring the process elsewhere. One member commented that:

If we can undertake the process in to three such diverse communities, it should work in other regions across Canada as well.

Several SLL respondents inquired as to where the process was heading in the future. SLL members did not want to see the process end and felt that outside support, resources and funding were necessary in order to sustain the CCP / RRT process.

Provincial and Federal Collaboration

An important aspect of the Community Collaboration Project is the ability of Federal and Provincial government departments and the Rural Development Institute to work effectively together. All management committee members reported that they believe they are “quite effective” in working together. Members of the management committee indicated that as a result of the CCP, there has been a greater interaction and understanding across the committee member departments. They also spoke positively of the relationship that had been built amongst the committee members. Management committee comments include:

[The committee] has developed close working relationships.

The committee is doing well and is very open and relaxed – a true Federal and Provincial partnership.

A lot of willingness to share and participate.

However, there were some challenges identified by management committee key informants with regards to their working relationship. Some of the challenges mentioned by committee respondents are the struggles individual members have had between their roles on the committee and their respective departmental mandates. Several management committee members felt it was often a challenge to departmentally justify ongoing support for the CCP / RRT and that somehow, the committee members will have to obtain support for the process irrespective of whether mandates are supported, as communities / regions themselves are not confined by these mandates. Other challenges cited by committee members during the review include the difficulty of understanding all the different funding levels and programs; difficulty in understanding some of the bureaucracy; and the mechanics of getting the committee together.

Most management committee members indicated “effective” interaction with at least one of the three groups engaged through the CCP / RRT. However, due to the nature of the Franco process, most management committee members were not involved to a significant extent and/or did not even have an understanding of the process being undertaken within the Franco communities. With respect to the Agro communities, most management committee members felt that it was fairly early in their process to comment on their “interaction”. Most comments from management committee respondents revolved around the SLL process, as it has been active for the longest period of time. Management committee key informant respondents’ comments about the SLL process and the committee’s interaction with this group include:

SLL scenario has gone a long way in a short time - good facilitation by management committee [in] selling the idea and then transferring [roles] to communities.

Committee felt like part of the gang in SLL, which indicates that SLL members felt that government was approachable. The community does not care what you know, until they know you care.

It takes time for the community [process] to evolve – have to go through the process in order to get the community ownership.

Management Committee Role

The management committee met fairly regularly throughout Year I of the project to discuss roles, responsibilities and the most appropriate process for developing the Regional Round Tables. Most of the management committee members felt that their main role was to oversee the community collaboration process, provide advice and information as needed, and make suggestions where appropriate. At the onset of the CCP / RRT, management committee members assisted in setting up the Regional Round Table process and in identifying projects and activities.

A number of other topics were also identified as being a part of management committee meeting discussions. These included methods for bringing the communities together; how to approach communities; community-based capacity building; sustainability; budgets and funding (Rural Dialogue, Community Animation Program, in-kind contributions); technology issues; and the next steps required in the project.

The SLL RRT resource person indicated that their role involved a substantial amount of administrative work at the start of the process. The resource person indicated that at the beginning of the SLL process, a significant amount of their time was spent assisting with SLL

minutes, meetings, and other establishment activities. The resource respondent felt that the management committee assistance had been helpful to the SLL group, but that the process would still have occurred without their assistance.

SLL key informants indicated that the management committee members and resource persons (Craig Hanley) were essential to the RRT process. Several of the SLL representatives interviewed suggested that the process would not have occurred or would have taken longer to happen without the management committee involvement. SLL identified RRT coordination, organization, funding, resources and facilitation as the key areas of expertise and assistance provided by management committee members. One SLL representative commented:

All 3 [Provincial, Federal and RDI] did an excellent job. Management committee got the process rolling and then stepped back. [The management committee] were hands off - they let the community do their own thing which was excellent. They did not try to dictate. Excellent facilitation from Bob Annis - not intrusive. Now SLL is basically self-sufficient.

RRT expanded the potential for the process – it provided structure and formality.

They [management committee] helped us move along more quickly.

Regional Awareness and Utilization of Partners and Resources

All key informant respondents believed that the SLL group had at least “some awareness” of relevant partners / resources. Respondents see this as an ongoing and developing part of the process. It was felt that SLL was just now identifying the “gaps” in information and that the management committee would be attempting to “fill” the gaps with the appropriate information. SLL key informants mentioned increased awareness of government, regional, community, industry specific and information resources as a result of the RRT process.

To date, there has been limited utilization of partners / resources in responding to regional challenges and needs. However, the management committee members felt that the SLL group is a very independent group who utilized local resources for their decision making. The majority of SLL key informants indicated that they are “just getting started” with regards to accessing partners / resources. SLL respondents referred to a number of resources utilized within their decision making process including, Hudson Bay Mining Company, Manitoba Hydro, Burntwood Regional Health Authority, Department of Highways, Department of Justice, SRMIS, local development groups (i.e. Craig Hanley) and community members at large.

SLL was made aware of partners / resources through an informal process spearheaded by the management committee. Some management committee members indicated that SLL had been provided with several contact names and program information during RRT meetings, informal networking and discussions. Some committee respondents indicated that they feel this aspect of the process has been a weak point and that it could be improved upon. The SLL resource respondent echoed the feelings of the management committee, indicating that more could have been done in providing information to the SLL group. Committee and SLL resource respondent comments include:

*[The sharing of information] did not occur the way I thought it should have happened.
[One] management committee member handed out informational pamphlets – did not see*

other departments doing this. Thought there was going to be an inventory of partners / resources for the communities – this did not happen.

This [part of the process] is a weakness. We [management committee members] have not done this very well. Still need to take priority areas identified by SLL and scope out the resources that they do not have and that could impact sustainability of the project – then resource the project to get it going.

Yes, SLL is aware of relevant resources to a modest extent, however is it a learning process – still trying to develop. Potentially could have had a more planned set of information that SLL could use. [RRT] in retrospective would have been a good vehicle to present more information, i.e. Federal and Provincial.

Agro and Franco communities are just now being introduced, by the management committee and CDEM, to some of the resources / partners available. At minimum, these two regions are aware of at least some of the players within the management committee.

Regional Awareness of Sustainability Issues

All management committee and SLL respondents indicated “yes”, that they feel that SLL is aware of what constitutes a healthy community and that they have linked their development efforts to a number of issues. However, management committee respondents noted that the learning process for SLL would take time and that they did not have a “full appreciation” of sustainability issues. Key informant comments include:

SLL’s issues were very health oriented/focused.

[SLL] has looked at development efforts with regards to a number of issues – the treatment centre is a good example of this.

Some [SLL representatives] have some appreciation, but all do not have a full appreciation [of what constitutes a healthy, sustainable community].

Social arm is always there . . . very important.

Some think alcohol-free, some think good health facilities. A healthy community is a combination of all these kinds of things . . .

[There is recognition that] the health of one community affects the whole region. Very aware of what constitutes an unhealthy community – now through the process recognizing what will make SLL healthy.

[SLL process] is definitely a holistic approach. Keep families happy and healthy. All three communities are very aware [of what constitutes a health community].

Regional Awareness and Utilization of Potential Partnerships and Funding Programs

As indicated by key informants, SLL members are “somewhat aware” of potential partnerships and funding programs. The process for this awareness was seen as “informal”. As with the awareness approach of partners / resources, the management committee provided SLL with some information including pamphlets and contact names. Key informants felt that this area of the

project could be improved, i.e. through the development of an inventory of partners, resources and funding programs.

The majority of management committee members, SLL resource and SLL member respondents indicated that SLL has not yet accessed partnerships / funding programs. Management committee respondents noted that the process is still in the early stages and that it will take time before SLL will be “ready” to access funding programs. SLL key informants also indicated that they were “just scratching the surface” with regards to tapping funding programs. SLL respondents identified the addictions treatment centre project as one area where funding programs may be utilized in the near future. Several SLL respondents mentioned the initial funding for the RRT process and Internet site development as the only funding accessed to date.

Introduction, Sharing and Use of Information Resources

SRMIS group made technical presentations to the Northern RRT over the course of two SLL meetings. The concepts surrounding information resources were introduced at all four SLL meetings. These presentations spearheaded the development of an SLL regional web site. This web site was funded through a separate initiative and is still in the developmental stages. The majority of key informants believed that SLL was “starting” to utilize information resources for planning purposes as illustrated by SLL’s use of the Internet and their regional website. Most management committee respondents felt that this was an “evolving process” that is just starting to become “operationalized”.

SRMIS also attended an Agro-Manitoba meeting to introduce the concepts and potential for information resources and initiatives. This issue of information resources and its potential uses within the southwest region is on the agenda for the next Agro-Manitoba meeting. There has not been an information resources presentation with Franco-Manitoba to date.

Identification of Regional Vision, Priorities and Projects

Key informants reported that SLL has identified several regional priority areas through the RRT process. SLL has also identified a number of ongoing projects and activities for the region. Implementation plans for the identified projects / activities are at varying stages of development, but all have been started. Some of the projects mentioned by respondents include: tourism; youth initiative; addictions treatment centre; tri-community profile; health care; radio station; fishing industry; roads (infrastructure) and training. Facilitation by RDI and Craig Hanley was mentioned by several key informants as fundamental to the identification of SLL’s regional priorities and projects. This facilitation helped SLL members in identifying actionable priorities / projects including, the issues involved, who is responsible, and what those responsible have to do. As a result of this approach, SLL representatives report regularly at their meetings on their priority areas.

The development of regional priorities, projects / activities and implementation plans can be seen as an indicator of community / regional support for Year II. Another indicator of support for Year II is the requests from other Manitoba communities / regions for implementation of the process, as documented in the file review (see page 11).

Most management committee members felt that SLL would be successful in moving at least some of the projects / activities forward. Some concerns were expressed with regards to the

support SLL would need to continue to be successful in moving its projects ahead. Management committee comments include:

[There is] good commitment from each of the three communities, right people at the table.

[Management committee member] thinks that the management committee needs to stay there [SLL] to ensure that we do not leave them high and dry – this should help drive the process forward.

[SLL members] are enthusiastic! Funding and volunteer time are barriers.

There was some disparity amongst the key informant responses as to whether or not SLL had indeed identified a regional vision. Some respondents felt that SLL had discussed a regional vision, but had not yet finalized and formalized that vision. Other respondents indicated that in fact SLL had identified a regional vision.

The Agro and Franco-Manitoba groups have identified, to some extent, their regional priorities. For these groups, this is still in the preliminary stages. At the time of this review, neither the Agro nor Franco communities have, as of yet, formalized a regional vision.

Regional Identification and Coordination of Problems and Solutions

As the Franco and Agro groups are still in the infancy stage of their processes, the specifics around the identification and coordination of problems and solutions refers only to the Northern RRT. All key informant respondents indicated that SLL had utilized government and non-governmental capabilities in making their decisions. Several respondents commented that SLL is “not far in to the process”, but that they had made a “great start”. During the course of problem identification, resources such as Craig Hanley and other government resources, Hudson Bay Mining Company and other private sector resources as well as other SLL community members were accessed by the group. Management committee comments include:

Yes, more and more [SLL] is beginning to see opportunities to use the process to address opportunities / problems.

Support of Craig Hanley got the first few meetings going – now communities do this and Craig and the management committee act as resource people [to SLL].

Improved Use of Government Programs and Services

The majority of respondents indicated that they felt there would be an improved use of government programs and services as a result of the Community Collaboration Project. Management committee members suggested that this improvement would take time with all three groups. SLL, due to their stage in the process, were seen as being the furthest along in looking at potential government programs and services.

One member of the committee mentioned that there was a need to “educate in-house” with regards to front-line government employees and this process. It was felt that this “in-house” approach would change the way government personnel approach communities and would allow them to “show by example”. SLL respondents mentioned that they were just beginning to

understand how to access government programs and services. Most of the SLL key informants noted that the interest and expertise of the management committee was crucial to this aspect of the process.

SLL Determinants of Success

During the SLL process, representatives identified several determinants of success for the RRT. SLL key informant interviewees were asked for their perspectives on where they were at in comparison to these determinants. A couple of the SLL respondents felt that the RRT had utilized the region's resources efficiently and mentioned the Tourism initiative and their commitment to "work together" as examples. The remaining SLL respondents felt that this was "just starting" and that there were "many resources not yet tapped in to".

Half of SLL respondents felt that the RRT process, through the sharing of resources and information, had improved community resources. The other half felt that it was "too early" in the process to ascertain whether there was improved community resources, and all felt that enhanced infrastructure was a long-term initiative. One SLL member mentioned the treatment centre as a near future example of improved infrastructure and resources.

The majority of SLL key informants felt that the level of local decision making had been positively affected by the RRT process. One SLL representative felt that it was still too early in the process to say whether or not decision making had been affected. SLL respondent comments include:

[The RRT's] allowed decisions and agenda items to come from local leadership.

[We have] taken a step towards governing on a regional basis in the future.

Respectful of what other communities are doing or problems they are having.

Overall, management committee respondents and SLL key informants were optimistic that the process would be effective in acting as a proactive forum for regional development. SLL respondents noted some concerns about the RRT process. SLL comments include:

I feel that there is some redundancy between the RRT process and Community Futures. There is a need to clarify where activities should be actioned from (RRT or Community Futures).

We have to sit down with Aboriginal communities and work together / partner.

Next Steps

Based upon this review, some suggestions regarding the next steps of the project are presented here for management committee consideration and discussion. These suggestions include:

- Clarify Provincial and Federal roles within the project, including roles, mandates, and responsibilities within the management committee;
- Examine the relationship of the various management committee members with the goal of improving and/or expanding the partnership/role of the individual committee members;
- Discuss the development of a formalized framework that will clearly articulate the process for communities and government departments;
- Continue to support the Northern, Agro and Franco-Manitoba processes through commitment of funds, time and expertise;
- Discuss the development of an inventory of resources, partners, and funding programs for regional use; and
- Examine each region individually to ensure the process “fits” each region, i.e. implement a different monitoring system for the Franco process, as it is unfolding differently (with CDEM involvement).

With the successes that resulted from Year I of the Community Collaboration Project, the management committee would like to continue the project into a second year. The process used has been flexible in accommodating the diverse needs of communities and can therefore be transferred into other communities and regions.

Objectives for Year II include the following:

- a) Engage new communities in CCP / RRT activities;
- b) Continue to support community development activities for existing CCP / RRT communities;
- c) Continue introducing and fostering the use of information resources for community participants; and
- d) Design and implement an ongoing monitoring and review process within the CCP / RRT.

It is anticipated that Year II of the Community Collaboration Project will result in the following outcomes:

- Identification of two new communities / regions for participation in CCP / RRT;
- Initiation of CCP / RRT process within two new communities / regions;
- Facilitation of Rural Dialogue / Regional Round Table within two new communities / regions;
- Involvement of citizen / community in risk management for a sustainable community, thus enabling the community to make a link to the scientific research and understand the risk assessment concerning the environment and how it affects the community’s health;

- Continue / support Regional Round Table process with South Indian Lake, Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids (SLL) and Agro-Manitoba communities;
- Continue to support Franco-Manitoba process (via CDEM);
- Assist SLL in moving towards Year II activities / initiatives including an agreed upon framework that identifies best practices, lessons learned, models and approaches for effective community-based interventions, information synthesis and exchange on human health and environment;
- A framework and inventory identifying capacity building needs respecting leaders, volunteers, local organizations, and municipal staff;
- Continue to attend (management committee and government support / resource persons) SLL and Agro-Manitoba RRT meetings at the community members request;
- Continue to provide facilitation services to Agro-Manitoba;
- Assist communities / regions in developing a better understanding of and access to funding, partnerships and resources;
- Provide introductory sharing of information resources;
- Development of an ongoing monitoring system that provides information on a routine basis about the delivery of project initiatives to specific communities / regions;
- Properly conceptualize information that should be captured within the three project domains: community participants; management committee and other members of the rural team; and sponsors and funders; and
- Provision of regular feedback to management committee about the process, to assist with planning and adjustments for Year II and III activities / initiatives and development of a monitoring and review framework.