



***Common Roots, Common Futures:
Different Paths to Self-Determination.
An International Conversation***

The University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona,



REPORT

DIANE SMITH

APRIL 2012

LIST OF CONTENTS

1. Foreword
2. Acknowledgements
3. The Conference Focus
4. The Starting Point: Three Big Concepts
5. The Program Format and Focus
6. Insights from the Delegates: The Three Big Concepts
7. Other Cross-cutting Insights and Challenges
8. Bringing it all Together: Next Steps and Commitments

1. FOREWORD

Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States of America are among the world's richest countries. They are democracies that tend to see themselves as examples to the world of enlightened, magnanimous and effective governance.

These same countries also share a common history of colonization, including the sometimes violent displacement and coercive control of Indigenous populations. Their Indigenous populations are today among the poorest in each country, with inexcusably high rates of disease, poor housing, unemployment, and other indicators of social stress and disadvantage. Yet in 2007, these four countries made themselves notorious as the only four countries in the world that refused to endorse the resolution that the United Nations adopt the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

In subsequent years, each of the four eventually endorsed the Declaration.

Today, the rights of Indigenous peoples vary across these four countries. However in recent years, in all four, there has been a growing political, social, and cultural movement on behalf of Indigenous self-determination, governance, and development—a movement on the part of Indigenous peoples themselves. Sometimes carried out in dialogue with central governments, sometimes not, this diverse movement has expressed the desire of Indigenous peoples to massively increase access to their rights and expand their capacities to make collective decisions for themselves relating to their lands, their communities, and their relationships with the countries of which they are a part.

In February of 2012, a group of about 35 people—most of them Indigenous—from these four countries gathered in Tucson, Arizona, to consider what we might learn from each other about these concerns. The conference concluded that a sustained, international conversation on these topics—a conversation that would include sharing the stories of what's working in support of Indigenous self-determination, governance, and economic development in each country—would be both timely and productive.

This document is a report on that three-day event, an attempt to capture the key themes of the conference and some of the highlights of the vigorous and stimulating discussions we had.

I want to thank my colleagues and conference co-chairs—Professors Stephen Cornell of the University of Arizona and Joseph Kalt of Harvard University—for their assistance in planning the conference and making it happen, and Dr. Diane Smith for her extensive contributions to the intellectual framework of the conference and for drafting this report.

Mick Dodson

National Centre for Indigenous Studies, the Australian National University

Malcolm Fraser & Gough Whitlam Chair in Australian Studies, Harvard University, 2011-12

2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Conferences such as *Common Roots, Common Futures* emerge from many intersecting personal networks, and rely on the hard work of many people. The initial impetus came from Professor Mick Dodson who, as the *Malcolm Fraser & Gough Whitlam Chair in Australian Studies* at Harvard University and a Visiting Professorship with the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, had the opportunity to organise a small conference on a topic of his choice. His idea was to bring together a small group of primarily Indigenous people already actively engaged in the world of governance — whether as practitioners, academic researchers, lawyers, or rights campaigners — to start a conversation across four countries; a conversation not about the failures but about the successes of Indigenous nations, about what works.

The conference was organised under the auspices of the Harvard University *Australian Studies Initiative* in partnership with Professor Stephen Cornell from the Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy at the University of Arizona; Professor Joseph Kalt of The Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development, Harvard University; Dr Joan Timeche, Executive Director of The Native Nations Institute at the University of Arizona; and The National Centre for Indigenous Studies at The Australian National University. In addition to the above organisers and sponsors, we gratefully acknowledge the generous support of the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, and the Office of Global Initiatives at The University of Arizona.

In the main, the weight of day-to-day organisation for the conference fell to Steve Cornell, Diane Smith and Mick Dodson. However their efforts would not have been as productive if not for the superlative administrative and management support provided by Anna Damiano from The National Centre for Indigenous Studies at The Australian National University; Carrie Stusse, Operations Manager at the Native Nations Institute; Kim Harlow, Administrative Associate at The Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy; Charissa Delmar from The Native Nations Institute University of Arizona; and Nicole Grenier from the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. And the University of Arizona's Multimedia Center did an excellent job videotaping all the plenary sessions.

Stephen Cornell and Diane Smith wrote an Overview Paper to introduce the conference's proposed themes and summarise relevant country-based issues, which was pre-circulated to all delegates. Neil Sterritt, Mick Dodson and Manu Barcham provided much-needed corrections and updates to that paper.

We would especially like to thank the keynote speakers Wilton Littlechild, Jaime Pinkham, Sir Mason Durie and Jason Eades (who stepped in at late notice to present on behalf of Patrick Dodson). They took time out from their hectic professional lives to prepare presentations that helped create a common starting point for us all in understanding the contexts for self-determination, self-governance and economic development in each of the four countries. Their fellow panel members further illuminated their insights by giving us practical examples of innovation and success. Mick Dodson, Neil Sterritt, Manuhua Barcham and Manley Begay ably chaired the plenary discussions that followed each country-presentation.

The conference was held at the University of Arizona that stands on the traditional territories of the Tohono O'odham Nation. Mr. Michael Enis from the Tohono O'odham Nation opened the conference with a blessing and strong words of encouragement for the fruitfulness of discussions. On the second day, delegates were able to travel to the Tohono O'odham Nation's lands, visiting their legislative offices and cultural centre and talking with some of their leaders. It was an

inspiring visit, and we would like to express our deepest thanks for the welcoming words we received and for the time the O’odham spent with us. At the end of the same day, the after-dinner speech by James Anaya challenged us to put our preliminary discussions and insights from Tohono O’odham into an even wider international framework of Indigenous rights and self-determination.

On the third day our task was made easier by the united contribution of rapporteurs Miriam Jorgensen and Azmi Wood who succeeded in the daunting task of drawing together for us the complex strands of discussion from the first day’s presentations and interweaving their own insights. Then Megan Menoka Hill, Toni Bauman and Tim Goodwin provided experienced facilitation with the break-out group sessions. This report draws heavily on their efforts and the feedback provided from those small group discussions.

Finally, but by no means least, we would like to thank the delegates for sharing their extraordinary expertise and experiences over the three days of the conference. Over 35 invited and sponsored people traveled from four countries and arrived with little time to acclimatise and overcome jet lag. They nevertheless provided keynote and panel presentations at relatively short notice and engaged enthusiastically and with good humour with each other, sharing many sensitive insights into the topics under discussion.

The conference program, overview paper, introductory paper, keynote presentations and delegates bios can all be found on the website created after the conference by the Udall Centre.

3. THE CONFERENCE FOCUS

As a way of explaining the focus for the conference, we refer to the words of Sir Mason Durie (2011) from New Zealand:

as we go into the future ... we will make progress much quicker if we unite in different ways ... [if] we can convert the common ground into a path into the future.

Carried out over three days, the conference afforded delegates from Canada, the United States of America, New Zealand and Australia with the opportunity to share their considerable experience and practical insights into how Indigenous peoples in their own countries are advancing their self-determination, self- governance, and sustained development. As conference organisers, we were particularly interested in focusing on the successes; on what works across these three inter-related issues and across the four countries.

In particular, the conference was founded on the hope that what works in one country in strengthening Indigenous self-determination, governance and economic development, may hold valuable lessons for the rest of us and for the future. While accounts of disadvantage and deficit still dominate far too many discussions of Indigenous issues, new stories of resourcefulness, creativity and success — as determined and chosen by Indigenous peoples themselves — are beginning to surface in all four countries. These are the stories that motivated the conference.

To set the scene and identify broad areas of diversity and commonality, we produced and pre-circulated (for internal conference use only) a *Conference Overview Paper* (Cornell and Smith

2012). The paper concluded by outlining a series of questions that were subsequently considered throughout the conference, via real-life examples from each country:

What is happening that is new, innovative, promising, or productive in self-determination, governance, and economic development, particularly on the part of Indigenous nations and communities?

Are there commonalities in the challenges we face, and if so, are there also similarities cross-country in some of the solutions and breakthroughs which Indigenous people are designing in order to maximise their self-determination through governance and economic development arrangements.

Is there value in an international discussion that focuses on what works, instead of what doesn't, in maximising Indigenous self-determination in all four countries?

Is there an action, research and communication agenda emerging from this discussion that could yield practical benefits and usable lessons for Indigenous communities?

4. THE STARTING POINT: THREE BIG CONCEPTS

Much has been written about the concepts of self-determination, governance, and economic development, including their Indigenous forms. For the purposes of the conference discussions, we defined these core terms in the following way:

Self-determination refers to genuine decision-making power and responsibility about what happens on Indigenous peoples' lands, in their affairs, in their governing systems, and in their development strategies. Mera Penehera et al. (2003) describe it as "having meaningful control over one's own life and cultural well-being". It does not refer simply to self-administration or self-management of programs or processes that are controlled by outside authorities. As genuine decision-making power and responsibility moves from external authorities into the hands of Indigenous peoples, self-determination grows.

Governance refers to the principles, rules, and mechanisms by which the will of the nation, clan, group, or community is translated into sustained, organised action. It can range from the organisation of economic activity, to law-making and enforcement, to dispute resolution to building relationships with other governments. It is about the ability (as opposed to the right or authority) of nations and their organisations to govern: to decide for themselves what they want for their future and to implement such decisions; to decide for themselves who the 'self' is in their self-governance; and what form of governance will prove to be most practically effective and legitimate for their collective purposes.

Economic development refers to the ability of Indigenous nations to support themselves, to sustain self-governance and to provide their citizens with the opportunity to live productive, satisfying lives. Development is "change or transformation that makes life better in ways that people want". From this viewpoint, it can take a variety of forms, from growth in traditional subsistence activities to increased participation in market economies, from Indigenous-citizen

entrepreneurship to joint ventures with non-Indigenous corporations, from collective nation, community and clan enterprises through to small individual and family cottage industries.

Over 20 years ago, the World Commission on Environment and Development's *Brundtland Report* proposed that development is sustainable when it "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". From this vantage point, it is a direction more than a place; it is about innovation and opportunity; and it involves value judgments about the preferred direction and speed of change. Not surprisingly, what constitutes effective and legitimate governance or sustainable development for one group may not be the case for another; and the factors influencing these may be viewed differently.

For many Indigenous peoples, the internal 'test' of sustainability in their economic development initiatives, and of effectiveness and legitimacy in their governing systems, involves coming up with answers to a set of difficult questions, many of which call for the kind of future-thinking referred to by Mason Durie, including:

- What kind of nation or community are we trying to build, not only for ourselves but for future generations of our people?
- What kinds of governance arrangements and innovations might be acceptable and consented to now, and acceptable to our people in the future?
- What role should collective Indigenous culture play in governance arrangements and economic initiatives, and how might that change over time?
- Who should benefit from economic development, and will the benefits of current development still be available for future generations?
- How do we maximise self-determination over the long run and enhance the ability of future generations of our people both to maintain the strengths of the past and to determine for themselves the shape of their own lives?

In one form or another these questions were returned to by delegates throughout the conference.

5. THE PROGRAM FORMAT AND FOCUS

Considerable thought and skype hookup-time was put into devising a program that would offer a variety of ways of carrying out informed, relaxed conversations. The final program included a mix of country presentations and panels, case studies, small-group discussions, and a field trip to introduce a solid practical reality to discussions.

Conference Day 1

The first day aimed to set the scene in recognition of the fact, as some delegate acknowledged in their evaluation sheet, that there are many gaps in our knowledge about each other and the wider international scene. Mick Dodson laid out the conference themes in an introductory presentation. He noted that Indigenous people have now secured many rights, successfully negotiated treaties and land claims, and entered into major resource and enterprise development agreements. With

these successes, he said, has come a daunting challenge - that of building effective forms of self-governance that promote development. The additional challenge in this, as Neil Sterritt from Canada has pointed out, is for Indigenous people not only to gain more control over their own affairs, but to find ways to make control meaningful and to maximise their practical capacity for self-determination.

The keynote presentations and panel discussions by Indigenous leaders from the four countries provided detail on contexts and practical examples. Canada, the United States of America, New Zealand and Australia form a distinctive set of countries, each with distinctive Indigenous cultures, and often with considerable internal diversity of cultures and rights as well. Speakers laid out the unique histories and experiences of Indigenous people in each country, and focused on key developments and innovations—particularly those being made by Indigenous communities themselves—that are advancing Indigenous self-determination, self-governance, and sustained development.

Even more importantly, we also heard about the strong commonalities that Indigenous people share across the four countries; commonalities that unite them and offer the chance for mutual support through similarly challenging situations. On this day, the delegates stayed together and, in often animated discussion, began to identify issues in common.

One particular commonality identified in all four cases is the consistency and resilience of Indigenous demands for self-determination and self-governance, and the persistence of Indigenous efforts to generate sustainable economic development. It is clear that in all four countries Indigenous people are paying increasing attention to governance and to the link between institutions of governance on the one hand and development outcomes on the other. Furthermore, the practical work of Indigenous people and research in all four countries suggest that self-determination and self-government are essential bases for making sustained improvements in the socioeconomic conditions of Indigenous peoples.

Conference Day 2

On the second day, delegates took a break from intense discussions to make a day-long visit to the Tohono O’odham Nation, southwest of Tucson, including the nation’s capital of Sells and its cultural center in Topawa.

The trip provided an invaluable reality check and a practical inspiration for delegates. It was a chance to see a nation of people who have won important rights and then gone on to the next step of working out how to capably exercise those rights. As their leaders told us, those steps have not always been easy, but it was impressive to see ‘governance in action’, especially when that governance is being exercised for all residents on the tribal territories, not just to the O’odham people.

The visit was inspiring and focused our minds on the practical implementation challenges that follow success. Delegates returned to Tucson with many issues to raise on the third day of the conference. These were captured in conversations by Miriam Jorgensen:

- *“the major thing I reflected on was how empowering it was to see Indigenous people take ownership of their own future in a way that was heavily grounded in their own cultural values. The moment that hit me in an almost emotional way was when the Cultural Officer*

said, “we didn’t build this museum for tourism, we built it for ourselves—to tell our own stories, to teach people who wanted to come to learn, but most importantly to teach our young people, to teach our own people about our culture, to be proud of that. I just found that so inspirational, that their economic development was about more than money: it was about making a future for their kids”.

- “For me, it was to see how they hold their future in their hands, the way they are set up with their legislative council. ... looking at the [Tohono O’odham structure], of how they do that, I’m going back with those ideas, thinking, “how could we have that kind of structure”?”
- “It’s very inspirational to see a community that’s thriving, and so rich in culture, and just such a strong sense of self, from each of the community members that we talked to. And for me, it really breathed a bit of life into me. You know, it’s easy to sit down at these international gatherings and have this really important dialog and all that information is really important. But at the end of the day, I really think it comes down to [this]: we’re talking about Indigenous people’s rights, it’s rights that we’re protecting, their traditions and their way of life. It kind of grounds you when you’re able to just go out and meet people in communities”.
- “to go into their legislature was just fabulous. And to understand and see how their government works. And to hear about how they resolve their issues, how their government is structured, to look at their constitution. It was really great to just make the comparisons. My nation is just getting into self-government, we’re just implementing our own constitution, and thinking about how we are going to best put our laws into place. And I think it was really helpful to see a nation that’s been involved in that process. ... we want to try to resolve our own issues. And to see that at work in a nation is just fabulous, it was a great experience for me to see that and to think about the comparisons between our nations”.
- “The sense and the reality that came from that visit, from hearing from those people, there’s no other way to get that depth of insight, I don’t think, in a real sense. You know the “knowing about,” and then there’s the “feeling part” that integrates the knowledge”. ... And I think also, the conversation about the separation of powers in that model, without thinking about it and talking to real people, you can’t appreciate the way that it’s embedded within a community”.
- “It was incredibly important coming from a New Zealand context, here it’s very different your political context in terms of your sovereign nations, how you’ve got reservations, and how you’ve got sovereignty over it. We don’t have that in New Zealand. There’s no equivalent. And so going off to the museum, and seeing that in practice, and seeing the beautiful set up, meeting their Chair, seeing the legislative building, all the different things they do. That’s self-government and sovereignty in action. ... For us, that’s very unprecedented, and really did crystalize, and for me, illustrate the things we’ve been discussing about governance, and economic development, and self-determination”.

- *“I think the actual timing of it [the visit] was great too. You know the first day was a day of discussion, what everyone’s doing. Next day we go and see it in practice, and giving us time to reflect on what’s been said and observe what’s really happening. And the following day’s a time to [bring it all together]”.*

The after-dinner speaker, James Anaya, UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Regents’ and James J. Lenoir Professor of Human Rights Law and Policy at the University of Arizona, provided the big-picture framework. Anaya referred to a number of the cases and issues he has been encountering in his work as UN Special Rapporteur, and to the challenge of implementing the recently adopted UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Conference Day Three

On the final day, delegates engaged in more open-ended conversation in smaller groups. The productiveness of that conversation was greatly enhanced by the outstanding overview provided at the beginning of the day by the two rapporteurs, Azmi Woods and Miriam Jorgensen.

Delegates then broke into smaller groups with facilitators. In the first session they focused on sharing and drawing together their insights into the common challenges facing Indigenous peoples in the four countries, and identifying common solutions. Each group reported back to a plenary session that was video-taped. In the second session, each group was asked to consider whether there would be value in continuing the conversation begun at the conference and if so, how that might be done. Delegates were additionally asked to consider what kind of practical action, research and communication agenda might support Indigenous communities struggling for self-determination and self-governance. One of the Māori delegates, Sacha McMeeking, captured some quite common sentiments when she said that three things in particular would be helpful to her over time: (1) information about what’s working where, (2) inspiration in the form of stories of how Indigenous nations are solving problems, and (3) specific mechanisms for problem-solving, information-sharing, and governance.

At the end of the day, delegates were asked to fill out sheets evaluating the conference. In their comments, they were unanimous in their desire to continue the conversation, sharing stories of what works, and to maintain the momentum and network possibilities.

Evaluation Sheets: What was most/least Useful?

Twenty-seven evaluation sheets were returned by delegates. Out of a score of 1-5 for the Usefulness of the Conference (with 1 = “Not Useful” and 5 = “Very Useful”): 22 delegates scored the conference as 5; 4 delegates scored the conference as 4; and 1 person created their own score of 5-6 for “Extremely Useful”.

Written Comments on ‘What was the Most Useful?’:

Hearing about international successes (inspiring and taught me possible tools); In Day 1 the presentations and the Rapp Session on Day 3 summarising everything (perfectly);

Honestly it was all great; So much talent and knowledge in the room; Excellent mix of experiences and ages

The field trip was excellent and really gave me life! Please continue this portion!

The energy, positivity, synergies and learning that has been provided. And action plans to do something

Hearing others' experiences re common challenges, visiting TO Rez, time to mingle and network, time to ponder and discuss strategies

Often conferences are jam packed with little time to rest and ponder. Great balance here

Hearing accounts of recent developments in each country - gains, problems, aspirations

Very intelligent, positive people able to address underlying issues. The out of session discussions at least as important as presentations

The connection and sharing of stories was very inspiring

The three key themes were very relevant and provided a great focus for all to contribute without diverting into other issues

The open discussions and country updates

The depth of ideas greatly increased from what I'm normally exposed to. The international experience reinforced by a sense of shared futures

Blend of field trip to exchange of national experiences; An invaluable network and exchange of ideas; Found all aspects useful

Offered a confirmation and extension of many things I'd been thinking about. The opportunity to think across nation-state settings and look for similar strategies by which Indigenous nations might improve/strengthen governance

So many folks hadn't thought about these things the way I already had. Except for NZ stuff very little very new. But still GOOD and useful because expansive and confirming

6. INSIGHTS FROM THE DELEGATES - THE THREE BIG CONCEPTS

Not surprisingly, delegates put forward many valuable insights and practical ideas. It is difficult here to do justice to the depth of the conversation and people's contributions; the sections below simply attempt to summarise their many ideas.

Self-determination: a means more than an end

With regard to self-determination, there have been striking developments in each of the four countries involving different pathways and different kinds of rights and recognitions, resulting in often very different outcomes.

Two important things we heard from our Australian and New Zealand colleagues were posed as questions. Patrick Dodson, as shared by Jason Eades, asked: "The challenge for traditional owners, like the Yawuru, is how do we, as a people, leverage our native title rights so as to promote our own resilience and reliable prosperity in the modern world?" Then Sir Mason Durie laid out some

pathways at national, tribal, community and family levels that Māori are currently using in New Zealand to progress their self-determination. He asked delegates to consider whether “Indigenous self-determination is an endpoint or a means to an end,” suggesting that self-determination is “more about achieving results that are relevant and beneficial in modern times”.

In respect to getting results, Sir Mason highlighted an issue similar to that of Patrick Dodson; namely, that implementation “has frequently been compromised by a lack of clarity around goals, insufficient human capability, inadequate resources, constitutional discouragement, and sets of relationships that have fragmented Māori resolve.” This assessment resonated with many delegates. So did the conclusion testified to in all the keynote presentations, that self-determination is closer to realisation than it was a decade ago, thereby bringing implementation, capacity and collaboration considerations even more to the fore.

These questions aligned well with Jim Anaya’s message at the conference dinner. As the James J. Lenoir Professor of Human Rights Law and Policy, University of Arizona College of Law, and UN *Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, he reminded us that internationally “self-determination is the keystone of the architecture of the Declaration [on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples].” But he has argued that, “Understood as a human right, the essential idea of self-determination is that human beings, individually and as groups, are equally entitled to be in control of their own destinies, and to live within governing institutional orders that are devised accordingly”.

From Canada, the panelists identified the increased attention being given by First Nations to reviewing and reforming their constitutions (as political documents that organise the governing for a community or nation; a polity), and reinvigorating their community memberships and relationships.

Throughout the conference, self-determination was persistently linked to the needs of future Indigenous generations. The Canadian delegates stressed that decisions and actions taken now — for example, the effort to write political constitutions that embrace traditional ways and are capable in the contemporary world — not only help make self-determination a reality today, but also build pathways for the future exercise of self-determination.

Participation in the modern treaty process in Canada is seen to have a similar effect - that of building mechanisms, laying the pathway that helps ensure future self-determination. From this perspective, some delegates were bringing to the foreground an important insight; namely, that the exercise and implementation of rights needs to be done sustainably, just as with economic development. In other words, the practice of self-determination should be done in such a way that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own self-determination needs.

In the US, the words of Joseph Lopez, cultural advisor to the Tohono O’odham Cultural Center focused our attention on what has been called “second generation self-determination” that is now occurring in the United States. He told the story of how, when he crossed into the US from Mexico an immigration agent asked him, “Are you a US citizen”? His reply was, “I’m Tohono O’odham.” This statement exercises the full content of “this is who I am” self-determination. It asserts that an Indigenous nation’s exercise of self-determination isn’t just a response to what the national government says they can do for themselves. It’s not reducible to self-management, self-

administration or service delivery. It puts a richer Indigenous content into those actions. It's about doing things in Indigenous ways, grounded in Indigenous ideas.

Over the three days, delegates gave numerous examples of how this kind of deep self-determination is being strategically exercised; through the negotiation of collaborations, agreements and partnerships; sometimes under the radar; and through a closer reengagement with community members.

Governance-as-practice

All the keynote speakers linked current Indigenous efforts to secure and sustain self-determination to the renewed work being done on nation-building and redesigning governance. Jaime Pinkham noted that “one of the things we learned early is that nation building requires a new conversation about the role and the strategic vision of tribal governments. Tribes are asking for nation building orientations to help frame the conversations among their councils and communities”.

Delegates reinforced the related point that governance is about principles and institutional mechanisms that translate community will into sustained, organised action. It's about the practical and legitimate *Indigenous* ways of getting things done for the nation and community. And importantly, it's about ability and legitimacy, not just the right and authority to govern. For example, from Australia, we heard from Tony Wurramarrba that a renewed focus on building practical governance capacity in Groote Eylandt has greatly enhanced their ability to negotiate with federal and territory governments, to monitor governmental commitment to agreements, thereby putting Indigenous people back in the driver's seat of decision making.

Many delegates returned to the insight that it is in the daily practice of governance that self-determination and sovereignty are actually generated as a current reality (rather than a distant goal in the future). Examples of such governance-in-action included the extension of nation-to-nation relationships and partnerships, the renegotiation of treaties and trust arrangements, entering into agreements on joint ventures, resolving cross-boundary and membership issues, and designing workable regulations and laws etc. These are acts of sovereignty—not erosion of sovereignty—as nations and tribes flex their governing powers to decide who their partners are and the content of the partnership.

In every jurisdiction, delegates noted that the legitimacy of their governance is directly linked to having a strong mandate from their community members. For everyone, this raised the challenging issue of how to make sure that communities are fully engaged in the work of revitalising governance. Delegates mentioned the time-consuming practical work that is required to keep often dispersed Indigenous citizens up to date on relevant legal, social and political developments and initiatives.

Jaime Pinkham, Rich Luarkie and Chellie Spiller highlighted a central point that all delegates kept returning to over the three days; namely, that in rebuilding governance, Indigenous people consistently look for a greater “cultural match” for how their governing laws and institutions align or resonate with community beliefs and values about how authority should be organised and leadership exercised.

While stories of governance deficits and lack of rights still dominate many discussions of Indigenous issues, conference delegates told new stories of resourcefulness, creativity and success. It was inspiring and sobering to hear about the hard-work that *is* making a difference on the ground: about clans, tribes and nations now renewing their governance arrangements as part of implementing complex agreements with the private sector and governments; about leaders building succession planning and youth leadership development into their governance arrangements; about Indigenous programs to build the practical capacity of people in communities to run education, financial systems, policing and health systems (not just for their own citizens but sometimes for non-Indigenous residents as well).

And, as Jaime Pinkham pointed out, there is increasing evidence “that in many rural communities, the most capable governments in terms of delivering public services are tribal governments”. This assessment resonated with delegates across the four countries.

Economic development as a sustainable journey

A common thread running through the discussions about economic development was the priority Indigenous people place on promoting economic activity that supports the present capacity of citizens to lead productive lives (“that makes people’s lives better in ways that *they* want”), without compromising their culture or the options of future generations.

This kind of approach to development is what Chellie Spiller called a “sustainable journey”. Furthermore, there is she said, a clear competitive advantage to such an approach - there is a ‘Māori edge’ that is a relational edge; it is the niche or value-plus that Māori can bring to business”. We heard about this ‘Indigenous edge’ in examples of a wide range of economic initiatives, businesses and agreements being negotiated and established: from small individual and family businesses, from subsistence to market participation, to major nation enterprises, innovative industries, and joint ventures with governments.

Examples given by Tony Wurramarrba, Patrick Dodson, and Jason Eades from Australia demonstrate that whilst it is important, nations and communities don’t need to have legislated rights or treaties in order to be able to leverage substantial resource and economic development outcomes. But a critical factor *is* having governance that is capable of supporting ‘self-determination in practice’, and for community members to be fully engaged and supported to think differently about their options for the future.

From Canada, Wilton Littlechild talked about the commitment to pursuing economic development as active participants—trying to make sure First Nation economies thrive, alongside their efforts to ensure stability and a role in the broader economy. From New Zealand we heard examples of Maori nations and communities collaboratively leveraging their growing economic power—especially in renewable energies, information technology, and innovative industries.

A clear common denominator emerging amongst delegates was the challenge of building “effective governance for doing business”, and the imperative that in doing so, culture needs to be treated as a positive strength, not a problem. As Chellie Spiller pointed out with examples of success from New Zealand, it’s a matter of creating innovative ways of “culturising commerce, not commercialising culture”.

At the same time, delegates also raised the “dark side” of economic development—especially in contexts where it becomes entangled in poor governance or unresolved issues of who is the “self” in self-determination. Many delegates identified common challenges in this regard: Who should get access to collective benefits and profits? How should per capita distributions be addressed? What investment strategies will address current disadvantage along with future equity issues? And importantly, who should make those decisions and how?

Delegates also noted that community expectations and demands in fact increase when organisations and nations are economically successful. In such cases, the need for effective governance becomes even more important, and directly linked not just to *implementing* rights but to *sustaining* successful outcomes. There was strong endorsement that the challenge of more effectively re-engaging with the community needs to be put back into heart of governance rebuilding and economic development considerations.

7. OTHER CROSS-CUTTING INSIGHTS AND CHALLENGES

The Transition to Implementation

Reflecting on his international experience led James Anaya to talk of there being three eras in the Indigenous fight for self-determination: the pre-recognition era of colonisation and the denial of Indigeneity; the battle for rights and recognition; and the post-declaration, implementation era. The conference focused, by and large, on the third era.

One thing everyone agreed on—over the last 40 years, in each of the four international jurisdictions, the game has changed or at least is changing. A transition is occurring from the “rights battle” to the “governance and development challenge”. As one delegate put it, “we are in the transition from victim to victor”. At the same time, as Sir Mason Durie and Patrick Dodson noted in their keynote presentations, achieving a successful treaty or land claim negotiation often necessitates carrying out an entire restructuring of existing governance arrangements. What worked for people to get them through negotiations is not necessarily what will work to implement those. Success propels people from thinking about past grievances to having to think about future need.

Furthermore, as Sacha McMeeking reminded us, there is now an entire Indigenous generation of young people whose careers and involvement in Indigenous issues have occurred in the third era—in the post-settlement, post-treaty and post-declaration of rights environment. Not only does this give them a different viewpoint on history and what’s possible, but they are also impatient for proper implementation and practical outcomes.

However, a related issue identified by delegates is that many Indigenous groups have spent so much time and energy fighting for recognition and rights, and dealing with internal disagreements along the way, that they have shortcut building their own governance foundations. As a result, when nations and communities do emerge from the maelstrom with rights, resources and development opportunities, they then face the challenge of having to implement and sustain those—but do so with ineffective or under-developed governing arrangements. They then have to

race to catch up, or worse, they miss out on opportunities and get continually hammered by a downwards spiral of crises, loss of confidence and disengagement by citizens.

If anything, getting informed community support becomes an even more critical factor in the transition to implementing self-determination than in the prior phase of battling to secure such rights. Angela Wesley and Karen Diver both provided examples that highlighted the crucial role that community and citizen engagement play in delivering outcomes. Angela told the story of how leaders in her nation only began to get support for their work in constitution rebuilding after one person made it their business to carry out thorough, informal and face-to-face discussions with all family members. That woman's efforts in knocking on doors and listening to people turned around many negative positions. It was only then that community trust, confidence and support for new ways of doing things were forthcoming. Karen Diver told of a similar strategic focus on building extensive community participation and buy-in, as forming the foundation on which her nation had been able to develop and implement strong new laws and regulations.

The Governance Challenge in a New Era

With the transition to an era of rights, recognition and resources comes enormous pressure (internal and external) to generate governance and development; and to do that fast. This has forced many nations and communities into poorly considered, often inflexible arrangements and ventures. Under such conditions, community members can be left behind with little information and a growing distrust of their governing leaders.

But Neil Sterritt reminded us that it is important to learn from the hard and unintended lessons of the governance failures in our own communities and organisations. In fact, sometimes you can learn more from having to rectify a failure than from an easy success. Several delegates talked of situations where communities and leaders had become locked into comfort zones, old ways of doing things, or a colonisation of the mind that blinds them to other strategies and potentially more effective ways of operating. It is only when people look hard at their failures that they can rise up to assert revitalised forms of governance for self-determination. In a similar vein, Sir Mason Durie pointed out that "future thinking" and "future planning" was one way of taking those lessons seriously, and applying them to solutions for future self-determination.

The positive message apparent throughout the conference is that slowly but surely the message about the importance of building a governance foundation is gaining ground. Delegates told stories from their home communities and organisations about their efforts to mobilise community discussion and re-engagement in planning and rebuilding governance arrangements, and about keeping that upfront, on the walls and in everyday conversation.

Delegates also repeatedly talked about having had "strategic conversations" that acted as a catalyst for getting started on addressing governance problems, renewing outdated arrangements, or considering new ways of doing things. It is clear that meeting the governance challenge is precisely about having that strategic conversation (about what kind of governance and for whom) and *then* crafting the governing institutions and building the governing capacity upon which the promise of hard-won rights can be practically delivered.

Moreover, as Leah Armstrong pointed out, that kind of strategic conversation is not simply an event that occurs at the beginning that can then be dispensed with. Nor is governance simply an end-point; something we will achieve in the future, in the same way we have thought about self-determination. Rather, “we need to make sure there is constant renewal and rethink about governance ... In our organisation we’ve come up with this term of constant restless renewal. Doing this renewal is just as relevant when we are successful: How do we handle success; How can we continue to build on our successes and strengths; and in changing environments”.

Sophie Pierre pointed to the many successes and hard work that have gone into governance building in Canada. Today people are really thinking hard and putting a lot of effort into getting on the front foot with their governance capacity, developing governance manuals and protocols, vision statements, succession planning and mentoring younger people. She strongly supported the real need for “Indigenous governance champions” and “nation rebuilders” on the ground to lead that work and make it happen.

And as Jaime Pinkham pointed out, redesigning governance models and constitutions is a sovereign decision; it is what ‘self-determination-in-action’ is about. From this viewpoint, the practice of exercising capable governance on a mundane daily basis is actually about sustaining “rights”. Sir Mason Durie suggested in turn that we need to move to a new kind of leadership when making the transition to implementing success. He spoke of a distributed, networked leadership that does not rely solely on one single leader or key negotiator. Networked leaders are people who can consider multiple options and ideas, who can facilitate connectivity and mobilise community support. This is a more sustainable form of leadership for future governance and development.

Addressing Concerns of Capacity, Succession and Youth

In the current period of meeting the challenge of ‘governance for success’, another set of inter-related questions arise: that of how Indigenous capacity is going to be built. When and how do you get to the point where you have the capacity to build and operate the institutions of governance? And how do you get younger people into those institutions who are equipped with the skills and understanding to operate them?

Karen Diver succinctly noted that “What you don’t know, you go and get”. In the case of her nation they headhunted the external scientific expertise they needed, as well as commencing a program of training their own youth in targeted professional areas. Many nations and organisations are becoming cannier about a two-pronged approach to building capacity. Also, Indigenous people often become engaged in externally driven and controlled initiatives where there are, nevertheless, important opportunities to leverage governance and capacity building. Examples given of such opportunities were land claims, agreement making, settlement and treaty negotiation processes.

But delegates also identified the need to target and support customised initiatives that are specifically Indigenous-driven. And younger delegates raised the chronic under-use of emerging leaders who can get trapped in a vicious circle of being asked by senior people to “stand-up and take on some responsibility”; only to then be told to “stand-down we don’t need you yet”.

Nations need to be able to grow their own young talented leaders, managers, negotiators and politicians, and give them real support and real roles. Bringing younger people along to conferences such as *Common Roots*, *Common Futures* is an important example of doing that. The benefits for them are obvious, and they have much to contribute, adding energy, enthusiasm and a fresh perspective. This shadowing strategy (of training up younger people through giving them practical experience alongside a leader) needs to become a routine part of conferences, negotiations, high-level meetings and planning so that upcoming generations are exposed to critical experiences, build their own skills, and acquire the trust and recognition they will need from their own community.

Fast-tracking young leaders who then do not have the governing, financial, management or communication experience and skills, and do not have community legitimacy and connections, can have disastrous effects—both on them and the wider community. Along with the invitation and desire to serve, must go the capacity, confidence and legitimacy to do so.

As part of that, Wayne Denning pointed out that new digital technologies represent an important opportunity for Indigenous people. He gave examples of the innovative role media technology can now play in turning around negative stereotypes, creating new ways of networking with each other, and reaching out to younger generations and including them in governance work. But he also noted that there is a “digital gap” at the moment whereby Indigenous people may be left behind.

Forging Indigenous Collaborations and Partnerships

One of the stand-out themes of the conference discussions was the issue of collaboration and partnership between Indigenous nations themselves. Jaime Pinkham gave several examples in his keynote speech of innovative partnerships being created with non-Indigenous governments and communities, and then challenged us to ask why such collaboration does not happen more regularly *between* Indigenous people themselves. Every delegate knew of examples where Indigenous people have been unable to work together owing to ongoing internal disputes, the legacy of historical distrust, and bitter community factionalism.

As Robert Joseph pointed out, many Indigenous people don’t have clear-cut boundaries to their nations, and yet contemporary development, agreements and treaties often demand just such precision. This has been the cause of much friction between Indigenous people, causing overlapping claims and land disputes; and continues to cause division. Another delegate commented “Through the process of colonisation we’ve lost the ability to trust in the “self”, trust in others... and lost confidence in our capacity”.

Jaime Pinkham warned that some of these divisive issues (such as per capita distribution; citizen membership; constitutional reform; the building of wealth) are now becoming “wedge issues” within community, keeping people apart. He suggested that in fact the biggest challenges facing Indigenous people in the US today are internal ones, and “that the next biggest battles we’re going to fight are not going to be from outside, but inside”. J.R LaPlante’s call for people to get beyond entrenched positions that undermine new ways of thinking about and doing governance and development was strongly supported by delegates.

In responding to these considered assessments, there was strong agreement that Indigenous cross-jurisdictional, inter-tribal initiatives, and intra-Indigenous reconciliation are areas of cutting-edge opportunity for Indigenous nations. Wilton Littlechild called, for example, for Indigenous nations to negotiate their own trade agreements and inter-governmental agreements with each other: “We need to be just as wise about approaching the future together as do the mining companies. They sit down together before they come to us to negotiate. We need to do the same across countries and nations”. He also suggested the strategy of forming Indigenous “nation alliances” or “multi-nation consortia” as one way of doing this.

Delegates strongly advocated the idea that there is an enormous opportunity for Indigenous people and nations to actively leverage their combined economic power and resources (‘nation-to-nation power’). The mutual benefits are likely to be immense. As Joe Kalt commented, “the challenge of maintaining internal legitimacy and consensus, whilst fighting the fights outside and negotiating ‘foreign relations’ [whether those be with other Indigenous nations or more widely] is actually a sign of a mature nation, a true sovereign”.

To activate and sustain both intra-Indigenous and wider collaborations, Indigenous nations and organisations need to be able to be seen and operate as “attractive development partners”. They need reliable institutions and decision making processes; effective implementation capacity; legitimate governance that works in getting things done.

Delegates gave several examples of nations and communities strategically reshaping themselves into attractive partners who can things done. Sophie Pierre told of some nations developing protocols with each other to ensure mutual understanding of shared commitments and to resolve boundary and claim disputes. Several delegates suggested that there is future pathway to be investigated where processes of reconciliation between tribal groups could lead to greater joint economic development; and that such initiatives could positively assist in reconciling old tensions and past grievances: “We can learn so much about ourselves by looking at what each other do; We are allies in reconciliation”. Some delegates also linked this strategic view to the possibility of spreading Indigenous cultural values and self-determination into wider economic forums, workforces and development initiatives.

Finding the place of Culture

An overarching issue running through all the thematic discussion and insights was that of Indigenous culture. Specifically, delegates voiced the common and deep concern that their cultures have to have a place in governance and development; and that place has to be both respected and workable.

This is not a matter of academic debate and interpretation. Some non-Indigenous academic analysts and politicians have characterised ‘culture’ as being unnecessary or even an obstacle in the contemporary world of Indigenous governance and development. They criticise Indigenous governing structures for mimicking local cultural forms, and suggest that cultural politics and processes should somehow be quarantined outside of representative organisations.

But contrary to this external viewpoint, there was very little question amongst delegates about whether culture matters or not for their self-determination and governance. They consistently and strongly pressed for the central role of culture in their governing institutions and decision-making, and in their views of what kind of future world they want to create for their families and communities. From this standpoint, culture is not seen as a problem, but as a source of strength and innovation; as Rich Luarkie said, “it’s not a way of *doing*, it’s a way of *being*”. Whilst non-Indigenous observers look for culture in the rules, structures, the policies, the regulations and laws, Indigenous people insert culture into their relationships, into how they self-determine and how they govern.

All the Indigenous delegates were keen to find a place for the recognition of culture in their governance and development strategies and to harness the strength and resilience of cultural roots in ways that are credible and workable in today’s world. That goal was encapsulated in the challenge about how to design ‘culturised’ governance’ and ‘culturised commerce’ solutions.

It was acknowledged that there is no simple fast-track answer to this. Delegates proposed some fundamental conditions or principles for respectfully and sensitively finding the place of culture in governance and development. Diane Smith’s concept of “informed Indigenous choice” focused on the need for Indigenous people to generate the solutions, on the bases of their own informed choice and inclusive decision making. In that way, contemporary “cultures of governance” are likely to have greater internal legitimacy and credibility with citizens. As Neil Sterritt noted, the important thing to remember is that it all takes time—time to talk, consult, get feedback with our own people; time to experiment, change and evolve as all societies do.

In his compelling presentation of the turbulent history and injustices done to the Pueblo nations, Rich Luarkie pointed to the cultural resilience and strengths that also came out of that colonising process. His people were forced through a process of “self-termination” by violent colonisation and are now reasserting themselves as a “self-nation”.

He demonstrated for us that a sensitive reconsideration of a nation’s governance history can positively assist in the process of reconfirming or renewing cultural choices for people about what kinds of contemporary governance they value. This process of cultural choice and renewal is far beyond mere reductionist mimicking.

Importantly, the Indigenous delegates strongly supported his comment that such cultural resilience is another strong “root commonality” shared amongst Indigenous people: “You know it’s not how good you can dance, or how good you can sing, because as we go round the table here, we all want to be treated well. We all want to be respected, isn’t that right? That’s a common language. That’s the unspoken language... We all have a beautiful connection through cultural roots. What we are doing here now is we’re beginning to think about where does that fit in nation building, in capacity building...”.

Manu Barcham reminded also us that “innovation and creativity are not new to our Indigenous cultures; all our cultures have traditions where people experimented, did things differently, made innovative changes. We can take that model and use it to continue to adapt into the future”. He also pointed to the need to consider changing demographics and urbanisation as factors in designing effective governance mechanisms. Part of that adaptation includes exploring new technologies and ways to keep the culture alive and real for young Indigenous people.

A critical component of keeping culture alive and relevant today was identified by Wilton Littlechild, Manu Barcham and Karen Diver; namely being assertive about using Indigenous language in all aspects of governance and development—at meetings, as language immersion in the class room, at home, with governments, when making decisions, and talking to citizens.

Neil Sterritt identified one factor that was seen to undermine the Indigenous legitimacy and workability of effort to ‘culturise governance’. He called it the dilemma of “culture versus cult” where people revert to a fantasy version of what they think their culture was in the past, as an idyllic romanticised way of being and doing. In doing that, “culture gets translated literally into cult” and then forcibly inserted into governing or development arrangements. Such pastiche creations can actually undermine culture and governance, and often have little solid legitimacy or workability. People become trapped in a distorted view of the past. Delegates agreed however that Indigenous ingenuity is able to generate more effective and credible solutions to all these concerns, than those coming from outside.

At the other extreme, in the highly pressured environment of negotiations there is the temptation to replace Indigenous collective participation and consensus decision-making with what Sacha McMeeking described as the “bare procedural legitimacy of democracy”. Leah Armstrong and Sacha McMeeking’s insights are especially relevant here. Governance solutions should not be set in concrete too early. New arrangements need some flexibility to enable adaptation, restless renewal and finessing to occur down the track. Miriam Jorgensen suggested that it might even be useful for nations and communities to actively set dates when they will revisit and review how they are governed. Some US Indian tribes are doing this through processes of revising their political constitutions and re-negotiating inter-governmental relations. Angela Wesley talked of how her nation has been thinking hard about ensuring their hereditary chiefs are respected and have the opportunity and time to consider what *they* want their roles and engagement to be in contemporary governing arrangements. Such processes mean their government continues to evolve.

9. BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER - NEXT STEPS AND COMMITMENTS

Delegates agreed that the conversations and connections that took shape at *Common Roots, Common Futures* were just a starting point, ones they wanted to continue and deepen. The consensus was that while Indigenous people from the four countries may be at different places in their transition from the rights to the challenges of governance and implementation, they share cherished cultural connections, experience common challenges, and can benefit greatly from sharing lessons, solutions and insights.

Sophie Pierre gave us the image that shaped our thinking about possible next steps. Our meeting together, she said, has been “like a tyre with its hub and spokes. We’ve got a hub group here (i.e. Harvard, NNI, and NCIS) who have organised this conference and given us the opportunity to talk together. The delegates here are the spokes with our links back to our nations, communities and organisations. Slowly we can start putting some rubber on the tyre to hit the road”.

In small group breakout sessions over the course of the final day, delegates gave considerable thought to practical recommendations that might help put that rubber on the road. These have been set out in summary below under key headings:

Suggested Issues for Follow-up

1. The Hub

The current hub has made a valuable contribution to creating connections between the Indigenous delegates and their institutions. The mix of practitioners and academics was an asset. The core group that currently constitutes the hub should continue as a working group and be tasked with following up suggestions and actions from the conference, including assessing the viability of the four country alliance, and formulating key projects for joint future activity across national boundaries.

The hub should upload the rapporteurs paper, the conference report, keynote presentations, delegates bios and overview paper so that all delegates can access them.

The hub should be expanded to include representatives from the four countries. Several delegates offered to be part of that process, and delegates also offered to take that issue back to their nations and communities to discuss.

Part of the hub’s expansion should come from including younger Indigenous people.

Expansion of the hub should not result in it becoming overly structured or formalised too soon. Its flexibility and workability are part of its advantage.

2. Information-sharing

An extremely valuable part of the conference was the sharing of practical insights and information about what works and what doesn’t, from real-life examples. Delegates were unanimous in wanting a communication portal and strategy to enable them to continue and expand the dialogue and sharing of information.

It is extremely important to identify and showcase Indigenous success and strengths within and across the four jurisdictions. Much of that information at the conference was new and thought provoking. Nations and communities will benefit greatly from having this kind of information more readily available to them.

The hub should explore ways to build on the existing sources of practical information available on the websites of NNI and the Udall Centre, the Harvard Project, NCIA, and Reconciliation Australia, and identify other sources/centres that can be networked and more widely publicised to Indigenous people.

Delegates were unanimous in wanting an online forum where they could log on and continue the dialogue. The hub should explore IT and telecommunications technology to support ongoing communication between delegates and with their nations and communities; including interactive, chat rooms, blogs, video clips and visual ways of presenting information, computer applications, Facebook pages, radio etc.

In collaboration with delegates, the hub should consider how to create a “Governance Watch Chatroom” as a space where delegates can connect up in real-time in order to exchange information, asks questions, share insights and identify new practical examples of what works. This could be done by establishing an electronic portal hosting a chatroom that is also linked to other key institutional websites.

To facilitate these and other recommendations, the hub should develop a broad-ranging communications strategy, which would include proposals for future conferences, exchanges by delegates, and development of resources such as briefing papers on commonly identified challenges/solutions across the four countries.

3. Collaboration and networking

The Tucson conference has created a hub and spokes group that could form the basis for a new Governance Knowledge Network.

It was agreed by all delegates that they wanted to mobilise the Indigenous connectivity across the four countries and use such networks to better communicate and reach out to their dispersed citizens in urban rural and remote regions.

There was talk of going global with the *Honouring Nations Awards*, to inspire others with governance best practice and solutions from across the four countries and wider.

Support Indigenous Governance websites across the four countries by providing copies of ground-breaking strategies, governance protocols, policies, templates, regulations, and intra-Indigenous alliances and agreements so that others can learn from them, and adapt them to suit their own circumstances.

Work together to develop up a Case Study Template that could be used to capture important lessons about what works in the four countries.

Link to other existing forums and institutions with this initiative (eg host a delegation to coincide with the Native American Finance Officers Association or other technical forums to spread information and insights, but most importantly to build relationships and trust between our Indigenous nations).

4. Education and Capacity building

Expand and develop the various governance databases so we have robust information and best-practice evidence to work with.

Collectively continue to support education and training initiatives at the community, nation and international levels that focus on governance best practice.

This could include the establishment of University degree programs in Indigenous Governance that have international portability across different Universities, offering international exchanges, and cross-University course units. This could become the basis for a virtual platform of Indigenous educational degree/programs/distance learning that engage the most experienced, highly regarded practitioners and academics.

Encourage and develop options for nation-building exchanges and secondments.

Delegates noted that capacity building always seems easier to do when another nation or organisation has done it. So it is important to share realistic information and ideas about real-life situations, and to be upfront about the real challenges, as well as workable solutions.

5. Delegates Commitments

Take the messages home and share knowledge and insights from the Conference, including about the need to engage in building and strengthening governance.

Support future exchanges and mentoring relationships amongst delegates.

Actively maintain the connections made in Tucson and take those back and deepen them into their own networks. Reach beyond their own networks to spread the message about building governance and Indigenous collaboration.

Be realistic about what can be done back in home communities: contribute locally, one community at a time.

Continue to contribute and share information and insights about common challenges and best practice at a national and international level.

Target and encourage local youth with mentoring, invest in their skills and energies, and provide them with real opportunities to become engaged in the work of building governance.

6. How could a Future Conference be improved?

(Suggestions from Evaluation Sheets)

At a future conference, delegates would appreciate an even greater focus on hearing about practical case studies from each country that highlighted positive strategies and solutions, including for specific thematic areas and challenges identified in Tucson. Their suggestions for improving the next conference included

- A bit more space for project-specific presentations that might be useful for others eg; NNI's governance database, Reconciliation Australia's Governance Toolkit.
- Have a short break-out session for each nation to internally discuss their action items and next steps and how they will make this real at home.
- Ironically, more time to present on our various countries.
- Focus on what we have done since the last meeting.
- Focus on specific issues eg; resolution of overlapping claims; mechanisms for collaboration; per capita issues; strategic alliances; future planning.
- More free flowing plenary discussions, and further work on the key problems and challenges identified in this forum.
- Specific presentations on examples of lessons learned in areas of economic development
- Information and presentations on local initiatives on business investment
- Spend more time recruiting the presenters and participants outside those connected with the host institutions. We must have more political leaders; for the US someone from NCAI
- Perhaps more opportunity for preparations, and to bring and visually share case studies
- More thematic work - one of the breakout groups mentioned this – it's a great idea. They are more focused and practice-related, and it creates policy research findings.
- More analytic time; more time creating, reading and reacting to themes. Daily rapporteur reports?

