



Canadian Northern Economic  
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de  
développement économique du Nord

Evaluation of the  
**Strategic Investments in  
Northern Economic Development**  
Program

2012-2013 to 2016-2017

Final Report

April 2018

## **Acknowledgments**

The Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (CanNor) would like to thank all of the key informants and survey participants who generously gave of their time and knowledge to contribute to the evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development program. Without their participation and their insights, this report would not have been possible. CanNor also acknowledges the work done by R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. who was contracted to conduct this evaluation.

**Published by** Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (CanNor)

**[www.cannor.gc.ca](http://www.cannor.gc.ca)**

©Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development and the Minister responsible for CanNor, 2018.

**Catalog** : R108-7/2018E-PDF

**ISBN** : 978-0-660-27156-9

**Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre** : *Évaluation du programme Investissements stratégiques dans le développement économique du Nord (2012-2013 à 2016-2017)*.

---

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) program is CanNor's largest funding program and the Agency's primary tool for delivery on its Northern economic development mandate. The SINED program aims to help foster the conditions for long-term sustainable economic development in the North by strengthening the territorial driver sectors, the economic base of each territory, and Northerners' ability to take advantage of economic opportunities.

The SINED program provides up to \$18.2 million annually in contributions, and is delivered on a project-by-project basis through a continuous intake process. Approval authority resides with the Minister responsible for CanNor and approved funding flows directly using CanNor's authority: *Contributions for promoting regional development in Canada's three territories*.

The SINED program was designed to achieve immediate, intermediate, and long-term outcomes as a result of SINED project investments. Specifically, the Performance Measurement Strategy outlines nine interrelated outcomes anticipated by the program:

- Immediate Outcomes
  - Expanded publicly accessible information (i.e., knowledge products)
  - Expanded multi-user infrastructure
  - Access to capital
  - Increased ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities
  - Partnerships established with Northern governments and organizations
- Intermediate Outcomes
  - Private sector growth
  - Growth of key economic drivers
  - Increased economic development and diversification
- Long-term Outcomes
  - Strong, stable territorial economies for the benefit of Northerners and all Canadians

R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. ('Malatest') was contracted by CanNor to conduct an evaluation of SINED, assessing the relevance, performance and efficiency of the SINED program over a five-year period (2012/2013 fiscal year to the 2016/2017 fiscal year). Specifically, the evaluation reviewed the relevance and need for economic development programs in the North, the impact of SINED on economic development in the North, the efficiency of SINED and any unintended outcomes. The evaluation also identified key issues for consideration by CanNor.

The study utilized multiple lines of evidence to support the evaluation of the SINED program including:

- A literature review using existing literature and statistical data sources which informed the relevance and need for economic development programs in the North;
-

- 
- Onsite file review at each of the CanNor regional offices (Yellowknife, Iqaluit and Whitehorse) where the Evaluation team gathered data on project outputs and outcomes (28% of total project files reviewed);
  - Administrative data review using sources provided by CanNor to evaluate SINED impacts;
  - Input-output analysis to assess the direct, indirect and induced impacts of SINED investments by sector across the three regions (Northwest Territories, Yukon and Nunavut);
  - Key informant interviews with nine CanNor staff, ten funding recipients, and four territorial government stakeholders to gain more in-depth understanding of SINED relevance, impact and efficiency;
  - An online survey with 39 funding proponents to support a broader sample of funding proponents included in the evaluation, and better understanding of project outputs, outcomes, and SINED efficiency; and
  - Sector case studies which provided in-depth analysis of the impacts of SINED investments in clean technology, fisheries, geosciences and tourism.

Limitations and challenges were noted during the evaluation process. First, the sample size used to recruit key informant interviewees and survey respondents was small (n=98). This list included proponents who are funded by SINED over multiple funding terms, limiting the recruitment pool for this evaluation. Funding proponents may have also experienced fatigue due to other CanNor data collection activities taking place during the evaluation timeline. Other challenges included the lack of aggregate reporting of performance measurement indicators within and across regions. Malatest utilized existing aggregate performance measurement data but this was only available for the 2009-2015 period. Malatest triangulated all lines of evidence to mitigate these challenges.

## **Findings**

It is important to note territorial contexts that may have informed the findings in this report. Each territorial office has differences in operations and program delivery, influencing the types of projects being funded in each region (e.g., different operational structures, different project file systems). Focus on economic diversity also differed across the territories. The three territories were among the five least diversified economies (by province/territory) in Canada. Each territory reportedly focused on different projects due to their economic drivers and environmental context. Overall, the territories experienced unique challenges and limited infrastructure compared to the South that impacted economic development and diversification.

## **Relevance**

The SINED program aims to address a need for economic development in the North while also aligning with Government of Canada priorities and CanNor strategic objectives. Territorial economies are largely driven by natural resource extraction and development projects, which contribute considerably to Canada's economic growth but are prone to boom-and-bust cycles. The territories face challenges in diversifying their economies for a robust, sustainable future and territorial businesses reportedly lack

---

---

the tools they need to leverage economic potential. The shortage of local workers and the high cost of business in the territories due to their geographical expanse and distance from major urban centres pose barriers to economic development. Within this context, the SINED program operates with the goal of strengthening key drivers of Northern economies and promoting sustainable, diversified economies in the territories.<sup>1</sup>

Aligning with the Federal priorities, the SINED program goals highlight economic diversification and sustainable economic development. Furthermore, the SINED program responded to the Government of Canada priority areas of innovation and clean technology by putting out an innovation and clean technology-targeted Expression of Interest in 2016. The SINED program also aligned with the federal priority to support growth and partnerships with Indigenous communities through the *Program Guidelines* which support projects that benefit Indigenous peoples and increase community capacity by providing expert advice/training in the area of economic and business development.

CanNor key informants agreed that SINED aligned with federal priority areas and filled a need for economic development programs in the North. They reported that the federal government had a role in developing the economies in the North, noting the need to maintain funding earmarked for economic development so it would not be spent on competing territorial priorities (e.g., healthcare).

## Performance

The SINED program is intended to promote economic development through: expansion of publicly-accessible information; expansion of multi-user infrastructure; promoted ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities; increased partnerships amongst Northern organizations and governments; and increased access to capital.

The SINED program appears to promote publicly accessible information as most projects produced knowledge products that are publicly available. Between 2009 and 2015, SINED-funded projects (n=567) produced 85 new maps, 21,375 new data set files, 203 new reports or papers, and 230 conference presentations or posters, and 24 graduate theses. More than one-third (36%) of survey respondents and most key informants reported knowledge products as a project outcome. Further, there may be more publically accessible information pieces that were produced or presented after the SINED-funded project ended.

Few SINED projects result in the expansion of multi-user infrastructure. Less than one-quarter (21%, n=8) of survey respondents and zero key informants reported that their project outcomes included public-use infrastructure. Most CanNor, territorial government and funded key informants reported that SINED did not have the large budgets necessary to support Northern infrastructure projects, or the

---

<sup>1</sup> Southcott, C., & Irlbacher-Fox, S. (2009). *Changing Northern Economies: Helping Northern Communities Build a Sustainable Future*. Northern Development Ministers Forum. Retrieved from [http://www.focusnorth.ca/documents/english/library/2010/changing\\_northern\\_economies.pdf](http://www.focusnorth.ca/documents/english/library/2010/changing_northern_economies.pdf)

---

---

ability to fund projects for terms long enough to see such impacts. Instead, SINED-funded infrastructure projects supported opportunities for infrastructure development that may occur in the future. Specifically, SINED funded infrastructure studies (\$6,007,814 between 2012/2013-2014/2015) which may lead to infrastructure projects in the future.

Increasing the ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities was another SINED outcome for which minimal impacts were seen within the evaluation period. While two-thirds (64%) of survey respondents and most key informants reported that their SINED-funded projects created or will create jobs for Northerners, it was not possible to determine how many jobs were created. Also, most key informants from all stakeholder groups (CanNor, territorial government and funding proponents) noted that the majority of jobs would be created beyond the lifespan of SINED-funded projects. SINED funding reportedly created some jobs for Northerners, however, it was anticipated that significantly more jobs for Northerners would be created, some by recruiting talent from the South who might subsequently relocate to the North.

SINED funding also appeared to impact relationships between funding proponents and CanNor. Almost one-half (41%) of respondents reported that their relationship had improved as a result of the SINED program. CanNor key informants also reported increased partnerships between CanNor, funding proponents and governments, noting that this was necessary to account for the large turnover in CanNor and territorial government staff in the North.

SINED-funding is intended to increase access to capital for Northern economic development projects. Between 2015/2016 and 2016/2017, for every SINED dollar invested, 96 cents was leveraged from other organizations or sources including territorial governments, private sector and others. Most CanNor staff, government stakeholders and funding proponents reported that SINED funding instilled confidence in other investors. Over one-half (58%) of survey respondents reported that obtaining SINED funding helped them secure additional capital. Key informants across sectors noted the importance of federal support through SINED funding because it provided “credibility” or “validation” for their projects, and may act as a trigger for other investors. Approximately one-half (46%) of survey respondents and most key informants reported that their project would not have proceeded without SINED funding or would have proceeded in a reduced capacity.

### **Economic Impact Analysis**

SINED-funded projects did contribute to economic growth in the North. Using an input-output approach, it is estimated that during the period from 2009 to 2014 (more recent data was unavailable), SINED investments totaled approximately \$78.8 million (in constant 2013 dollars). Based on this approach, it is estimated that each \$1 million invested by SINED generated \$1.71 million in total output when including direct, indirect, and induced impacts. It is further estimated that each \$1 million invested by SINED yielded \$2.20 million in GDP (in constant 2013 dollars) as well as supported significant employment, including 18 person-years of employment, when considering direct, indirect and induced impacts.

---

---

## **Efficiency/Effectiveness**

All key informants and approximately two-thirds (64%) of survey respondents reported challenges with the SINED program, related to the application process (28%), approval process (39%), funding cycle (26%) and reporting requirements (23%). Application and approval processes have reportedly been too slow, resulting in project delays or very short windows for completing the approved work. CanNor key informants also reported confusion in approval requirements and the rating scale used, also noting unclear definitions of what qualifies as “innovation”, or the extent of “clean technology”. Most importantly, there was a lack of a consistent understanding as what projects and proponent groups were eligible for SINED funding (e.g., is a project for a private for-profit business eligible) and whether repayable loans should be managed through SINED. Both CanNor and funding proponent key informants noted the need for examples of what can and cannot be funded through SINED. In regards to funding cycles, the majority of key informants noted that two year funding cycles limited long-term planning and did not accurately reflect project timelines. Finally, funding proponents and CanNor staff also noted challenges in reporting requirements. Funding proponents from key informant interviews and the survey noted challenges with the amount of work required when both CanNor and territorial governments are funders, as both tend to invest in the same projects, and each funder can have different reporting requirements. CanNor key informants also reported a need to clarify the types of outcomes required in reporting, ensuring they are realistic, reasonable and inform the success of the project.

## **Recommendations**

By triangulating the results of the file review, case studies, key informant interviews, and survey data, the evaluation of SINED identified key considerations that CanNor may consider to advance the program:

- Implement two application intake periods throughout the year for designated amounts;
  - Develop longer funding agreements or A-base program funding to allow long-term project funding;
  - Develop more defined funding guidelines to ensure more consistent understanding of eligible projects across the territories;
  - Review and define the performance measurement indicators to make them more appropriate;
  - Develop a reporting template to support consistent reporting and easier tracking of SINED outputs;
  - Develop a database to track project outputs and outcomes by region;
  - Consider delegating levels of project approval to increase efficiency of the approval process; and
  - Consider allowing approved project funds to be rolled over from one year to the next if they are not expensed in the year allocated.
-

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	ii
SECTION 1: Background .....	1
1.2 Expected Outcomes .....	2
SECTION 2: Evaluation Objectives .....	3
SECTION 3: Methodology .....	3
3.1 Literature Review.....	3
3.2 File Review.....	4
3.2.1 Input-Output Analysis .....	4
3.3 Key Informant Interviews.....	5
3.4 Case Studies.....	6
3.5 Funding Recipient Survey.....	6
3.5.1 Survey Design and Recruitment.....	6
3.5.2 Survey Completions .....	7
3.6 Methodological Limitations.....	8
SECTION 4: Findings.....	9
4.1 Territorial Context .....	9
4.2 Relevance .....	9
4.2.1 Need for SINED .....	10
4.2.2 Alignment with Government Priorities .....	11
4.2.3 Role for the Federal Government .....	13
4.3 Performance .....	13
4.3.1 Publicly Accessible Information .....	13
4.3.2 Expansion of Multi-User Infrastructure.....	15
4.3.3 Ability of Northerners to Respond to Economic Development Opportunities .....	15
4.3.4 Increased Partnerships Amongst Northern Organizations and Governments .....	16
4.3.5 Access to Capital .....	16
4.3.6 Input-Output Analysis .....	17
4.4 Efficiency/Effectiveness .....	20
4.4.1 Unintended Outcomes .....	21
SECTION 5: Conclusions and Recommendations .....	21

---

---

5.1 Recommendations..... 23

**APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A: Evaluation Plan

APPENDIX B: Literature Review

APPENDIX C: Key Informant Interview Guides

APPENDIX D: Funding Proponent Survey Tool

APPENDIX E: Funding Proponent Survey Frequently Asked Questions



## SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

The Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) program is an economic development contribution program whose aim is to help foster the conditions for long-term sustainable economic development in the North. The program's goals are to strengthen:

1. The driver sectors of the territorial economies;
2. The economic base of each territory; and
3. Northerners' ability to take advantage of economic opportunities.

The SINED program is CanNor's largest funding program and the Agency's primary tool for delivering on its regional economic development mandate. Between 2004 and 2015, the Government of Canada provided over \$188,000,000 in funding to over 1,000 projects across the North through the SINED program.

The SINED program is delivered on a project-by-project basis across the North through a continuous intake process, which is supplemented by calls for expressions of interest. The SINED program aims to be responsive to various priorities, such as the Government of Canada's Innovation and Growth Agenda. The SINED program provides up to \$18.2 million annually in contributions, which includes \$1.2 million in A-Base funding. The breakdown of sources of funds for the SINED program over the past five years is shown in Table 1.1.

**Table 1.1 Cost, Funding Requirements and Source of Funds for the SINED Program**

	Fiscal Year						Total
	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	
Operating Expenditures (B-Based)	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$18,000,000
B-Based Contributions	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$102,000,000
A-Based Contributions	\$1,157,000	\$1,157,000	\$1,157,000	\$1,157,000	\$1,157,000	\$1,157,000	\$6,942,000
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$21,157,000</b>	<b>\$21,157,000</b>	<b>\$21,157,000</b>	<b>\$21,157,000</b>	<b>\$21,157,000</b>	<b>\$21,157,000</b>	<b>\$126,942,000</b>

Source: SINED Administrative Documents

The SINED program is delivered by CanNor, the agency that has the responsibility to review individual SINED-funded projects and recommend them for funding. Approval authority resides with the Minister responsible for CanNor. Approved funding flows directly using CanNor's authority: *Contributions for promoting regional development in Canada's three territories*. Policy parameters for the implementation and administration of the SINED program are outlined for SINED's Terms and Conditions and its Management Control Framework. The program's logic model and indicators, as identified in the Performance Measurement Strategy, are intended to support the program's direction, data collection instruments, as well as the program goals, outputs and ultimate outcome.

Roles and responsibilities related to monitoring and reporting of the SINED program are consistent with CanNor's *Management Control Framework for Grants and Contributions*. Responsibilities are shared across the regional offices, the Director General (DG) of Operations, and the Policy Unit. An overview of responsibilities for the SINED program is shown in Table 1.2.

**Table 1.2 Overview of SINED Responsibilities Across CanNor**

CanNor Office	Responsibility
Regional Offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Determining applicant's eligibility, assessing the project against SINED Terms and Conditions, and recommending funding levels based on SINED's Management Control Framework and Guidelines;</li> <li>- Drafting funding arrangements for approved projects; and</li> <li>- Collecting, reviewing and approving recipients reports based on reporting requirements detailed in the contribution agreement.</li> </ul>
DG of Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collecting, aggregating, tracking and disseminating data across the three regional offices on project:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Applications received, approved or rejected</li> <li>o Progress, expenditures and results</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Informing CanNor management of performance, financial results and program level risks;</li> <li>- Reporting to CanNor management of aggregated data per the Performance Management framework; and</li> <li>- Monitoring the consistent application of program requirements.</li> </ul>
Policy Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring and reviewing program performance measurement reports and recommending amendments to the program performance measurement strategy as needed; and</li> <li>- Coordinating the program's evaluation.</li> </ul>

Source: SINED administrative data

## **1.2 Expected Outcomes**

The SINED program was designed to achieve immediate, intermediate, and long-term outcomes as a result of SINED project investments. The program's logic model, as found in the Performance Measurement Strategy, outlines nine diverse and interrelated outcomes:

- Immediate Outcomes
  - o Expanded publicly accessible information (i.e., knowledge products)
  - o Expanded multi-user infrastructure
  - o Access to capital
  - o Increased ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities
  - o Partnerships established with Northern governments and organizations
- Intermediate Outcomes
  - o Private sector growth
  - o Growth of key economic drivers
  - o Increased economic development and diversification
- Long-term Outcomes
  - o Strong, stable territorial economies for the benefit of Northerners and all Canadians

---

These outcomes informed the development of the evaluation objectives, as well as the analysis and reporting of evaluation results.

## **SECTION 2: EVALUATION OBJECTIVES**

---

R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. ('Malatest') was contracted by CanNor to conduct an evaluation, assessing the relevance, performance and efficiency of the SINED program over a five-year period (2012/2013 fiscal year to the 2016/2017 fiscal year). Specifically, the evaluation undertook the following tasks related to assessing and measuring the success of SINED:

- Evaluated the relevance and need for economic development programs in the North;
- Evaluated the impact of SINED funding on economic development in the North;
- Evaluated the efficiency of SINED;
- Identified unintended outcomes; and
- Identified issues for consideration.

The evaluation was informed by the Evaluation Plan, which outlines the evaluation questions, indicators, measures, research methods, and source of information. The Evaluation Plan can be found in Appendix A.

## **SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY**

---

The study utilized many lines of evidence to support the evaluation of the SINED program, including a literature review, file review, key informant interviews, case studies, and a funding recipient survey.

### **3.1 Literature Review**

A literature review was conducted using existing data sources, including literature and statistical data. The Evaluation team accessed publicly available data for all years dating from 2012/2013, as per the time frame of reference for the evaluation. The review explored existing literature to inform the relevance and need for economic development programs in the North. Specifically, the literature review considered information related to:

- Current economic climate, including several GDP measures and economic diversification;
- Legal and jurisdictional considerations to identify whether the mandate and scope of SINED aligned with federal/territorial divisions of responsibilities;
- Changes in federal, territorial, and Indigenous government powers and priorities since 2012/13, and whether these changes had an impact on the relevance of SINED's activities;
- Changes in international demand for mining exports from Canada's North, including the impact that change to major trade agreements may have on these demands; and

- 
- Remote and regional development programs and policy approaches in other circumpolar regions and nations, to identify best practices and points of comparison to Canada's approach through SINED.

The literature review can be found in Appendix B.

### **3.2 File Review**

The administrative data review was used to identify evaluation questions related to the impact of the program on economic investment in the North, and the economy and efficiency of the program. Two members of the consulting team traveled to the CanNor regional offices in Yellowknife, Iqaluit, and Whitehorse to review paper files. The Evaluation team was onsite for 3-5 days in each location. Of the 328 projects funded between 2012/2013 and 2016/2017, 91 (28%) project files were reviewed. File review supplemented project information provided by CanNor, which included:

- Fiscal year funding was received;
- Region (NWT, Yukon or Nunavut);
- Funding recipient;
- SINED program funded under;
- NAICS coding;
- Target industry;
- Whether the recipient was an Indigenous organization or not;
- Organization type; and
- Geography (local, territorial, pan-territorial, regional or extra-territorial).

Malatest reviewed documents dating back to the 2012/13 fiscal year to the greatest extent possible; however, some documents from past years were unavailable. Additionally, final reports were not always available in project files. Malatest requested electronic versions where available to support file review. In some cases, documents could not be retrieved because they had not yet been submitted by funding proponents. This was especially the case for projects funded in the 2016/2017 fiscal year.

#### **3.2.1 Input-Output Analysis**

Malatest also reviewed total SINED funding invested by sector to conduct an input-output analysis. Input-output (IO) measures the impacts of spending within one sector throughout the economy. IO estimates the total impact of a given expenditure and how that expenditure “rippled” through other sectors. The IO model estimates three types of impacts: direct, indirect and induced. Direct impacts are the initial change in expenditures (e.g., constructing and opening a mine). Direct effects on GDP, jobs, and imports are also associated with direct impact. Indirect impacts measure the changes due to inter-industry purchases as they respond to the new demands of the directly affected industries. These are the impacts on other sectors that would not occur but for the initial change in expenditures (e.g., suppliers of the mine purchasing goods and services or hiring workers). Finally, induced impacts

measure changes in the production of goods and services in response to consumer expenditures induced at the household level generated by the production of direct and indirect requirements.

To support the IO analysis, CanNor provided Malatest with the total dollars invested per sector. Malatest reviewed the CanNor identified sector and re-coded them using NAICS coding. The recoded sectors are shown in Table 3.1. The matched NAICS coding was used to identify and apply the appropriate Statistics Canada multipliers to estimate the direct, indirect, and induced impacts of SINED funding by sector. It should be noted that financial data was available for the period from 2009 to 2014. All expenditure data was converted to constant 2013 dollars to align with the 2013 input-output model used.

**Table 3.1 Sector Investments Made by SINED, by CanNor-identified Sectors and NAICS Coding**

CanNor Identified Sector	NAICS Coding
Agriculture	Crop And Animal Production
Arts And Culture	Information And Cultural Activities
Connectivity	Utilities
Energy	Mining, Quarrying, And Oil And Gas Extraction
Mining	
Fisheries +	Fishing, Hunting And Trapping
Hunting and Trapping	
Forest Sector and Bioenergy	Forestry And Logging
Infrastructure	Engineering Construction
Miscellaneous	Other Territorial Government Services
Pan-Territorial	
SMES Support	Professional, Scientific And Technical Services
Tourism *	Arts, Entertainment and Recreation
	Advertising, Promotion, Meals, Entertainment, And Travel

**Source:** SINED Administrative Data and the *North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Canada 2012* (Statistics Canada).

\*Due to the types of tourism projects funded by SINED, a 'blended' industry was used to estimate impact. 50% of CanNor investments in tourism were assigned to the NAICS code, Arts, Entertainment and Recreation, and 50% were assigned to the NAICS code, Advertising, Promotion, Meals, Entertainment and Travel.

### **3.3 Key Informant Interviews**

Malatest conducted indepth key informant interviews with representatives from three SINED stakeholder groups: funding proponents, CanNor staff, and government staff. Interviews were conducted between June and September 2017. Malatest developed three interview guides, one for each stakeholder group, which were approved by CanNor. Guides were semi-structured, containing mostly open-ended questions on a range of issues related to program relevance, effectiveness, efficiencies and unintended outcomes (Appendix C). The use of a guide ensured that all interviewees within each

---

stakeholder groups were asked consistent questions, and all issues of relevance to the evaluation were adequately covered.

CanNor provided Malatest with a list of 98 funding proponents to recruitment from. Malatest identified a sample of 21 key informants, including nine CanNor staff, ten funding recipients, and four territorial government stakeholders. Malatest send an email invitation to the selected individuals, with a CanNor signed letter describing the study attached. One funding proponent and one government staff did not respond to the request to participate in the interview. The remaining key informants were scheduling for a phone or onsite interview. Eight CanNor staff, two funding proponent and one territorial government stakeholder interviews were held onsite at the CanNor regional offices. The remaining interviews were conducted over the phone. Key informants were sent a copy of the interview guide in preparation for the interview. The interviews were recorded for note taking purposes. Malatest conducted qualitative analysis of the interview data. Data was thematically organized by evaluation theme (relevance, performance, efficiency/effectiveness). Where necessary, Malatest followed-up with key informants to seek clarification on interview notes.

### **3.4 Case Studies**

Malatest conducted four case studies as part of the evaluation of the SINED program. Each case study reviewed a sector supported by SINED investments and reported on the relevance, performance and impact of SINED funding on the sector. Each case included an in-depth review of administrative documents, project files, and key informant interviews with funding proponents and CanNor staff to assess the impacts of each project's outputs on progress towards SINED goals. Malatest conducted case studies on the following sectors:

- Clean Technology;
- Fisheries;
- Geoscience; and
- Toursim.

### **3.5 Funding Recipient Survey**

#### **3.5.1 Survey Design and Recruitment**

Malatest also conducted a survey with representatives of projects that received funding from SINED between 2012/2013 and 2016/2017 to gather information about how SINED funding impacted the project progress and outcomes.

In consultation with CanNor, Malatest developed an online survey instrument that included questions regarding aspects of SINED-funded project progress. This included questions about leveraged funding, timelines for project completion, project outputs, impacts, and challenges with SINED. A draft survey was developed by Malatest, and shared with CanNor for review and approval (Appendix D).

CanNor provided Malatest with contact information of project representatives, including email addresses and/or phone numbers. All representatives with emails addresses were sent a preliminary letter from CanNor regional offices informing them of the study and the upcoming survey. Respondents then received an email invitation from Malatest with a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document attached (Appendix E). The FAQ included additional information about the study, details on how their privacy would be protected, and a link with login credentials to complete the survey online. Malatest sent two follow-up emails to respondents who had not yet responded to the email invitation. Regional offices were requested to send out a final reminder email to all respondents requesting they complete the survey if they had not done so already. Finally, Malatest conducted follow-up phone calls with respondents who had not yet completed the survey and where phone numbers were available. The survey was active for a total of four weeks, and the close date was extended over one weekend. The timeline of the survey is shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2 Timeline of Funding Proponent Survey**

Action	Date
Initial email sent by CanNor regional offices	September 5, 2017
Invitation email sent by Malatest	September 7, 2017
Follow-up email #1 sent by Malatest	September 14, 2017
Follow-up email #2 sent by Malatest	September 18, 2017
Malatest requested CanNor regional offices to send reminder email to all respondents	September 21, 2017
Follow-up phone calls conducted by Malatest	September 26-28, 2017
Initial survey close date	September 29, 2017
Extended survey close date	November 2, 2017

### 3.5.2 Survey Completions

CanNor provided Malatest with a list of 98 unique funding proponents from across the three territories to recruit for the online survey. However, emails were only available for 90 cases (92% of original cases). Email invitations to participate in the survey were sent to all 90 cases.

Of the 90 cases invited to participate in the survey, 43 did not respond. An additional twelve cases did not move past the web introduction or the first question, one case unsubscribed, and three cases did not move past question three. Therefore, the number of surveys completed was 39 (42% valid response rate). This is the valid number of survey completes analyzed in this report.

When looking at the respondents who completed the survey, one-half (51%) were from Yukon and approximately one-quarter were from Nunavut (28%) and NWT (21%). Over one-third of survey respondents were funded in 2012/2013 (36%) or 2013/2014 (41%). One-half (51%) of respondents had received SINED funding over two or more funding periods and over one-third (44%) had received funding over three or more funding periods. Most respondents reported that their most recent SINED-funded project was 'in progress' (e.g., data collection or analysis phase) or 'completed' (e.g., final reports submitted). More than one-third (39%) of respondents reported their relationship with CanNor as 'positive'.

---

### **3.6 Methodological Limitations**

Limitations and challenges were noted during the evaluation process. This section outlines those limitations and the mitigation strategies used by Malatest.

First, the sample size used to recruit key informant interviews and survey respondents was small (n=98). Further, a single recruitment list was provided for both methodologies. Although there were more projects funded within the evaluation period, many funding proponents received funding over multiple years, limiting the number of potential respondents for the key informant interviews or the survey. This limited the recruitment pool for these lines of evidence. Malatest was cautious to not over-recruit key informants from this sample to avoid fatigue, noting that funding proponents may be less likely to complete the survey if they were also recruited to participate in a key informant interview. Recruitment for key informant interviews also occurred during the summer months, which is a common time for individuals to be away in the North. Key informant recruitment spanned two months due to these challenges. Funding proponents may have also experienced fatigue due to other CanNor data collection activities taking place during the evaluation timeline. Key SINED stakeholders were also being recruited to take part in CanNor round tables while Malatest was recruiting for key informant interviews and the survey.

Due to the small number of survey completes survey findings should be interpreted with extreme caution. Numbers were too small to allow crosstabs by informative variables, such as target industry. Furthermore, generalizations of reported findings cannot be made to all funding proponents. To mitigate this, Malatest triangulated survey findings with file review, case studies, and interview data.

Other challenges in the study included variations in reports and project files across the CanNor regional offices. The consulting team noted that every office utilized different file management systems, resulting in the need to 're-learn' project files on each site visit. Variations in reporting also resulted in different types of information being reported across offices and across projects within offices, limiting the direct comparisons that could be done by region. Further, many project files did not contain project reports. These were requested electronically, delaying review of final reports to after site visits.

Finally, the consulting team noted the lack of aggregate reporting within and across regions. Instead, individual project files needed to be reviewed to understand SINED project impacts. Regional offices did not appear to track performance measurement indicators. Malatest did utilize existing aggregate performance measurement data but this was only available for the 2009/2010, 2011/2012, and 2013/2014 fiscal years. Malatest utilized key informant interviews and the funding proponent survey to further explore the impacts of SINED funding on economic development in the North.

---

## SECTION 4: FINDINGS

---

The evaluation assessed the relevance, impact and economy/efficiency of the SINED program in regards to economic development in the North. This section outlines the key evaluation findings as they align with the SINED program intended outcomes (See Section 1.2) by triangulating literature review, case study, key informant interview and survey data.

### **4.1 Territorial Context**

Through interviews with CanNor staff and project file reviews, the evaluation team noted many differences between the regional offices. It is important to note these differences as they may have informed the findings of the evaluation. First, there were noted differences in operational structure and how program guidelines were interpreted by CanNor staff. This resulted in different roles being played by program officers and management across offices, as well as different types of projects being funded in each territory.

Different territorial contexts also resulted in different types of projects being funded in each territory. CanNor staff frequently noted that territories had different economic drivers. For example, fishing was a key economic driver in Nunavut with \$3,117,082 of SINED dollars invested between 2009 and 2014. SINED investment in fisheries was significantly less in Yukon (\$74,200) and non-existent in NWT (\$0). Forestry, however, was a largely supported sector in Yukon (\$1,236,147) and NWT (\$3,267,375) compared to Nunavut (\$0).

Focus on economic diversity also differed across territories. The three territories were among the five least diversified economies (by province/territory) in Canada, joined by Alberta and Newfoundland. From 2011 to 2015, the economic diversity index for the territories consistently lagged Canada's overall index by a statistically significant amount.<sup>2</sup> CanNor key informants reported that each territory focused on different projects due to their economic drivers and environmental context. Some territories were more advanced and innovative than others in certain sectors. Overall, the territories experienced unique challenges and limited infrastructure compared to the South that reduced the prioritization of economic diversification.

The remaining sections of the report will assess the evaluation findings as they align with the key evaluation themes: Relevance, Performance and Impact.

### **4.2 Relevance**

The SINED programs aims to address a need for economic development programs in the North while also aligning with Government of Canada priorities and CanNor strategic objectives. The evaluation assessed whether there is a need for the SINED program, how it aligns with federal priorities and

whether there was a legitimate, appropriate, and necessary role for the federal government to play in Northern economic development.

#### 4.2.1 Need for SINED

Territorial economies are largely driven by natural resource extraction and development projects.<sup>2</sup> Projects that extract and develop these resource deposits contribute considerably to Canada's overall economic growth, as well as locally to the communities and territories where they are situated in. While these large-scale resource-based projects have the potential to generate large amounts of wealth for the territories, the resource dependency of these economies in the North are prone to boom-and-bust cycles. Within this context, the SINED program operates with the goal of strengthening key drivers of Northern economies and promoting sustainable, diversified economies in the territories.<sup>3</sup>

There is a demonstrated need for economic development programs in the North. Changes in gross domestic product (GDP) since 2012 have shown great variability among the territories, and among sectors. Across all industries, Yukon showed a moderate contraction in 2015 in comparison to 2014 (-5.95%), and the Northwest Territories and Nunavut showed slowed growth (+1.30% and +1.22%, respectively).<sup>3</sup> However, overall since 2012 all three territories have shown modest to large GDP growth: Yukon, +3.07%; Northwest Territories +9.14%; and Nunavut, +14.24%.<sup>3</sup> In some cases, total GDP growth between 2012 and 2016 was comparable (Yukon, NWT) to the provinces. When assessing GDP growth across provinces and territories with similar economic diversity index scores, Yukon's GDP growth was on par while NWT and Nunavut's GDP growth was greater.

Despite promising GDP growth in the North, the territories still face challenges in diversifying their economies for a robust, sustainable future. In 2012, the economic diversity index for the North was 88.42 (compared to 93.03 for all of Canada); in 2015 this had shown very little change, at 89.05. In all three territories, the two largest sectors were public administration, and mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction. In 2015, information and cultural industries in the territories represented between two and three percent of the total GDP in each of the territories, and agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting represented less than one percent of the total GDP in each territory.

When looking at unemployment rates, unemployment rates were comparable or lower than the national average in NWT (7.4%) and Yukon (5.6%). However, Nunavut had the highest unemployment rate in Canada (14.9% compared to the national average of 7.0%).<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2014). *Northern Economic Diversification Index* (report). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency. Retrieved from <http://www.cannor.gc.ca/eng/1388762115125/1388762170542>

<sup>3</sup> Southcott, C., & Irlbacher-Fox, S. (2009). *Changing Northern Economies: Helping Northern Communities Build a Sustainable Future*. Northern Development Ministers Forum. Retrieved from [http://www.focusnorth.ca/documents/english/library/2010/changing\\_northern\\_economies.pdf](http://www.focusnorth.ca/documents/english/library/2010/changing_northern_economies.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Statistics Canada. (2016). Table 379-0030 Gross domestic product at basic prices, by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), provinces and territories, annual. <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&id=3790030>

<sup>5</sup> The unemployment rate is the unemployed expressed as a percentage of the labour force in that group.

---

Furthermore, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce reported that territorial businesses lack the tools they need to leverage economic potential. The shortage of local workers and the “cost creep” of business in the territories due to their geographical expanse and distance from major urban centres pose barriers to economic development. The territories have less infrastructure development than the south, large geographical areas, small populations, expensive energy, and high cost of consumer goods. A report of the Top Ten Barriers noted that territorial businesses need infrastructure funding and investments, and the ability to attract and retain talent.<sup>6</sup> There is a required commitment by the federal government to address these barriers to support economic development in the North by enhancing infrastructure and subsequently, making the territories more attractive to potential employees.<sup>3,7</sup>

Key informants from CanNor and funding proponents reported similar challenges with economic diversification in the North. Harsher climates and the high energy costs were commonly referenced challenges. Additionally, key informants from Nunavut and NWT reported a lack of existing infrastructure which limited the readiness of the territories for economic diversification.

The demonstrated growth of the territories, and the identified barriers to economic development and diversification, support the continuation of economic development programs which promote the growth of Northern economies.

#### **4.2.2 Alignment with Government Priorities**

The SINED program is intended to align with the Government of Canada priorities. Under the previous Government, the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (CanNor) was created, followed shortly by the Northern Projects Management Office. These agencies were created to help promote, focus, and improve the efficiency of major project development and implementation in the North. CanNor programs were intended to align with the Agency’s strategic objective to develop diversified, sustainable and dynamic territorial economies. In 2015, the election of a new government resulted in a shift in priorities. Initiatives and policies are no longer undertaken under Canada’s Northern Strategy, which is no longer active. Northern priorities and policies under the new government have focused more on reconciliation, climate change, and community economic development. The Budget 2017<sup>8</sup> identified several issues as priorities for the federal government, including:

- Innovation and clean technology;
- A “clean growth economy”;
- Healthier and stronger Indigenous communities; and
- Strengthening relationships with First Nations and Inuit communities.

CanNor’s SINED program appears to align with the Government of Canada’s priorities and CanNor’s strategic objectives. SINED documents, including the *Program Guidelines*, the *Performance Measurement Strategy*, the *Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development Investment Plans*,

---

<sup>6</sup> The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. (2015). Tackling the Top 10 Barriers to Competitiveness 2015.

<sup>7</sup> The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. (2012). Developing the Economic Potential of Canada’s Territories.

<sup>8</sup> Government of Canada (2017): Budget 2017. <https://www.budget.gc.ca/2017/docs/bb/brief-bref-en.html>.

---

and the program *Terms and Conditions* highlighted the SINED goals of economic diversification and sustainable economic development. Most CanNor key informants agreed and noted that SINED proposals were reviewed based on program terms and conditions, which were established to align with CanNor's strategic objectives to encourage diversified, sustainable, and dynamic economies in the North. However, many CanNor key informants felt that there were impacts of changing territorial and federal priorities. For example, one respondent noted that as economic conditions change (e.g., downturn in mining), the focus will change from one sector to another across regions.

The SINED program also aligned with the Government of Canada priorities areas of innovation and clean technology. SINED has encouraged innovation and clean technology by issuing an innovation and clean technology-targeted Expression of Interest in June 2016. Sixty-nine proposals were received and screened in response to the call. Of those proposals, 21 applicants were invited to submit full proposals in August 2016. However, this appears to be a newer direction for SINED projects as only 10% (n=34 of 328) of projects funded between 2012/2013-2016/2017 had a 'clean technology' component, as identified by CanNor. CanNor key informants agreed, and noted that the call for expression was issued by all three territories in response to the newly identified federal priorities. That resulted in many of the SINED funded projects in that year to have requisite components of clean technology included that may not have been otherwise.

The SINED program also aligned with the federal priority to support growth and partnerships with Indigenous communities. As stated in the *Program Guidelines*, SINED project assessment should pay particular attention to a projects' ability to address opportunities that benefit Indigenous peoples, as well as women, minority language communities, youth and persons with disabilities. The *Program Guidelines* also state that SINED should support eligible projects that increase community capacity by providing expert advice/training in the area of economic and business development. CanNor key informants agreed that the SINED program aligned with this priority area, noting that most of the communities in the North were comprised of Indigenous people. Therefore, economic development supported by funded projects did continue to support Indigenous communities. CanNor's other program, NAEOP, more fully targeted these priorities but SINED also funded some projects aimed at supporting Indigenous business ventures and strengthening Indigenous communities. This was evident in the review of approved projects. Between 2012/2013 and 2015/2016, a total of \$8,819,542.00 was allocated to Indigenous organizations (10% of total SINED funding). Forty-nine Indigenous organizations were funded during this time frame. While more Indigenous groups were funded in Yukon, it is important to note that there are more self-governing and "sophisticated" First Nations groups in the territory which many influence the greater number of partnerships between First Nations groups and CanNor in this region.

Overall, CanNor key informants felt the SINED program aligned with most, if not all, federal priorities. Some noted that projects may align more with the priority areas of innovation and clean technology, and clean growth. These priorities were considered more heavily when developing proposals. Few

---

CanNor key informants noted that SINED funded projects did not align with federal priority areas because the North relied on non-renewable energy resources for economic development.

#### **4.2.3 Role for the Federal Government**

All key informants, including funding proponents, CanNor staff, and government stakeholders, supported the federal government's role in Northern economic development. CanNor staff, government stakeholders, and funding proponents believed it was necessary to maintain funding earmarked for economic development. If funding was delivered through territorial transfer payments, key informants believed there would be competing priorities (e.g., healthcare) for funding and economic development would not be supported to the extent it is now. Further, CanNor staff noted that the SINED program was the only way the federal government could meet its commitments to economic development.

### **4.3 Performance**

The SINED program logic model identified many intended outcomes of SINED funding. This section explores whether these impacts were or will be realized in the immediate, intermediate or long-term. Specifically, the evaluation reviewed whether SINED-funded projects promoted:

- Expansion of publicly-accessible information;
- Expansion of multi-user infrastructure;
- The ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities;
- Increased partnerships amongst Northern organizations and governments; and
- Increased access to capital.

It is important to note that all project indicators noted above were difficult to track across SINED projects and territories due to a lack of a standardized reporting template. This was especially true for the publicly-accessible information and opportunities for Northerners indicators. The lack of a reporting template resulted in variant reporting of project outputs and outcomes across the territories. Further, the lack of aggregate data limited the understanding of such outcomes across the SINED program.

#### **4.3.1 Publicly Accessible Information**

The SINED program aims to promote the availability of publicly accessible information developed through SINED funded programs. Between 2009 and 2015, SINED-funded projects (n=567) produced 85 new maps, 21,375 new data set files, 203 new reports or papers, and 230 conference presentations or posters, and 24 graduate theses.<sup>9</sup> It is not clear whether these were produced across all projects or only a select number. While aggregate data was not available for the evaluation period (2012-2017), this data suggests that information was a common output of SINED funded projects. Further, there may be more publically accessible information pieces that are produced or presented after the SINED-funded project ends. Key informants and survey respondents agreed, and noted that the information produced by SINED-funded projects was publicly available. Stakeholders commonly referred to publicly accessible

---

<sup>9</sup> SINED Performance Measurement Framework – CanNor Agency Total. Retrieved from SINED administrative data.

information as 'knowledge products'. This term will be used interchangeably throughout the remainder of the report.

More than one-third (36%) of survey respondents reported knowledge products as a project outcome. The most common knowledge products included reports (54%), presentations (33%), and academic articles/other publications (31%). The types of knowledge products reported by survey respondents are shown in Table 4.1. Most (71%) survey respondents who reported knowledge products as a project outcome also reported that these products were publicly available (e.g., on the internet) or were shared beyond their organization (e.g., at conferences), supporting SINED's goal of producing publicly accessible information products.

**Table 4.1 Types of Knowledge Products Produced by SINED-Funded Projects**

Knowledge Product	n	%
Reports	21	54%
Presentations	13	33%
Publications (academic or other)	12	31%
Workshops	10	26%
Website	8	21%
Training Manuals	5	13%

**Source:** Evaluation of SINED Funding Applicants Survey September 2017

**Valid n=39**

Totals do not add up to 100% due to multiple responses.

Key informants also reported the production of knowledge products (e.g., reports, training manuals/workshops, presentations, datasets, and maps). Many of these knowledge products were created as a result of tourism- or geoscience- related projects, as observed in the review of project files and reports, and key informant interviews. Key informants from the tourism sector were more likely to report training documents being created as a result of SINED-funded projects (e.g., manuals to support tourism operators). The tourism industry has also produced pan-territorial guidelines to support operators in establishing and maintaining their business as part of a SINED-funded project.

SINED-funded geoscience projects produced many research or data items, including new maps, data sets, or methodologies that are anticipated to advance the sector. Raw data has also been shared with the industry to support investment and research, with the goal of establishing new mines. Key informants noted that mapping led to the identification of potential mineral deposits that attracted national and international organizations that have subsequently made or could make substantial investments in the territories.

Very few CanNor key informants reported that some funding proponents did not want to produce publicly accessible information as a result of the SINED-funded project. Some private organizations did not want to share their findings with competitors. Due to the small number of key informants who reported this finding, it is not clear if this is consistent across sectors or territories.

---

### 4.3.2 Expansion of Multi-User Infrastructure

Between 2012/2013 and 2014/2015, SINED contributed \$6,007,814 to infrastructure studies. It was not clear if any of the SINED investment led to infrastructure projects as 2016/2017 data is not yet available, but it is unlikely within this evaluation period. CanNor key informants noted that infrastructure funding was limited, and invested mostly into feasibility or mapping studies that are precursors to infrastructure projects. Additionally, less than one-quarter (21%, n=8) of survey respondents reported that their project outcomes included community/public-use infrastructure. Additionally, very few respondents (less than 5) reported telecommunication access as a project outcome.

Most CanNor, territorial government and funded key informants reported that SINED did not have the large budgets necessary to support Northern infrastructure projects, or the ability to fund projects for terms long enough to see such impacts. Instead, SINED-funded infrastructure projects supported opportunities for infrastructure development that may occur in the future. Examples include the anticipated development of mines as a result of geoscience projects, as well as the mapping of Frobisher Bay (Nunavut) which is anticipated to lead to the development of a port.

### 4.3.3 Ability of Northerners to Respond to Economic Development Opportunities

The SINED program aimed to increase the ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities. Two-thirds (64%) of survey respondents reported community economic development (e.g., through business opportunities, tourism, entrepreneurship opportunities) as a project outcome. Approximately two-thirds (64%) reported that their projects created or will create jobs for Northerners, and one-third (31%) of those respondents reported that these jobs will be sustained after expiration of project funding. Additionally, almost one-half (44%) of respondents reported their project led to or will lead to training/skills development for Northerners.

While survey data supported the outcome of opportunities for Northerners, the Evaluation team noted the difficulty of evaluating the number of jobs created for Northerners due to the differences in project reporting. Most project applications reviewed by the Evaluation team did propose hiring Northerners, but most key informants from all stakeholder groups (CanNor, territorial government and funding proponents) noted that the majority of jobs would be created beyond the lifespan of SINED-funded projects. The geoscience case study found that many jobs were anticipated to be created as a result of geoscience research, for example, when mines open or when the port in Iqaluit is developed and operational (seabed mapping in Frobisher Bay project). Similarly, for pilot projects that have positive outcomes, it is expected that future investments will be made by businesses as a result and these would result in employment of Northerners. The tourism case study found that as the North is promoted as a tourist destination, jobs for tourism operators, craftspeople and those in the hospitality industry will continue to increase. Similarly, research to support commercialized inshore and offshore fisheries in Nunavut is intended to enhance the capacity of local communities to develop their fisheries by providing jobs and training.

---

For SINED projects funded years ago, mines and businesses have opened, but it was difficult for key informants to make direct attributions given the SINED project was one of several factors that may have impacted the subsequent economic development. However, some funding proponent key informants reported jobs being created as a direct result of SINED funding. The tourism case study and key informants from the sector found that SINED funding supported tourism such that careers in this sector were now a viable option for Northerners. Key informants from other industries, including mining, geoscience, and from territorial governments also reported jobs being created as a result of SINED, but high-level jobs were commonly filled by individuals from the South. While this does not meet the program goal to create jobs for Northerners, some funding proponent key informants reported that SINED funding created opportunities for specialized jobs in the North that would not exist otherwise (e.g., engineers). Other funding proponents also noted that bringing employees and students to work on SINED-funded projects promotes “life in the North” and may encourage them to remain living in the territory after the project ends. This was also identified during the roundtable sessions on the renewal of SINED with funding proponents conducted in June 2017 by CanNor executive in Yukon.

While it is difficult to directly attribute to SINED, the funding program has reportedly created some jobs for Northerners as a result of SINED-funded projects. However, SINED is anticipated to create significantly more jobs for Northerners, or promote relocation to the North by recruiting talent from the South to fill knowledge/skills gaps. These outputs are not likely to be seen in the immediate future and are more likely to be realized after a project ends.

#### **4.3.4 Increased Partnerships Amongst Northern Organizations and Governments**

SINED funding also appeared to impact relationships between funding proponents and CanNor. When asked whether SINED funding impacted their relationship with CanNor, 41% of respondents reported that their relationship had improved as a result of the program. Similarly, 43% of respondents reported that their relationship had remained the same.

CanNor key informants also reported increased partnerships, despite the age of the SINED program. Key informants noted that Project Officers and proponents were still establishing connections with governments and organizations, and that this was necessary to account for the large turnover in CanNor and territorial government staff in the North.

#### **4.3.5 Access to Capital**

SINED-funding is intended to increase access to capital for Northern economic development projects. Most project participants, including key informants and survey respondents agreed that SINED-funding increased access to capital. Between 2015/2016 and 2016/2017, years for which the data was available, \$34,222,465 was leveraged from other organizations or sources including territorial governments, private sector and others. Given that the actual total SINED investments added up to \$35,681,644 for that period, 96 cents was leveraged for every SINED dollar invested.

---

Aggregate data is not available for the evaluation period (2012-2017).<sup>10</sup>

Most CanNor staff, government stakeholders and funding proponents reported that SINED funding instilled confidence in other investors. This was the case across all sectors and territories. The majority (85%) of survey respondents reported that they leveraged funding or in-kind contributions from other sources for their SINED-funded projects and over one-half (58%) reported that obtaining SINED funding helped them secure additional capital. Key informants from the geoscience and mining sectors specifically noted the importance of federal support for their sector to leverage funding, with this finding also reflected in the sector case studies. They reported that the SINED-funded geoscience work has brought “big players on board”, even during a downturn in the mining sector. Geoscience projects in the North have reportedly increased investor interest and confidence. Key informants from other sectors noted the importance of federal support through SINED funding because it provided “credibility” or “validation” for their projects, increasing the confidence of other investors. SINED funding acted as a trigger for other investors and in some cases, allowed funding proponents to ask for matching funds.

Approximately one-half (46%) of survey respondents reported that their project would not have proceeded without SINED funding, and more than one-third (36%) reported that their project would have proceeded but in a reduced capacity. Overall, SINED funding supported leveraging of other funding sources as investors had more confidence investing in the North when the federal government was also investing.

#### **4.3.6 Input-Output Analysis**

SINED invested dollars into many sectors to support Northern economic development. While the total dollars invested by sector is not available for this evaluation period (2012-2017), data is available for the 2009/2010-2013/2014 period. When looking at the total SINED dollars invested between 2009 and 2014, the mining industry received the greatest amount in funding (\$23,153,550), followed by tourism (\$15,354,341) and small- and medium-sized enterprise support (\$10,474,275). The amount of funding invested in each sector between 2009 and 2014 (i.e. over 5 fiscal years) is shown in Table 4.2. Please note that the dollar amounts reported have been adjusted to 2013 values, for consistency of comparison over time and to maintain consistency with the input-output national multipliers used for calculations (Statistics Canada, 2013).

---

<sup>10</sup> SINED Performance Measurement Framework – CanNor Agency Total. Retrieved from SINED administrative data.

**Table 4.2 Total SINED Funding Invested by Sector, 2009-2014**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Yukon</b>	<b>NWT</b>	<b>Nunavut</b>	<b>Pan-territorial</b>
<b>Mining</b>	\$23,153,550	\$8,197,190	\$7,702,137	\$7,254,223	\$0
<b>Tourism</b>	\$15,354,341	\$5,773,144	\$3,041,308	\$2,942,898	\$3,596,991
<b>SMES support</b>	\$10,474,275	\$2,858,719	\$2,334,852	\$5,240,226	\$40,479
<b>Arts and culture</b>	\$5,626,974	\$2,180,659	\$484,496	\$2,660,039	\$301,779
<b>Forestry and Bioenergy</b>	\$4,573,482	\$1,275,073	\$3,298,410	\$0	\$0
<b>Connectivity</b>	\$4,360,124	\$442,829	\$2,569,864	\$1,347,431	\$0
<b>Energy</b>	\$4,145,281	\$1,980,716	\$2,052,377	\$112,188	\$0
<b>Misc</b>	\$3,443,124	\$346,687	\$622,959	\$0	\$2,473,478
<b>Infrastructure</b>	\$3,317,062	\$8,701	\$2,272,681	\$1,035,680	\$0
<b>Fisheries</b>	\$3,273,075	\$83,319	\$0	\$3,189,756	\$0
<b>Agriculture</b>	\$602,891	\$19,987	\$582,905	\$0	\$0
<b>Hunting and trapping</b>	\$503,967	\$17,182	\$79,103	\$356,482	\$51,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$78,828,147</b>	<b>\$23,184,206</b>	<b>\$25,041,091</b>	<b>\$24,138,923</b>	<b>\$6,463,926</b>

Source: SINED Administrative Data

Totals may not add perfectly due to rounding to the nearest dollar

The impacts of direct investments by SINED into the above sectors are likely to be seen across sectors. To better understand the economic impacts of SINED funding, Malatest conducted an input-output (IO) analysis. Sectors identified in Table 4.2 (above) were re-coded to align with NAICS coding to facilitate IO analysis (See Section 3.2.1 for more details).

The use of input-output analysis (IO) allows for the estimation of the total impact of SINED funding, as it estimates not only the direct impacts, but also the indirect and induced impacts as such funding will stimulate further spending in the regional economy. These impacts are commonly referred to as the economic multipliers and examine impacts in terms of sales (output), GDP, and person-years of employment.

For the purposes of this analysis, the SINED funding identified in Table 4.2 above was re-coded to better align with industry (NAICS) classifications that are used in the IO model. As noted previously, such expenditures were also adjusted to be reported in constant (2013) dollars (see Section 3.2.1 for additional details). Further, pan-territorial funds were rolled into territorial totals (i.e., pan-territorial totals were divided by three and added to territorial totals).

The direct impacts, or the direct investments by CanNor through SINED funding, are likely to encourage secondary effects (indirect and induced impacts) on the territorial economies. As highlighted in Table 4.3, each \$1 in investments attributed to SINED funding generated an additional \$1.71 in total impact across all sectors, and across all territories, on average. The estimated impacts of SINED investments, in terms of additional sales (output), in each territory are shown in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3 Direct, Indirect, Induced and Total Impacts of SINED-funded Investments on Output, by Territory**

Territory	Direct Impact	Indirect and Induced Impact	Total Impact (Direct, Indirect and Induced)
Northwest Territories	\$27,195,733	\$21,291,837	\$48,487,570
Nunavut	\$26,293,565	\$18,776,527	\$45,070,093
Yukon	\$25,338,848	\$16,089,802	\$41,428,650
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$78,828,147</b>	<b>\$56,158,165</b>	<b>\$134,986,312</b>
<b>Overall (for every \$1M invested)</b>	<b>\$1M</b>	<b>\$0.71M</b>	<b>\$1.71M</b>

Source: SINED administrative data

Totals may not add perfectly due to rounding to the nearest dollar

In addition to the impact on indirect and induced spendings, the IO analysis provides an estimate of the impact of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in each territory. As detailed in Table 4.4, the SINED investment of approximately \$78.8 million between 2009 and 2014 (2013 dollars) generated a direct GDP impact of \$36.4 million. Including indirect and induced impacts, SINED investments are estimated to have generated a further \$136.8 million in GDP across the three territories, for a total GDP impact of \$173.3 million (2013 dollars).

SINED investments also contributed to significant job creation and employment. While it is estimated that the direct investment of approximately \$78.8 million between 2009 and 2014 (2013 dollars) directly supported approximately 293 person-years of employment, inclusion of the indirect and induced impacts suggest that there was a total of 1,426 person-years of employment generated through SINED investments.

**Table 4.4 Direct, Indirect and Induced Impacts of SINED Funding, by Territory**

Territory	Direct Economic Impact			Indirect and Induced Economic Impact			Total Economic Impact		
	Output	GDP	Emp. (PYs)	Output	GDP	Emp. (PYs)	Output	GDP	Emp. (PYs)
Northwest Territories	\$27,195,733	\$12,665,552	88	\$21,291,837	\$48,064,221	376	\$48,487,570	\$60,729,773	464
Nunavut	\$26,293,565	\$13,109,087	110	\$18,776,527	\$46,582,954	400	\$45,070,093	\$59,692,040	509
Yukon	\$25,338,848	\$10,715,257	95	\$16,089,802	\$42,177,965	358	\$41,428,650	\$52,893,222	453
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$78,828,147</b>	<b>\$36,489,896</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>\$56,158,165</b>	<b>\$136,825,139</b>	<b>1,133</b>	<b>\$134,986,312</b>	<b>\$173,315,035</b>	<b>1,426</b>
<b>Overall (for every \$1M invested)</b>	<b>\$1M</b>	<b>\$0.46M</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>\$0.71</b>	<b>\$1.74M</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>\$1.71M</b>	<b>\$2.20M</b>	<b>18</b>

Source: SINED administrative data

Totals may not add perfectly due to rounding to the nearest dollar

Over the five years of investment examined in this input-output analysis (2009 – 2014), a total of 1,426 person-years of full-time employment were created (464 in the Northwest Territories, 509 in Nunavut, 453 in Yukon). In the Northwest Territories, each \$1M of SINED funding resulted in a total of 17 jobs

---

created (direct, indirect, and induced). In Nunavut, this ratio was 19 jobs per \$1M in SINED funding, and in Yukon it was 18 jobs.

#### **4.4 Efficiency/Effectiveness**

All key informants and approximately two-thirds (64%) of survey respondents reported challenges related to the SINED program, including challenges with the application process (28% of survey respondents), approval process (39%), funding cycle (26%) and reporting requirements (23%). All key informants also reported encountering challenges in one or more of these areas.

Application and approval processes have reportedly been too slow, resulting in project delays or very short windows for completing the approved work. This forced some funding proponents to spend SINED funds quickly, which reportedly may have resulted in less considered spending decisions. Such delays may also result in delayed project timelines. Key informant funding proponents reported that these delays made the SINED approval process unfavourable for seasonable work. Funding proponent key informants and survey respondents noted that delays in approval were a challenge for field-based research that can only occur in the summer. Key informants suggested that having delegated authority to approve projects based on funding amounts would likely result in faster approval processes (e.g., regional approval of small projects, DG approval of medium sized projects, and Ministerial approval of larger projects only). Further, delays in projects tended to result in the need to return unspent money at the end of the fiscal year, despite the pushed back timeline. Key informants who had received SINED-funding reported a need to roll funding over fiscal years to provide flexibility to ensure optimal use of SINED allocations.

CanNor key informants also reported confusion in approval requirements for the SINED program, noting unclear definitions of what qualifies as “innovation”, or the extent of “clean technology” required to qualify as meeting federal priorities. Territorial context adds further confusion as each office may interpret project requirements differently. Both CanNor and funding proponent key informants noted the need for examples of what can and cannot be funded (e.g., on the CanNor website). CanNor staff noted the need for additional tools and training to assist regional staff in the development and review of applications.

In regards to funding cycles, the majority of key informants noted that two year funding cycles limited long-term planning and did not accurately reflect project timelines. Most key informants noted that five-year or ongoing A-based funding would be more appropriate for the types of projects funded by SINED. CanNor has funded the same projects over subsequent funding cycles with project applications being required each time, thus confirming the need for longer-term funding. To plan for economic development, often in collaboration with territorial governments, the assurance of the availability of long term funding is critical and further confirms the priorities of the federal government in supporting economic development in the North. Further, with the rolling application period, the projects funded first may not be the best projects supporting the movement to A-based funding.

---

Some funding proponents reported that project reporting requirements were onerous, unclear and not well supported by CanNor. They noted challenges reporting to both territorial governments and CanNor, as both stakeholders tended to invest in the same economic development projects. Funding proponents noted that the required reporting is often different for the same project, doubling the amount of work required to meet funding agreement terms. They reported a desire for regional offices to work more closely with territorial government to plan ahead and align priorities for economic development to maximize benefits/outcomes, and subsequently align application and reporting requirements.

Finally, CanNor key informants also noted challenges to reporting. Specifically, they noted the need to clarify the types of outcomes to be reported by funding proponents, ensuring they are realistic, reasonable and inform the extent of success of the project.

#### **4.4.1 Unintended Outcomes**

Key informants from all stakeholder groups (CanNor, territorial government, and funding proponents) were asked to report any positive or negative unintended outcomes of the SINED program. The majority of key informants were not able to comment on unintended outcomes. The few respondents who did provide comments noted:

- Limited ability for long-term planning due to short funding terms (Also see Section 4.4);
- Next steps after feasibility studies were completed were not supported by SINED, meaning successful outcomes did not lead to substantive economic development; and
- Benefits of SINED funding were largely accrued by the South with the North only providing the resources with minimal benefit.

While these unintended outcomes should be interpreted with caution due to the small number of key informants, they provide insight into potential areas for consideration by CanNor.

## **SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

The Strategic Investment for Northern Economic Development (SINED) program is intended to foster conditions for sustainable economic development in the North by strengthening drivers for territorial economic development, the economic base of each territory, and the ability of Northerners' to take advantage of economic opportunities. The evaluation of SINED assessed the relevance, performance and economy/efficiency of the program through file review, sector case studies, a survey with funding proponents, and key informant interviews with CanNor staff, funding proponents and territorial government stakeholders. These multiple lines of evidence informed the evaluation findings and the key considerations for CanNor (See Section 5.1).

Overall, the evaluation found that the SINED funding program aligned with CanNor strategic objectives (promoting diversified, sustainable and dynamic Northern economies) and federal priority areas (innovation, clean technology, healthier Indigenous communities, and stronger relationships between

---

Indigenous communities and government), but was also informed by territorial contexts. Specifically, territories with more advanced infrastructure could focus more on diversification than other territories. This appeared to impact the types of projects being funded across the North.

The SINED program appeared to fill a need for federally-supported economic development programs in the North. CanNor and funding proponent stakeholders supported the federal government's role in such a program to ensure funding earmarked for economic development was not spent on other competing priority areas in the North (e.g., healthcare). Federal support in economic development through SINED funding also instilled confidence in investors, increasing access to capital.

While intended SINED outcomes are expected as a result of funded projects, many project outcomes are not realistic within project timelines. Publicly accessible information (i.e., knowledge products such as maps, datasets, reports and presentations) were commonly reported by SINED-funded projects, but other indicators such as infrastructure and jobs for Northerners were not expected to be realized in the short or intermediate-term. Instead, SINED funding supported economic development that is expected to lead to these outcomes. The SINED budget is reportedly too small compared to the budget required for infrastructure projects. Instead, SINED funding supports feasibility studies and research expected to support infrastructure development. It also supported sector growth through marketing, research, SME opportunities, and training which is expected to create opportunities for Northerners. Some sectors (e.g., tourism, fisheries) are supporting training and capacity building for Northern communities, but jobs created as a result of SINED-funded projects are more likely to be realized after the project ends. The current performance measurement indicators may not be appropriate for the SINED program as most outcomes will not be seen within the lifespan of SINED-funded projects.

Key stakeholders reported experiencing many challenges with SINED's application, approval, and reporting process. All stakeholders who participated in the evaluation noted the slow turnaround from CanNor, resulting in project delays. Project timelines have been pushed back due to delays in project approval, which may significantly affect seasonable work. There is a reported need for more localized approval power to move funding more quickly. This may avoid shortened project timelines tied to the government's fiscal year end and potentially insufficient amounts of time to spend SINED funding, which may result in less than ideal spending decisions. Further, there is a need to clearly define what SINED can and cannot fund. The rating scale used to evaluate projects requires refining as do terms that would identify whether a project meets the requirement of being 'innovative' or using 'clean technology'. There is also a need to better define project reporting requirements that are coordinated with territorial reporting as CanNor and the territorial government commonly fund similar projects. Project reporting should capture SINED performance measurement indicators to allow better tracking of project outputs and outcomes, and better understanding of the SINED impacts.

---

## **5.1 Recommendations**

The evaluation of SINED identified recommendations that CanNor may consider to advance the program. These recommendations are a result of the file review, case studies, key informant interviews, and survey data.

### **1. Implement two application intake periods throughout the year for designated amounts**

With the rolling application period, the projects funded are the first to come forward but not necessarily the best projects. If there are specific intake dates, then projects can be evaluated and the best ones selected for funding. A “pot” of SINED dollars could be kept for smaller projects of a specified value that are accepted on a rolling intake basis with these possibly being approved at the regional level. Variations on implementation could be explored further to determine best intake application dates and the specific of the “pot” of money for rolling intakes.

### **2. Develop longer funding agreements or A-base program funding to allow long-term project funding**

Since the SINED program has been limited to two-year renewals in the last two cycles, projects can only be approved for up to two-years. CanNor staff, territorial governments and funding proponents reported the limitations this puts on project outcomes. It was suggested that SINED be funded for a minimum of five years, allowing project funding approvals for similar time spans or given A-base funding confirming the federal government’s commitment to economic development in the North.

### **3. Develop more defined funding guidelines to ensure more consistent understanding of eligible projects across the territories**

Differences in how program guidelines were interpreted by CanNor staff resulted in different types of projects being funded across the territories (e.g., one territory funded businesses while another territory did not). While it may be beneficial to have tightened guidelines, territorial contexts must also be considered. These contexts result in different funding needs across the regions. This should be explored further prior to redefining any funding guidelines.

### **4. Review and define the Performance Measurement Indicators to make them more appropriate**

Many outputs and outcomes identified by SINED were not likely to be seen within the two-year project timelines. Additionally, CanNor staff felt that the current performance measurement framework did not capture relevant outputs and outcomes. Current SINED performance measurement indicators for economic development tend to be long-term, and would require tracking once a project ends which would be very challenging to implement. Further exploration with regional CanNor staff is recommended to better understand gaps as performance measurement data has been limited or not available.

### **5. Develop a reporting template to support consistent reporting and easier tracking of SINED outputs**

The evaluation team noted variation in proponent reports across projects and across territories. A reporting template would help ensure concise and consistent reporting from funding proponents. These

---

report templates should include important performance measurement indicators to allow easy tracking of SINED funding program outputs.

**6. Develop a database to track project outputs and outcomes by region**

In addition to the above considerations, project outputs and outcomes should be tracked in a database to allow easier assessment of SINED impacts over time.

**7. Consider delegating levels of project approval to increase efficiency of the approval process**

The current process which requires the Minister to sign off on all projects is time consuming and resource intensive. Slow approval processes were commonly reported as an efficiency issue by all respondents (i.e., CanNor staff, territorial government representative and funding proponents). Levels of project approval could be developed to facilitate application review and approval. For example, smaller projects (e.g., up to \$150,000) could be approved at the regional level; somewhat larger projects (over \$150,000 to \$250,000) could be approved by the DG of CanNor, and the remaining larger projects (over \$250,000) could continue to be approved at the Ministerial level. This would allow fewer applications having to be reviewed by the Minister and facilitate the timeliness of all applications.

**8. Consider allowing funds to be rolled over from one year to the next if they are not expensed in the year allocated**

Allowing project funding to roll over to the following year if it is not spent would allow more flexibility to deal with unforeseen project barriers. This can be particularly challenging when project approval comes close to fiscal year end and requires the proponent to spend all that year's allocation in a shortened time, not always spending the funding to achieve optimal outcomes. As discussed, the Northern context restricts some project activity to the summer season which can result in money not being able to be spent if approval comes later in the year.

---

## **APPENDIX A: SINED EVALUATION PLAN AND EVIDENCE FRAMEWORK**

**Table A1: Evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) Evaluation Framework**

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source	
<i>Issue: Relevance and need for economic development programs in the North</i>					
Is there an ongoing need for economic development programs in the North?	In absence of economic development programs, private capital / investment in the North would be reduced	Private corporations would be less willing to invest and/or banks would be less willing to finance projects in the North without the presence of economic development programs	Key informant interviews	Funding recipients	
			Survey		
	Economic growth in the North is low and lagging		GDP growth in other provinces, and similar regions internationally if available, since 2013	Literature review	Statistics Canada: Gross Domestic Product by Industry - Provincial and Territorial (Tables 115-0005 and 379-0030) GDP information from other international regions
			Northern Economic Index trends	Administrative data review	Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency Annual Reports
		Current trends in GDP growth in territories	Literature review	Statistics Canada: Gross Domestic Product by Industry - Provincial and Territorial (Tables 115-0005 and 379-0030)	

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
	Northern residents are underemployed without the necessary skills/opportunities to actively participate in the labour force	Current employment rates and labour market participation rates in the territories	Administrative data review	StatCan and/or CanNor data on current jobs available / joblessness rate in North StatCan and/or CanNor data on match or mismatch between jobs available and skillsets among Northerners
Is the program consistent with Government of Canada priorities and CanNor's strategic objectives?	CanNor alignment: The program encourages territorial economies to become diversified, sustainable, and dynamic	SINED documents identify its goals as promoting diversified, sustainable, and dynamic economies in the territories	Administrative data review	Budget submissions / program funding documents
		CanNor identify SINED as successfully encouraging diversified, sustainable, and dynamic economies in the North	Key informant interviews	CanNor staff
		Community stakeholders identify SINED as successfully encouraging diversified, sustainable, and dynamic economies in the North		Community stakeholders
	GoC alignment: Budget 2017 named several issues as priorities for the federal government, including: innovation and clean technology; a "clean growth economy"; healthier and stronger Indigenous	A proportion of SINED project funding is dedicated to encouraging clean growth technology, clean technology innovation, strengthening Indigenous communities and building better relationships with First Nations and Inuit communities.	Administrative data review	Budget submissions / program funding documents
			Key informant interviews	CanNor staff

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
	communities; and strengthening relationships with First Nations and Inuit communities	Program staff identify these issues as relevant considerations in funding decisions and/or reporting requirements from funding applicants		Community stakeholders
Is there a legitimate, appropriate and necessary role for the federal government to play in this type of economic development programming?	The activities carried out by CanNor align with federal responsibilities as laid out in the Constitution and recent devolution agreements with the territories	Constitution and devolution agreements identify economic development and investment as a federal responsibility in the territories	Literature review	Constitution, devolution agreements with territories
		SINED supports economic development by filling a gap in economic development funding available through Federal and Territorial funding.	Literature review	Number of Federal and Territorial programs and total funding available for economic development as compared to SINED
			Key informant interviews	CanNor staff
				Funding recipients
<b>Issue: Impact of the SINED program on the delivery of economic development programming in the North</b>				
Did the program support an expansion of publicly-accessible information?	Funded projects include research studies, development of strategic plans, feasibility studies, and other projects that develop or expand knowledge in the North	Outputs documented among SINED funding projects include research studies, development of strategic plans, feasibility studies, and/or other projects that develop or expand knowledge in the North	Administrative data review	Review of projects funded through SINED
			Case studies	Case studies of a variety of projects funded through SINED
	Recent research and practices relevant to Northern industry is	Knowledge products related to innovative practices and recent research (e.g., geosciences) is publicly available (e.g.,	Administrative data review	Review of documents created as a result of funded projects through

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
	made available to the public	available on the Internet, at conferences, published, provided to government for dissemination, other)		SINED
			Survey	Funding recipients
			Key informant interviews	Funding recipients

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
Did the program contribute to an expansion of multi-user infrastructure?	Funded projects include infrastructure projects designed for multi-user or public use	Outputs documented among SINED funding projects include infrastructure for multi-user or public use, such as transportation arteries, ports / airports, telecommunications projects, and others	Administrative data review	Review of reports created as a result of funded projects through SINED
			Case studies	Case studies of a variety of projects funded through SINED
			Survey	Funding recipients
Did the ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities increase?	Communities are better able to participate in economic opportunities and growth (e.g., employment, training and upgrading, etc.)	Community leaders report greater ability within their community to engage in / take advantage of local economic opportunities	Key informant interviews	Community stakeholders
		Employment in communities local to funded projects has increased / unemployment rate has decreased	Literature review	StatsCan data on employment rates in selected communities
	Funded projects created local employment opportunities	Funding recipients report that their projects required local labour / hired local workers	Survey	Funding recipients
Have partnerships amongst northern organizations and governments increased?	Partnerships between northern organizations and governments have increased since 2013	Number of funded projects involving partnerships have shown consistent year-over-year increases since 2013	Administrative data review	Review of documents related to SINED-funded projects since 2013
Has access to capital increased?	Additional capital and loans are more accessible to proponents undertaking investment in the North	Funded project proponents report easier access to additional capital / loans	Key informant interviews	Funding recipients
			Survey	Funding recipients

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
<b>Issue: Impact of the SINED program on economic development in the North</b>				
Has the private sector grown?	GDP produced by private sectors in the territories has grown	Year-over-year increases of GDP in key private sectors since 2013	Literature review	Statistics Canada: Gross Domestic Product by Industry - Provincial and Territorial (Tables 115-0005 and 379-0030)
		Year-over-year increases of GDP per capita in key private sectors since 2013	Literature review	Statistics Canada: Gross Domestic Product by Industry - Provincial and Territorial (Tables 051-0001 and 379-0030)
	SINED Investments in infrastructure, research, or other business expansion opportunities have been made	Project proponents report making investments in major projects, expansion opportunities, research, or other	Key informant interviews	Funding recipients
			Administrative data review	Budget submissions / program funding documents
		Community stakeholders report seeing investment from project proponents and communities in infrastructure, research, or business expansion	Key informant interviews	Community stakeholders
	Have key drivers of the economy, such as the mining sector, and other economic sectors, such as fisheries and tourism,	GDP produced by key sectors (up to 4, to be determined in consultation with client) has grown	Year-over-year increases of GDP in key sectors of interest since 2013	Literature review

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
grown?				0005 and 379-0030)
Have the territorial economies grown and diversified? What can be said about the strength and stability of the territorial economies?	Economic activity in the territories becomes more diversified among different sectors	Year over year increase in economic diversity indices for each of the three territories since 2013	Literature review	Statistics Canada: Gross Domestic Product by Industry - Provincial and Territorial (Table 379-0030)

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
<b>Issue: Efficiency of the SINED program</b>				
How could the program's effectiveness be improved?	Barriers identified to program effectiveness	Identification of barriers (e.g., program design or implementation challenges) to program effectiveness	Key informant interviews	CanNor staff
	Possible resolutions to barriers to program effectiveness	Identification of potential resolution to barriers to program effectiveness		Funding recipients
How could the program's efficiency be improved?	Barriers identified to program efficiency	Identification of barriers to program efficiency (e.g., duplicated work, unnecessary barriers to needed resources, other)	Key informant interviews	CanNor staff
	Possible resolutions to barriers to program efficiency	Identification of potential resolutions to barriers to program efficiency		
Is the program the most efficient and economic means of achieving the intended outputs and making progress towards outcomes?	No other or alternative programs can be identified that would achieve the intended outputs and make progress toward outcomes	Identification (or lack thereof) of alternative approaches to achieving SINED outputs and outcomes	Key informant interviews	CanNor staff Funding recipients
<b>Issue: Unintended outcomes</b>				
Have there been any unintended (positive or negative) outcomes?	Unintended or unexpected outcomes identified by stakeholders	Unintended or unexpected outcomes identified by stakeholders	Key informant interviews	CanNor staff Funding recipients

Evaluation Question	Indicator	Measure	Research Method	Source
				Community stakeholders
What was the impact of unintended outcomes on key CanNor stakeholders, including recipients?	Positive and negative impacts experienced by stakeholders as a result of unexpected outcomes	Identification of the impacts / results of unintended or unexpected outcomes	Key informant interviews	CanNor staff Funding recipients Community stakeholders

---

## **APPENDIX B: LITERATURE REVIEW**

---

## **SECTION 1: BACKGROUND**

---

### **1.1 Economic Investment and Regional Development in the North**

In Canada's North, territorial economies are largely driven by natural resource extraction and development projects (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2014). Large mineral deposits, as well as oil and gas resources, can be found in the territories (CanNor, 2016). Projects that extract and develop these resource deposits contribute considerably to Canada's overall economic growth, as well as locally to the communities and territories that they are situated in (CanNor, 2016). Currently, there are 14 mining projects active or in progress in the territories, and one oil or gas project active (Northern Projects Management Office, 2017).

While these large-scale resource-based projects have the potential to generate large amounts of wealth for the territories, the resource dependency of these economies in the North are prone to the boom-and-bust cycle of commodities pricing and resource exhaustion (Southcott and Irlbacher-Fox, 2009). The social and financial costs to communities and governments during resource busts can be great, ranging from increased reliance on income assistance to large rates of out-migration resulting in drastically decreased community sizes as residents leave to find employment elsewhere (Jacobsen and Parker, 2016). In addition to the economic impacts, there is little research that has been done to date on the social impacts of boom-and-bust cycles on local communities although concerns have been raised over issues such as substance abuse, social cohesion, and impacts on traditional Indigenous culture and activities such as subsistence hunting and languages (Southcott et al., 2016).

Within this context, the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) operates with the goal of strengthening key drivers of Northern economies and promoting sustainable, diversified economies in the territories. SINED is a grant program that offers funds to projects in the North that contribute to four broad objectives of the program: building the knowledge base regarding environmental and social context, and resource development in the North; improving economic infrastructure; developing capacity among governments and private sector organizations to improve skills, support, and systems; and diversifying the Northern economy.

### **1.2 Investment, Regional Development, and Jurisdictional Issues**

The historical precedent of federal investment in regional development and major economic projects was thoroughly researched in the literature review conducted for the previous evaluation of SINED in 2013. In summary, federal investment and support for regional development through economic projects has been undertaken in various forms since the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century in Canada. Efforts to achieve relative economic parity among regions have been pursued through a number of ways, such as transfer payments and regional development agencies, and are a key aspect of Canadian federalism.

---

While economic investment and incentive programs are not specifically identified as a service or jurisdictional issue in the Constitution Act of 1982, which lays out the division of provincial, territorial, and federal powers, the Constitution does give the federal government authority for the regulation of trade and commerce in Canada, among a few other issues. This could be interpreted to include investment in economic development programs; to date no significant constitutional challenges have been made to Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) and their work in various regions throughout Canada continues.

---

## **SECTION 2: CHANGES SINCE 2013**

---

### **2.1 Changes in Governments**

#### **2.1.1 Changes in Federal Government Priorities and Strategies**

The Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (CanNor) was created in 2009, followed shortly by the Northern Projects Management Office. Created under a different government, these agencies were formed to help promote, focus, and improve the efficiency of major project development and implementation in the North.

In 2015, the election of a new government resulted in a shift in priorities. Northern priorities and policies now focused more on reconciliation, climate change, and community economic development (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2016). The SINED program is compatible with these goals as some of the program's strategic priorities emphasize; program guidelines state that project assessment will pay particular attention to a project's ability to address opportunities that will benefit Indigenous peoples and women, as well as projects that increase community capacity in economic and business development.

#### **2.1.2 Indigenous Land Claims and Self-Government**

A positive development for northern and Indigenous economic development has been the finalization and implementation of many modern treaties and Comprehensive Land Claim Agreements across the North. While each agreement is unique, their provisions often include land ownership and management, land harvesting rights, participation in environmental management and measures to support economic development and protect Indigenous cultures. For instance, the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, finalized in 1993, granted the Inuit of Nunavut title over 350,000 square kilometers, making them the largest Indigenous land owner in Canada.

Funds obtained through the land claim agreements have contributed to the establishment of Indigenous economic development corporations (IEDCs), which are the economic and business development arms of Inuit, First Nations and Métis governments. It is estimated that there are more than 50 IEDCs in the North.

### **2.2 Economic Changes**

#### **2.2.1 Global Demand and Prices for Mining Exports**

Although considerable efforts have been made to diversify economies in the North, the territories still rely considerably on mining and other resource extraction activities as major economic drivers. As a result, changes in global prices and demand for minerals and energy can have a considerable impact on economic activity and investment in the North.

---

In 2015 and 2016, a significant slowdown in global demand for metals and minerals, largely fueled by an economic downturn in China, resulted in decreased economic output from mining activities in the territories (Conference Board of Canada, 2016). However, recent increases in prices for metals and minerals have put Nunavut and the Northwest Territories on track for strong growth in 2017, while Yukon is likely to see a mild contraction (Conference Board of Canada, 2017). Throughout this period of volatility, however, stakeholders in Northern mining operations have maintained that the fundamentals of resource extraction economies in the territories are strong, and long-term growth is expected (Mining Association of Canada, 2014; Conference Board of Canada, 2016). As a result, long-term planning and investment in new or planned projects in the North has not been greatly affected by this downturn. Expectations of economic growth in the mining sector in the territories remain high, and ongoing investment in the sector continues.

### **2.2.2 Economic Growth and Diversification**

Changes in gross domestic product (GDP) since 2012 have shown great variability among the territories, and among sectors. Across all industries, Yukon showed a moderate contraction in 2015 in comparison to 2014 (-5.95%), and the Northwest Territories and Nunavut showed slowed growth (+1.30% and +1.22%, respectively) (Statistics Canada, 2017). However, overall since 2012 all three territories have shown modest to large GDP growth: Yukon, +3.07%; Northwest Territories +9.14%; and Nunavut, +14.24% (Statistics Canada, 2017).

Despite promising GDP growth in the North, the territories still face challenges in diversifying their economies for a robust, sustainable future. In 2012, the economic diversity index for the North was 88.42 (compared to 93.03 for all of Canada); in 2015 this had shown very little change, at 89.05 (CanNor, 2016). In all three territories, the two largest sectors are public administration, and mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction. In 2015, information and cultural industries in the territories represented between two and three percent of the total GDP in each of the territories, and agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting represented less than one percent of the total GDP in each territory (CanNor, 2016).

### **2.2.3 Trade Agreements**

When SINED was last evaluated in 2013, negotiation of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement was still underway. The final agreement among 12 countries was drafted in October 2015, and Canada signed onto the agreement in February 2016. The TPP would have had a substantial positive impact on the mining industry in Canada, as it would have gradually eliminated import tariffs on many minerals and metals among countries that already import such commodities from Canada (Financial Post, 2015). However, following the United States' withdrawal from the agreement in January of 2017, the future of the agreement was unclear; several signatory countries had expressed interest in continuing with a trade agreement absent of the United States' participation (Reuters, 2017). In early 2018, Canada and ten other countries reached an agreement on a new TPP.

---

In addition to the TPP trade agreement, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is currently undergoing renegotiation discussions among the United States, Mexico, and Canada. Mining and quarrying sectors may not be directly impacted by any changes to a great extent, given that the United States is not a major importer of metals and minerals from Canada; however, oil and gas are among Canada's top exports to the United States. Currently there is one active oil and gas project underway in the North: the Beaufort Sea Exploration Joint Venture Drilling Program in the Northwest Territories (Northern Projects Management Office, 2017). Further, oil and gas extraction activities directly contribute to about 7% of total GDP for the Northwest Territories (Statistics Canada, 2017). While the ongoing negotiation of NAFTA creates uncertainty over trade with the United States, changes to the agreement are unlikely to result in a large impact in the territories.

---

## **SECTION 3: INTERNATIONAL PRACTICES IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

---

The literature review conducted as part of the program evaluation in 2013 identified several general strategies that other countries with circumpolar interests and/or remote regions use to promote regional development in these areas. For a full discussion of each of these strategies, please refer to the previous literature review.

In summary, these strategies are:

- Linking economic development to national sovereignty in the Far North;
- Capitalizing on military investments;
- Building to national standards;
- Coordinating and supporting private sector investments;
- Sustained capacity building;
- Evidence-based regional development;
- Empowering Indigenous organizations and communities;
- North-Centered innovation; and
- Qualifications on place-based economic programs.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive, nor are they necessarily absent in Canada. For example, the previous federal government made Northern sovereignty a key component of its election platform and mandate in government, and followed through on these promises by implementing the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, the Northern Projects Management Office, and the Canadian Northern Strategy. The SINED program itself also fits into several of the strategies listed above, including evidence-based regional development, empowering Indigenous organizations and communities, and North-Centered innovation.

The subsections below discuss recent announcements, white papers, or policy statements related to remote and regional development in circumpolar countries.

### **3.1 Circumpolar Nations**

Norway is among the least urbanized of the OECD countries, with only 24% of its population living in predominantly urban areas (OECD, 2016). This aligns with Norway's rural and regional development strategy, which identifies a scattered settlement pattern as a key aspect of Norway's unique cultural heritage to be preserved. In order to support such scattered populations, the national government supports programs to keep communities throughout the country attractive through capacity-building support to municipalities, and digitally connected through market-based development that is kept competitive by public authorities (Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development,

---

2013). Like Canada, Norway faces challenges in what it calls the “action zone” – the northernmost region of the country, which faces issues such as a small population base, a small skilled labour pool, and geographic isolation. Many of the policy approaches that Norway has undertaken in this region target individual citizens for assistance to encourage skills development and settlement in the region. These include a write-down of student loans by up to 10% of the original amount, exemptions from electricity tax on consumption, reductions in personal taxation, and an increase in family allowance (Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation, 2015). The Norwegian Government also exempts employers in the action zone from national insurance contributions.

Iceland also experiences low rates of urbanization, with 64% of its population living in intermediate areas. Despite having a population of roughly 330,000, the country has a Strategic Regional Plan (2014-17) that identifies numerous program priorities and initiatives to promote regional development (Parliament of Iceland, 2014). The main goals of the plan are to avoid depopulation of regions, and minimize regional disparities (OECD, 2016). Notably, there is no single agency or ministry responsible for enacting the Strategic Regional Plan; four priority areas, each with several initiatives or projects, are identified, and each initiative has an assigned responsible office. In this way, regional development is not addressed through a single specialized agency, but rather a whole-of-government approach is taken. One of the four priority areas in the Strategic Regional Plan is “Special Measures in Vulnerable Communities”. This priority area emphasizes halting population decline in small communities and rural areas, increasing education levels in these communities, and providing support to business enterprises in such communities through subsidies for transportation and energy costs, reduced national insurance contributions to businesses in these areas, and reviewing the agricultural subsidy system in the country.

In 2013, Finland launched its Strategy for the Arctic Region (OECD, 2016). This broad strategy addresses a number of factors in sustainable development in the region, including support for local residents, education, research, infrastructure, environmental concerns, and international cooperation in the Arctic. Like Canada, Finland also constitutionally recognizes the rights of Indigenous peoples (i.e. the Saami), to develop and preserve their language, culture, and traditional livelihoods; as a result, consultation and seeking participation from the Saami is a key aspect of Finland’s Strategy for the Arctic Region (Prime Minister’s Office, Finland, 2013). Also similar to Canada, key policy areas such as education and health are the purview of sub-national governments (OECD, 2016). Objectives of the Arctic Strategy include enhancing social sustainability and working conditions, enhancing Indigenous peoples’ participation in decision-making in matters that affect their status as Indigenous peoples, improving Finnish Arctic expertise (including inter-disciplinary research and investment in education), and supporting the business potential of the Arctic region (including major development projects), among others (Prime Minister’s Office, Finland, 2013).

The United States’ involvement in the circumpolar region is limited to only one state, Alaska. Due to the division of state and federal powers, as well as the lack of any national regional or rural development strategies in the United States, only the regional and economic development policies of Alaska were examined here (OECD, 2016). Alaska utilizes Alaska Regional Development Organizations – ARDORs – to

---

identify regional development priorities and develop and implement comprehensive economic development strategies (CEDs) (Alaska Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, 2017). Although these CEDs are required to include certain information, such as fact-gathering and identification of potential resources to guide economic development, these CEDs have broad flexibility in identifying regional development priorities and strategies. It is also important to note that, although CEDs can identify community development objectives such as infrastructure improvements, recreation opportunities, and other strategies to improve quality of life for residents in some ways, any larger population-based strategies such as public education or health care initiatives to meet local needs would require negotiation with state-wide bodies.

---

## SECTION 4: CONCLUSION

---

Since SINED was last evaluated in 2013, there have been some developments in jurisdictional powers and legal authority in the North that may have impacts on major projects in the North, and therefore indirectly the SINED program. The Northwest Territories fully devolved in 2014, resulting in the territory taking on full responsibility for many aspects of environmental review and assessment for major projects. In addition, the Délı̄nę Got'ı̄nę First Nation Government began operating in 2016 and now has its own department that is responsible for engaging in environmental review and interfacing with territorial counterparts on major projects. There remain a large number of ongoing jurisdictional issues and land claims negotiations, including 20 land claims and/or self-government negotiations with First Nations in the territories, and the devolution of Nunavut. However, these land claims and negotiations have been ongoing in the North for many decades, and the uncertainty they create is not a new condition to the investment landscape.

Resource extraction industries were affected by a considerable downturn in demand and prices for commodities, particularly metals and minerals, in 2015. Despite this, the sector is optimistic that this slowdown is short-term and long-term planning and investment in projects in the region has not been greatly reduced as a result. However, although major sectors in the North remain confident in the long-term viability of resource extraction in the territories, the region has continued to struggle to economically diversify in the years since 2013. The region has the lowest economic diversity index in Canada, and across all three territories mining and quarrying, and public administration, are the largest sectors.

Overall, despite considerable change in the past four years regarding political and jurisdictional shifts, economic conditions changing, and trade agreements being altered or put on hold, these uncertainties do not seem to be deterring interest in developing the North among resource extraction firms or government actors. With the continued reliance on just a few industries in the North, especially the mining and quarrying industry which is prone to boom-and-bust cycles, the goal of SINED to promote sustainable and diversified economic development in the North appears to continue to be relevant.

---

## REFERENCES

---

- Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. (2016, January 26). Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada — 2016–17 Report on Plans and Priorities [financial report]. Retrieved September 22, 2017, from <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1453826795178/1453826845637>
- Bone, R. (2017). The Changing Circumpolar World for Canada, Quebec, Nunavik, and the Arctic Council. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 47(2), 162–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02722011.2017.1325036>
- Bradford, N., & Wolfe, D. A. (2013). Governing Regional Economic Development: Innovation Challenges and Policy Learning in Canada. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 6(2), 331–347. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rst006>
- Conference Board of Canada. (2016, February 24). Mining Sector Woes Continue to Limit Economic Growth in the Territories in 2016. Retrieved September 26, 2017, from [http://www.conferenceboard.ca/press/newsrelease/16-02-24/mining\\_sector\\_woes\\_continue\\_to\\_limit\\_economic\\_growth\\_in\\_the\\_territories\\_in\\_2016.aspx](http://www.conferenceboard.ca/press/newsrelease/16-02-24/mining_sector_woes_continue_to_limit_economic_growth_in_the_territories_in_2016.aspx)
- Conference Board of Canada. (2017, August 1). Economic Conditions Improve for Canada's Territories. Retrieved September 26, 2017, from [http://www.conferenceboard.ca/press/newsrelease/17-08-01/economic\\_conditions\\_improve\\_for\\_canada\\_s\\_territories.aspx](http://www.conferenceboard.ca/press/newsrelease/17-08-01/economic_conditions_improve_for_canada_s_territories.aspx)
- Department of Finance Canada. (2009). Budget 2009 - Home page. Retrieved August 22, 2017, from <http://www.budget.gc.ca/2009/home-accueil-eng.html>
- Dylan, A., Smallboy, B., & Lightman, E. (2013). "Saying No to Resource Development is Not an Option": Economic Development in Moose Cree First Nation. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 47(1), 59–90.
- Export Development Canada. (2017). Country Information: United States. Retrieved September 26, 2017, from <http://www.edc.ca/EN/Country-Info/Pages/United-States.aspx>
- Greenfield, C., & White, S. (2017, January 23). After U.S. exit, Asian nations try to save TPP trade deal. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-asia/australia-and-new-zealand-pledge-to-salvage-tpp-after-u-s-exit-idUSKBN15800V>
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. (2009, August 18). Canada's Northern Strategy - Our North, Our Heritage, Our Future. Retrieved September 21, 2017, from <http://www.northernstrategy.gc.ca/cns/cns-eng.asp>
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2009a). *Canada's Northern Strategy*. Ottawa, Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.northernstrategy.gc.ca/cns/cns.pdf>
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2009b, June 8). Economic and Resource Development [fact sheet; organizational description; promotional material; resource list]. Retrieved September 21, 2017, from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100022921/1100100022922>
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2012a, September 4). Comprehensive Land Claim and Self-Government Negotiation Tables [geospatial material]. Retrieved September 25, 2017
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2012b, November 9). Nunavut Devolution [resource list]. Retrieved September 22, 2017, from <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1352471770723/1352471861365>

- 
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2013, May 17). Resource Development [reference material]. Retrieved September 21, 2017, from <http://www.cannor.gc.ca/eng/1368816364402/1368816377148>
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. (2014). *Northern Economic Diversification Index* (report). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency. Retrieved from <http://www.cannor.gc.ca/eng/1388762115125/1388762170542>
- Jacobsen, G. D., & Parker, D. P. (2016). The Economic Aftermath of Resource Booms: Evidence from Boomtowns in the American West. *Economic Journal*, 126(593), 1092–1128.
- Kappler, M. (2017, May 21). Canada, 10 other countries to move on with new TPP after U.S. withdrawal. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/international-business/pacific-trade-ministers-commit-to-moving-ahead-with-tpp-without-us/article35075058/>
- Keeling, A., & Sandlos, J. (2016). Introduction: Critical perspectives on extractive industries in Northern Canada. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 3(2), 265–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.10.005>
- Koven, P. (2015, October 5). Canadian mining sector cheers TPP signing. *Financial Post*. Retrieved from <http://business.financialpost.com/commodities/mining/canadian-mining-sector-cheers-tpp-signing>
- Matejovsky, L., Mohapatra, S., & Steiner, B. (2014). The Dynamic Effects of Entrepreneurship on Regional Economic Growth: Evidence from Canada. *Growth & Change*, 45(4), 611–639. <https://doi.org/10.1111/grow.12055>
- McAllister, J. A. (2011). Redistributive federalism: Redistributing wealth and income in the Canadian federation. *Canadian Public Administration*, 54(4), 487–507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2011.00188.x>
- Mining Association of Canada. (2014). Facts & Figures of the Canadian Mining Industry 2014. The Mining Association of Canada. Retrieved from [http://mining.ca/sites/default/files/documents/Facts\\_and\\_Figures\\_2014.pdf](http://mining.ca/sites/default/files/documents/Facts_and_Figures_2014.pdf)
- Natural Resources Canada. (2001, August 24). Northern Projects Management Office - Home Page. Retrieved September 21, 2017
- Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development. (2013). *On Rural and Regional Policy: Report No. 13 to the Storting (2012-13) Summary* (p. 9). Oslo, Norway: Government of Norway. Retrieved from [https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/KRD/Vedlegg/REGA/distriktsmeldinga2013/on\\_rural\\_regional\\_policy\\_summary.pdf](https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/KRD/Vedlegg/REGA/distriktsmeldinga2013/on_rural_regional_policy_summary.pdf)
- Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development. (2015, January 20). Action zone in Finnmark and Nord-Troms [Redaksjonellartikkel]. Retrieved September 26, 2017, from <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/topics/municipalities-and-regions/rural-and-regional-policy/Berekraftig-regional-utvikling-i-nord/action-zone-in-finnmark-and-nord-troms/id2362290/>

- 
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2016a). Regional Outlook 2016: Iceland. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/regional-outlook-2016-iceland.pdf>
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2016b). Regional Outlook 2016: Norway. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/regional-outlook-2016-norway.pdf>
- Parliament of Iceland. (2014). *Parliamentary Resolution on a Strategic Regional Plan for the years 2014-2017* (p. 6). Reykjavik, Iceland: Parliament of Iceland. Retrieved from <https://www.byggdastofnun.is/static/files/Byggdaaetlun1417/parliamentary-resolution-on-a-strategic-regional-plan-for-the-years-2014-2017.pdf>
- Prime Minister's Office, Finland. (2013, August). Finland's Strategy for the Arctic Region 2013. Prime Minister's Office Publications. Retrieved from <http://vnk.fi/documents/10616/334509/Arktinen+strategia+2013+en.pdf/6b6fb723-40ec-4c17-b286-5b5910fbecf4>
- Rhéaume, G., & Caron-Vuotari, M. (2013). *The Future of Mining in Canada's North: Economic Performance and Trends January 2013*. Canada: Conference Board of Canada. Retrieved from [https://www.canada2030.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Future-of-mining-in-Canadas-north\\_cfn.pdf](https://www.canada2030.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Future-of-mining-in-Canadas-north_cfn.pdf)
- Rodon, T. (2017). Development in Nunavik: How Regional and Local Initiatives Redefine Sustainable Development in Nunavik. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 47(2), 176–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02722011.2017.1347993>
- Shelomentsev, A. G., Kozlova, O. A., Mingaleva, Z. A., Bedrina, Y. B., & Terentyeva, T. V. (2015). Comparative Analysis of Regional Development of Northern Territories. *Asian Social Science*, 11(14), 349.
- Southcott, C., Abele, F., Natcher, D., & Parlee, B. (2016, October). What do we need to know about extractive resources in the North? – Northern Public Affairs. Retrieved September 21, 2017, from <http://www.northernpublicaffairs.ca/index/magazine/volume-4-issue-3/what-do-we-need-to-know-about-extractive-resources-in-the-north/>
- Southcott, C., & Irlbacher-Fox, S. (2009). *Changing Northern Economies: Helping Northern Communities Build a Sustainable Future*. Northern Development Ministers Forum. Retrieved from [http://www.focusnorth.ca/documents/english/library/2010/changing\\_northern\\_economies.pdf](http://www.focusnorth.ca/documents/english/library/2010/changing_northern_economies.pdf)
- Statistics Canada. (2017, May 30). CANSIM - 379-0030 - Gross domestic product (GDP) at basic prices, by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), provinces and territories. Retrieved August 22, 2017, from <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&id=3790030>

---

## **APPENDIX C: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDES**

## **Evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) Government Stakeholders**

Thank you for taking the time to participate in an interview for the evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED). The SINED program is an economic development contribution program whose aim is to help foster the conditions for long-term sustainable economic development in the North. The program's goals are to strengthen:

1. The driver sectors of the territorial economies;
2. The economic base of each territory; and
3. Northerners' ability to take advantage of economic opportunities.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess and measure the success of SINED. The evaluation includes questions to assess the relevance, impact and efficiency of the program for economic development in the North. Your participation in this interview will provide valuable information to help in understanding the SINED program and its performance, based on your experiences and perspectives.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer questions, or end the interview, at any time. Your identity will not be attached to your individual responses we will not share any of your personally identifying information with CanNor or any other third party. Responses from the interviews will only be used for the evaluation and will be reported in aggregate form (i.e., at the group level). Any quotes that are used for reporting purposes will be selected to ensure that no individual is identifiable.

The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to one hour to complete. With your permission, I would like to record the interview to ensure accuracy and completeness of results. All recordings will be used for research purposes only, and will be destroyed at project completion.

Do I have permission to audio-record the interview? [Y/N]

Do you have any questions before we begin? [Y/N]

Are you comfortable proceeding with this interview? [Y/N]

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. Please explain your experience with CanNor's SINED funding program?

## **PROGRAM RELEVANCE**

**The first section pertains to the relevance of the SINED program to stakeholders, CanNor goals, and the federal government's priorities.**

2. Do you feel there is a need for the federal government to support economic development in the North?
3. Without SINED, would there be an impact on the economic development in the North? Please explain.
4. Has SINED funding encouraged collaboration between CanNor, territorial government and Aboriginal communities to support skill development?
5. To what extent does the SINED funding program align with CanNor's strategic objective to encourage diversified, sustainable and/or dynamic economies in the North?

## **OUTCOMES OF SINED**

**This section will ask questions regarding the outcomes of the SINED funding program.**

6. SINED funded projects may result in partnerships between northern organizations and governments. Are partnerships continuing to be created?
7. What would you say are the biggest impacts of SINED in your territory?
8. Do you feel that SINED has been able to increase economic development in your territory?

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

**This section will ask about SINED's effectiveness and efficiency.**

9. Based on your experience and interaction with SINED, how could program effectiveness be improved?
10. Based on your experience and interaction with SINED, how could program efficiency be improved?
11. Are there any alternative approaches to SINED to encouraging economic development in the North?
12. Has CanNor's SINED funding program resulted in any unexpected outcomes (positive or negative)?
  - a. If yes, what kind of outcomes?
  - b. Who has been impacted by these additional outcomes?

## **CONCLUSION AND WRAP-UP**

That concludes all the questions that I have for you today. Do you have any further comments regarding CanNor's SINED program that we have not discussed?

Thank you, once again, for taking the time to speak with me. Your information will be valuable to the program's evaluation, and we appreciate your cooperation.

## **Evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) Funding Applicants**

Thank you for taking the time to participate in an interview for the evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED). The SINED program is an economic development contribution program whose aim is to help foster the conditions for long-term sustainable economic development in the North. The program's goals are to strengthen:

1. The driver sectors of the territorial economies;
2. The economic base of each territory; and
3. Northerners' ability to take advantage of economic opportunities.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess and measure the success of SINED. The evaluation includes questions to assess the relevance, impact and efficiency of the program for economic development in the North. Your participation in this interview will provide valuable information to help understand the SINED program and its performance, based on your experiences and perspectives.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer questions or end the interview at any time. Your identity will not be attached to your individual responses we will not share any of your personally identifying information with CanNor or any other third party. Responses from the interviews will only be used for the evaluation and will be reported in aggregate form (i.e., at the group level). Any quotes that are used for reporting purposes will be selected to ensure that no individual is identifiable.

The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to one hour to complete. With your permission, I would like to record the interview to ensure accuracy and completeness of results. All recordings will be used for research purposes only, and will be destroyed at project completion.

Do I have permission to audio-record the interview? [Y/N]

Do you have any questions before we begin? [Y/N]

Are you comfortable proceeding with this interview? [Y/N]

### **INTRODUCTION**

Please explain your experience with CanNor's SINED funding program?

## **PROGRAM RELEVANCE**

**The first section pertains to the relevance of the SINED program to stakeholders, CanNor goals, and the federal government's priorities.**

1. Do you feel there is a need for the federal government to support economic development in the North?
2. Has CanNor's SINED funding influenced whether you would invest in projects in the North?
3. Without SINED, would there be an impact on the economic development in the North? Please explain.
4. To what extent does your project(s) funded through SINED have innovative and 'clean technology'?
5. Has your project(s) funded through SINED created jobs for Northerners?

## **OUTCOMES OF SINED**

**This section will ask questions regarding the outcomes of the SINED funding program.**

6. Did your funded project create any knowledge products?
  - a. What kind of knowledge products?
  - b. Were these knowledge projects shared in any way? (E.g., available on the internet, presented at conferences, provided to government)
7. Has SINED funding made it easier to access funding for projects in the North? (E.g., secure additional capital or loans)
8. Has SINED funding encouraged you to participate in other projects in the North? (This may include investments in major projects, expansion opportunities, research or other)
9. What would you say are the biggest impacts of SINED in the North?
10. Do you feel that SINED has been able to increase economic development in the North?

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

**This section will ask about SINED's effectiveness and efficiency.**

11. Based on your experience and interaction with SINED, how could program effectiveness be improved?
12. Based on your experience and interaction with SINED, how could program efficiency be improved?
13. Are there any alternative approaches to SINED to encouraging economic development in the North?
14. Has CanNor's SINED funding program resulted in any unexpected outcomes (positive or negative)?
  - a. If yes, what kind of outcomes?
  - b. Who has been impacted by these additional outcomes?

## **CONCLUSION AND WRAP-UP**

That concludes all the questions that I have for you today. Do you have any further comments regarding CanNor's SINED program that we have not discussed?

Thank you, once again, for taking the time to speak with me. Your information will be valuable to the program's evaluation, and we appreciate your cooperation.

## **Evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) CanNor Staff**

Thank you for taking the time to participate in an interview for the evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED). The SINED program is an economic development contribution program whose aim is to help foster the conditions for long-term sustainable economic development in the North. The program's goals are to strengthen:

1. The driver sectors of the territorial economies;
2. The economic base of each territory; and
3. Northerners' ability to take advantage of economic opportunities.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess and measure the success of SINED. The evaluation includes questions to assess the relevance, impact and efficiency of the program for economic development in the North. Your participation in this interview will provide valuable information to help in understanding the SINED program and its performance, based on your experiences and perspectives.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer questions, or end the interview, at any time. Your identity will not be attached to your individual responses we will not share any of your personally identifying information with CanNor or any other third party. Responses from the interviews will only be used for the evaluation and will be reported in aggregate form (i.e., at the group level). Any quotes that are used for reporting purposes will be selected to ensure that no individual is identifiable.

The interview should take approximately 1 to 1.5 hours to complete. With your permission, I would like to record the interview to ensure accuracy and completeness of results. All recordings will be used for research purposes only, and will be destroyed at project completion.

Do I have permission to audio-record the interview? [Y/N]

Do you have any questions before we begin? [Y/N]

Are you comfortable proceeding with this interview? [Y/N]

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. Please explain your experience with CanNor's SINED funding program?

## **PROGRAM RELEVANCE**

**The first section pertains to the relevance of the SINED program to stakeholders, CanNor goals, and the federal government's priorities.**

2. Do you feel there is a need for the federal government to support economic development in the North?
3. The Government of Canada identified the following priority issues areas in the 2017 Budget:
  - innovation and clean technology;
  - a "clean growth economy";
  - healthier and stronger Indigenous communities; and
  - strengthening relationships with First Nations and Inuit communities.

Are these priorities weighted when making funding decisions? (E.g., are points assigned when proposals meet a priority area?)

What percentage of SINED funded projects would include components that align with these priorities?

4. Without SINED, would there be an impact on the economic development in the North? Please explain.
5. Do you feel that SINED funded projects strengthen relationships between SINED stakeholders and communities (e.g., CanNor, INAC, project proponents)?
6. To what extent does the SINED funding program align with CanNor's strategic objective to encourage diversified, sustainable and/or dynamic economies in the North? How are these objectives considered when making funding decisions?

## OUTCOMES OF SINED PROGRAM

This section will ask questions regarding the outcomes of the SINED funding program.

7. Which of these project types does SINED fund?
  - o Geoscience research
  - o Research
  - o Topographic mapping
  - o Resource stock assessment
  - o Collection and/or digitization of socio-economic data
  - o Sectoral data collection and overviews
  - o Feasibility studies
  - o Public infrastructure
  - o Sectoral strategies
  - o Technology clusters
  - o Business cases
  - o Patents and certifications
  - o New product and services
- a. Do these projects result in knowledge products?
- b. If yes, are these products disseminated in any way? Please explain.
8. Have SINED funded projects resulted in or contributed to infrastructure for multi-user or public use? (e.g., transportation arteries, ports, airports, or telecommunication projects)
9. SINED funded projects may result in partnerships between northern organizations and governments. Are partnerships continuing to be created?
10. What would you say are the biggest impacts of the SINED program in your territory?
11. Do you feel that SINED has been able to increase economic development in your territory?
12. If so, has SINED helped contribute to sustainability of benefits of economic development through:
  - i) Stimulating entrepreneurship?
  - ii) The emergence and sustainability of economic activities in sectors such as tourism, geosciences, renewable energy, fisheries, and cultural/traditional sectors?

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

**This section will ask about SINED's effectiveness and efficiency.**

13. Based on your experience and interaction with SINED, how could program effectiveness be improved?
14. Should program parameters be modified in any way to maximize the use of funding for economic development and promoting innovation?
15. Based on your experience and interaction with SINED, how could program efficiency be improved?
16. Is SINED the most efficient and economic way of achieving program outputs (see question 6) and making progress towards the program's outcomes:
  - Expanded, publicly-accessible information;
  - Expanded multi-user economic infrastructure;
  - Increased access to capital;
  - Increased ability of Northerners to respond to economic development opportunities;
  - Increased partnerships with Northern government and organizations;
  - Increased private sector investment and expanding business employment opportunities;
  - Increased sustainability of principle economic drivers;
  - Increased economic development and diversification?
17. Are there any alternative approaches to SINED to encouraging economic development in the North?
18. Has CanNor's SINED funding program resulted in any unexpected outcomes (positive or negative)?
  - a. If yes, what kind of outcomes?
  - b. Who has been impacted by these additional outcomes?

## **CONCLUSION AND WRAP-UP**

That concludes all the questions that I have for you today. Do you have any further comment regarding CanNor's SINED program that we have not discussed?

Thank you, once again, for taking the time to speak with me. Your information will be valuable to the program's evaluation, and we appreciate your cooperation.

**APPENDIX D: EVALUATION OF THE STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS IN NORTHERN ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT (SINED) FUNDING APPLICANTS SURVEY**

**Evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED)  
Funding Applicants Survey**

CanNor is conducting an evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED) program. The SINED program is an economic development contribution program whose aim is to help foster the conditions for long-term sustainable economic development in the North. On behalf of CanNor, R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. is conducting this survey to obtain feedback from organizations who have received funding from SINED in the past 5 years (2012/2013 – 2016/2017). Your responses will help us assess and measure the relevance, impact and efficiency of SINED.

Your participation is completely voluntary. Your identity will not be attached to your individual responses. We will not share any of your personally identifying information with CanNor or any other third party. Responses from the survey will only be used for this evaluation.

To protect the privacy of your information, Malatest has extensive data protocol and policies in place; for more information, please visit [www.malatest.com/Privacy.htm](http://www.malatest.com/Privacy.htm).

The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please **click here** to begin the survey

***If you need any assistance, you can contact R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. at 1-888-274-1700  
Monday through Friday, 8:30 AM – 4:30 PM (PST). Your survey ID is [SURVEY ID].***

-----

1. The evaluation of SINED looks at the past 5 years. In what year(s) did you receive funding from SINED? *(select all that apply)*
  - a. 2012/2013
  - b. 2013/2014
  - c. 2014/2015
  - d. 2015/2016
  - e. 2016/2017
  - f. Don't know
  - g. I did not receive funding from SINED → **Thank you for participating in the SINED evaluation survey.** *[go to exit page]*
  
2. What is the status of your most recent project funded by SINED?
  - a. Initiation/Planning phase
  - b. In progress (e.g., data collection, analysis)
  - c. Near completion (e.g., preparing final reports)
  - d. Completed (e.g., final reports submitted) *[skip to Q4]*
  - e. Other → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
  - f. Don't know *[skip to Q5]*
  
3. What is the anticipated date of project completion? *[only ask if Q2=a,b,c, or e]*
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ *[must provide; format MM/YYYY]*
  - b. Don't know
  
4. . When was the project completed? *[only ask if Q2=d, otherwise skip to Q5]*
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ *[must provide; format MM/YYYY]*
  - b. Don't know
  
5. Have you leveraged funding or in-kind contributions from other sources for your SINED-funded project(s)?
  - a. Yes leveraged funding
  - b. Yes leveraged in-kind contributions
  - c. No *[skip to Q8]*
  - d. Don't know *[skip to Q8]*

6. From what sources have you leveraged funding or in-kind contributions? *(select all that apply)*
- a. Territorial government
  - b. Non-profit organization
  - c. Private sector organization
  - d. Individual investments
  - e. Other → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
7. Did obtaining SINED funding help you secure additional funds or in-kind contributions?
- a. Yes → Please explain: *[not mandatory]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. No
  - c. Don't know
8. Would the project(s) have proceeded without SINED funding?
- a. Yes – to the same extent
  - b. Yes – but in a reduced capacity
  - c. No
  - d. Don't know

9. What were the main outcomes (or anticipated outcomes) of your SINED-funded project(s)? (*select all that apply*)
- a. Jobs for Northerners
    - i. Approximately how many jobs were created? \_\_\_\_\_ [*not mandatory*]
    - ii. Were/Will these jobs be sustained after the expiration of your SINED funding?
      - Yes
      - No
      - Don't know
  - b. Jobs for Canadians outside the territories
    - i. Approximately how many jobs were created? \_\_\_\_\_ [*not mandatory*]
  - c. Community or Public use infrastructure
  - d. Telecommunication access
  - e. Sector growth: [*select all that apply*]
    - i. Tourism
    - ii. Fisheries
    - iii. Mining
    - iv. Other → please explain
  - f. Scientific knowledge (including new maps, new indicator data)
  - g. Training and/or skills development for Northerners → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ [*not mandatory*]
    - i. Approximately how many people were trained? \_\_\_\_\_ [*not mandatory*]
  - h. Community economic development (e.g., business opportunities, tourism, entrepreneurship opportunities)
  - i. Other → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ [*must answer if selected*]
  - j. Don't know

10. Have your SINED funded project(s) produced knowledge products (e.g., papers, reports, presentations, websites)?

- a. Yes → What kind of knowledge products? (*select all that apply*)
  - i. Academic articles
  - ii. Reports → To whom were these distributed?  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - iii. Other publications → Please identify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - iv. Development of website pages or entire website
  - v. Presentations →
    - At conferences
    - To Indigenous Councils/government
    - To Territorial/Provincial government
    - To Federal government
    - To communities/community organizations
    - Other → Please specify:  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - vi. Training manuals

- vii. Workshops
  - viii. Other → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
  - b. No *[skip to Q13]*
  - c. Don't know *[skip to Q13]*
11. Are these knowledge products publicly available (e.g., on the internet) or were they shared beyond your organization (e.g., at conferences)?
- a. Yes
  - b. No
12. What are the biggest impacts of SINED funding for economic development in your sector/territory/community? *[at least one must be selected; can fill out both a and b; don't know is exclusive]*
- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Don't know
13. How has your relationship with CanNor changed as a result of receiving SINED funding?
- a. Improved
  - b. Stayed the same
  - c. Deteriorated
  - d. Don't know
- 13b. How would you describe your relationship with CanNor? (only ask if 13 = b)
- a. Positive
  - b. Negative
14. Did you encounter any challenges related to the SINED program (e.g., application or approval process, funding cycle, reporting, other)?
- a. Yes
  - b. No *[skip to Q17]*
15. What challenge(s) have you have encountered? *(select all that apply)*
- a. Application process → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
  - b. Approval process → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
  - c. Funding cycle → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
  - d. Reporting → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
  - e. Other → Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_ *[must answer if selected]*
  - f. Don't know *[skip to Q17]*

16. Are there any improvements that can be made to the SINED funding program to address the challenges you identified? *[at least one must be selected; can fill out a and b; don't know is exclusive]*

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. Don't know

17. Without SINED, would there be an impact on the economic development in the North?

- a. Yes → Please explain: *[must answer if selected]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. No
- c. Don't know

18. Are there areas that present a barrier to economic development that SINED does not currently address?

- a. Yes → What are these areas and what changes to SINED could help address them?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. No
- c. Don't know

### **CLOSING COMMENTS**

Do you have any other comments you would like to share with us for this evaluation?

- 
- o No comments at this time

***THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE***

Exit to <http://www.cannor.gc.ca>

## **APPENDIX E: FUNDING PRPONENT SURVEY FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS**

**Evaluation of the Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development (SINED)  
Funding Applicants  
Frequently Asked Questions**

***What is the study about?***

CanNor is conducting an evaluation of the *Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development* (SINED) program. The SINED program is an economic development contribution program whose aim is to help foster the conditions for long-term sustainable economic development in the North. The program's goals are to strengthen:

4. The driver sectors of the territorial economies;
5. The economic base of each territory; and
6. Northerners' ability to take advantage of economic opportunities.

R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. (Malatest), a Canadian research company, was selected by CanNor to conduct the evaluation of SINED. The study includes a survey, key informant interviews, file review, and case studies of SINED funded projects.

***Why should my organization participate in this survey?***

The survey will help us assess and measure the success of SINED. Specifically, the survey will ask about the relevance, impact and efficiency of the funding program. Your participation in this survey will provide valuable information to help understand the SINED program and its performance, based on your experiences and perspectives. It will also help identify potential improvements to the efficiency of the program, the impact of SINED in your sector, as well as its impact on economic development across the North.

The final results of the evaluation will be posted on the CanNor website following completion of the project.

***Who should participate in this interview?***

We are requesting the individual most familiar with the SINED funding process (e.g., application, reporting), as well as the projects funded by SINED (e.g., project timelines, goals, outcomes) complete the survey.

***How did you get my name?***

Regional CanNor offices (Iqaluit, Yellowknife and Whitehorse) provided Malatest with a list of proponents funded between 2012/2013 and 2016/2017.

***How will my privacy be protected?***

The survey will not ask for any personally compromising information. Your name will not be deliberately identified any evaluation reports or other documents as part of this project (e.g., we will not associate your name or organization with a particular comment or finding). The information obtained will be used for this study and for no other purpose. We will never share or sell any information you provide, including contact information.

To protect the privacy of your information, Malatest has extensive data protocol and policies in place; for more information, please visit [www.malatest.com/Privacy.htm](http://www.malatest.com/Privacy.htm).

***Do I have to participate in the survey?***

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Your participation will be greatly appreciated and will help inform the study by providing insight into your organization's experience with the SINED funding program. If you choose to participate, you may stop the survey at any time and come back to it at a later time using the access code provided in the email invitation.

***How long will the survey take?***

The survey will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

***How much time do I have to complete the survey?***

The survey will be available from the day you receive the request to participate until September 29, 2017.

***How do I complete the survey?***

If you would like to participate in the survey, you can follow the link below. If you need any assistance, you can contact R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. at **1-888-274-1700** Monday through Friday, 8:30 am – 4:30 pm Pacific Daylight Time.

[www.sinedeval.malatest.net](http://www.sinedeval.malatest.net)

**Thank you for your interest and participation.**