

Indigenous Ethics Environmental Scan

Prepared by Sarina Perchak in partnership with the OFIFC

*This is a living document that may be added to over time

PART I

Guiding question: Who is talking about Indigenous ethics processes and processes of doing research with Indigenous peoples in ethical ways?

Table 1. Indigenous-led processes (Canadian focus)

Organization	Scope	Details	Source
Mi'kmaw Ethics Watch	Any and all research into the collective Mi'kmaw knowledge, culture, arts or spirituality.	-Housed within Cape Breton University -Established by the Sante' Mawio'mi (Grand Council) on July 25, 1999, at Chapel Island -Must also undergo REB approval from home institution of PI APPLICATION NOTES: -usefulness of research required -inclusion of oral consent options -inclusion of accommodations for Mi'kmaw language, culture, and community protocols -section pertaining to ownership	(Cape Breton University, 2022).
Six Nations of the Grand River	Authorized by the Six Nations Elected Council to approve and monitor the conducting of research on the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory.	-Must also undergo REB approval from home institution of research team -Approval is needed before data collection and before publication -Research design should aim to recruit and provide meaningful training to FN researchers APPLICATION NOTES: -space provided for Haudenosaunee language use -space given to detail who will own the data and results of the research, and the Six Nations Council will retain ownership of any IK collected	(Six Nations of the Grand River, 2022).
Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project	Specifically for this community-based research project	-Created by Center for Research and Training to guide partners to achieve the goals of KDSPP -Partnership between Kanien'keha:ka community of Kahnawake and researchers who are affiliated with KSDPP (from McGill, Université de Montreal and Queen's University) APPLICATION NOTES: -research must be relevant and beneficial to community, and include capacity building -includes obligations for researchers and partners (intended roles during research process)	(Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project, 2007).
First Nations University	Research housed within FNUniv	-Uses University of Regina; requires all researchers to work with their REB which is constituted according to the current TCPS	(First Nations University of Canada, 2020).

Yellowhead Institute	Research housed within the institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Based in the Faculty of Arts at Toronto Metropolitan University; ethics for any new project goes through their REB -TMU has a resource for “Guidelines for Research Involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada (2017).” It lists the following principles: respect, individual and collective welfare, collaboration, and engagement (lists OCAP; outlines that a community engagement plan needs to be submitted to the REB). Research agreements are emphasized for those wanting to formally engage with communities. -reference OCAP and TCPS2 – Chapter 9 	(Yellowhead Institute, n.d.; personal communication, October 17, 2022; Toronto Metropolitan University, 2017).
Centre of Indigegogy	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Based out of Wilfrid Laurier University -Does not operate as a research institute, but lectures and workshops on ethical research, trauma-informed work, circle work, etc. More about professional development than research. 	(Wilfrid Laurier University, 2022).
L’nuey and Mi’kmaq Confederacy of PEI Research Ethics Board	The two nations that reside on what is now known as PEI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Specifically asks about the benefits to individual Mi’kmaw people, governments, and the nation -Includes room for risks associated to power imbalances, language, and cultural sensitivities -Like others, very similar to institutional processes 	(L’nuey and Mi’kmaq Confederacy of PEI, 2021).
Inter Tribal Health Authority	British Columbia, IHTA member nations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -in 2007 they developed guidelines for promoting good research and a research review committee to monitor projects -research must benefit any or all ITHA First Nations and First Nations people generally -respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility; OCAP; Tri-Council guidelines were listed as guiding elements, as well as cultural values of Coast Salish and Kwakwaka’wakw -review committee to include someone who understands research process, someone who understands research ethics, an Elder, gender representation, representation from Coast Salish and Kwakuitl, board member, management committee, and ad hoc members who know about the specific project 	(Inter Tribal Health Authority, 2007).
Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres	Projects affiliated with the OFIFC (an urban Indigenous community focus)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -welcome submissions of different formats -broken down into the four sections of the USAI framework: utility, self-voicing, access, and interconnectedness -focus on partnership building and being informed by protocols, practices, and conversations relevant to the research project and research team -reciprocal relationships with participants outlined -community care; how will the team support care of participants and each other 	(OFIFC, n.d.; personal communication, October 21, 2022).
Manitoulin Anishinaabek Research Review Committee	Manitoulin area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Established as a result of a collaboration with Noojmowin Teg Health Centre, Mnaamodzawin Health Services, Kenjgewin Teg Educational Institute APPLICATION NOTES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -section for community involvement -discussion of priorities -area specifically talking about OCAP 	(Noojmowin Teg Health Centre, n.d.).

		-specific questions about Anishinaabek knowledge and the Seven Grandfather Teachings -influenced by TCPS2, like others	
First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba – Health Information Research Governance Committee	Gatekeeper of First Nations data at a regional level (this is what the website says but unsure of the region)	-Aims to ensure respectful research for and by FN is carried out according to: free, prior informed consent on a collective and individual basis; OCAP; FN ethical standards, whether Cree, Dakota, Dene, etc.; and benefits to FN -Members include Tribal Council Health Directors, First Nations Director of Health/Education/Economic Development, First Nations Academic Advisor, First Nations Advisors (Environments and Socio-Economic Issues), in addition an Elder/Knowledge Keeper and Youth APPLICATION NOTES: -benefits to FN -section about free, prior, and informed consent -asks you to address each OCAP principle; the specific ethical standards of the community you aim to work with -discussions of harm are kept to the last “other” section (not given as much space and weight)	(First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba, n.d.).
First Nations of Quebec and Labrador Health and Social Services Commission	Speaking to the Quebec and Labrador territory	-list respect, co-capacity building, authentic relationships, and trust as core tenets of community-engaged scholarship -in order to effectively and ethically conduct research with FNMI Peoples, the wide range of human abilities to know must be at the very least respected, and ideally, both understood and engaged by those involved in any collaborative effort (p. 40) -extensive account of many different ethics committees and scholars from across the globe -a key point is cultural safety, which requires community involvement	(Basile, McHugh, & Gentelet, 2021).
Indigenous Health Research Advisory Committee – Chronic Pain Network	All across what we call Canada	Compiles resources for researchers and communities; strive to facilitate authentic partnerships between Indigenous communities and researchers using Two-Eyed Seeing (like a database)	(ACHH Initiative, 2017).
Unama’ki Institute of Natural Resources	Relating to Unama’ki or Cape Breton Island	Protocols and principles: -That all projects within the territory of Unama’ki come directly to the UINR - Council of Elders with provide feedback on important ATK that needs to be considered -Knowledge must always remain the property of the knowledge holders -UINR will advise on any issues surrounding intellectual property rights that might arise from any potential projects and provide additional direction for additional partnerships that need to be made -The costs of Elder Council gatherings should be considered as any other consulting fee and be included in budgets	(Unama’ki Institute of Natural Resources, 2007).

<p>Inuit Research Advisors – ArcticNet</p>	<p>Four Inuit land claim regions of the Canadian Arctic</p>	<p>-ArcticNet supports an IRA in each of the four areas -the IRAs are knowledgeable and resourceful contacts for their regions. They are available to: assist and advise researchers and Inuit communities in making the appropriate connections during the proposal development and during the project; assist and advise researchers and Inuit communities in dissemination and communication of research results; assist in the development of new Inuit-driven research projects; identify and engage youth in training and educational opportunities and build research capacity in each region -more of a mentorship or resource program than about ethics</p>	<p>(ArcticNet, 2021).</p>
<p>Standard for Research in Northern Barkley and Clayoquot Sound Communities (2005)</p>	<p>The Barkley and Clayoquot Sound areas of BC</p>	<p>-Developed through the Protocols Project of the Clayoquot Alliance for Research, Education and Training -based on community discussion held in Ucluelet and Tofino in 2001-2002, as well as with five central regions Nuu-chah-nulth Nations, Central Region Chiefs in partnership with researchers at UVic (made for projects and studies conducted through UVic but more widely applicable too) -purpose: encourage mutually-beneficial research collaborations, maximize benefits, share burdens fairly, minimize risks, support local participation, and make research results more locally-meaningful -cornerstone: respect for the well-being and interconnectedness of individuals, communities and ecosystems -outlines all the things, before, during, and after research, that should be done in order to respectfully do research</p>	<p>(Bannister et al., 2005).</p>
<p>Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee</p>	<p>Nuu-chah-nulth territory (Vancouver, BC)</p>	<p>-Created a document outlining protocols and principles for conducting research in a Nuu-chah-nulth context (2008) -developed to assist researchers in ensuring that they meet the appropriate protocols of the Nuu-chah-nulth communities when conducting research in their territories, and is done in an ethical and appropriate manner -partnership, protection, and participation -it is the responsibility of the researcher to identify unique protocols through consultation -criteria for approval by REC: complete REC application for approval; include purpose of conducting research and indicates a benefit to Nuu-chah-nulth communities; any risks associated with participation in the research are outweighed by definitive benefits; minimal disruption to the community as a result of research; no deception; research team is transparent about credentials and positionality; once complete data will be disseminated to individuals and communities in such a manner that is comprehensible and useful to those individuals; ownership of data is communicated as well as plan for where data is housed when research is complete -respect for persons includes an incorporation of autonomy, protection, beneficence (do no harm);</p>	<p>(Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee, 2008).</p>

		maximize benefits and minimize possible harms); and justice (to each person an equal share, according to individual need, according to individual effort, according to societal contribution, and according to merit)	
Ktunaxa Nation's Code of Ethics for Research	Ktunaxa Nation Traditional Territory (Kootenay region of BC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Applies to all persons conducting research projects that relate to the Ktunaxa Nation, including its treaty negotiations -all requests for information, use of cultural heritage resources, use of the Traditional Use Study Library and the KKTC library, resources and interviews with community members or groups must be addressed in writing to the Ktunaxa Treaty Council Administrator -request must include: aims, scope and anticipated results of research project, including potential impacts and any possible risks -if accepted, researcher must consult with the Elders group and any other groups or individuals which the Elders group directs them THEN may approach individual community members or groups -capacity building, continued consultation 	(Ktunaxa Nation, 1998).
Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc.	First Nations of Manitoba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Principles: protection, preservation, partnership, and participation; OCAP -Research Practices: advised to submit a proposal to the Chief and Council for review (including overview, rationale, intent, and benefits to community); working intimately with the research committee of the community you aim to work with -Code of Research Ethics: researchers should not demand the status of FN People; must respect the sovereignty, jurisdiction, and rights of FNs; must respect the privacy, protocols, and dignity of the individual as well as the collective rights of First Nations; research should support the FN to move toward self-determination; FNs must be actively involved in the research process, maintain authority over research, and control the information collected as a result of the research; research must be culturally relevant to the local community and meet expected norms; research should enhance capacity and skills of the FN people involved; must respect strengths, cultures, languages, and traditional norms of FN and involve them whenever possible; transparency and accountability through allowing FN access to the collected data and explanation of findings -Encourages a research agreement 	(Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014).
Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami	Inuit Nunangat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Developed the National Inuit Strategy on Research -relevance of research; Inuit envision research producing new knowledge that empowers our people in meeting the needs and priorities of our families and communities -Inuit must be the partners in the governance of Inuit Nunangat research - to improve efficacy, impact, and usefulness of research activity -call for enforceable guidelines in the area of wildlife and the environment because of the intimate connection between Inuit peoples and the Land 	(Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2018).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ITK and the NRI have published complementary guidelines to TCPS2 for negotiating research relationships with Inuit communities (TCPS2 is limited to institutions and entities that receive federal funding from the Tri-Council Agencies; which are located outside of Inuit Nunangat where the evaluation of risk involved for participants in research does not include broader consideration of Inuit wellbeing) -Inuit tend to be unrepresented on REBs nor are established mechanisms in place to engage Inuit representational organizations on making determinations about Inuit Nunangat-specific research proposals under review -Five priority areas: advance Inuit governance in research; enhance the ethical conduct of research; align funding with Inuit research priorities; ensure Inuit access, ownership, and control over data and information; and build capacity for Inuit Nunangat research (**provides a list of objectives and actions for each) 	
Alberta First Nations Information Governance Committee	First Nations of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -20-year culmination of work aimed to strengthen FN control and capacity in ethical and relevant processes for research; and the collection, utilization, and storage of data -regional satellite of the National FNIGC (creators of OCAP) -increases the impact of research and information that measures the state of FN health and wellbeing; provides governance and oversight to research initiatives and specialized surveys; providing stewardship of data; and builds the individual and systemic capacity for respectfully engaging in data collection, analysis, and utilization through professional development, training and tools, standards of excellence, and access to equitable funding -maximize benefits and limited harm 	(Alberta First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2022).
Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network (UAKN)	Across Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No direct ethics process as it falls with the leading partner organization that makes up a specific project that falls within the UAKN network. -Operates under a set of guiding principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Community Driven Research -> research grounded in community priorities and designed collaboratively; research is respectful of Indigenous cultures; principles of USAI and OCAP will be used as useful guides references informing CDR -Protection -Ongoing Consent -Ownership and Intellectual Property Rights Fairness -> fair treatment for individuals and communities; reflexivity to balance biases -Respect -Honesty -Community Relevance and Practicality -> research outcomes will ensure progress and practicality, especially as it concerns Indigenous peoples and/or organizations that are involved in the project 	(Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network, 2016).

--	--	--	--

Table 2. Non-Indigenous and institution led processes (Canadian Focus)

Organization	Scope	Details	Source
UBC – Office of Research Ethics	University of British Columbia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -BREB (Behavioural REB) approach the review of research by and with FNMI with a lens of cultural safety, humility, and learning -Uses frameworks of OCAP, BC Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act, the TRC, trauma-informed research guidelines, and TCPS2 Chapter 9 -Look for evidence of meaningful collaboration and engagement; costs and benefits; evidence of support from an appropriate Indigenous partner representative -Has a specific section (G) pertaining to Indigenous Peoples, communities, or organizations (no principles are mentioned) -only provides information on the REB coordinators and administrators 	(University of British Columbia, n.d.).
University of Alberta	University of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -relies on TCPS2 and principles of OCAP to guide the ethical review of applications to seek to include Indigenous participants -consultation before making application is necessary -section in the consent form dedicated to FNMI Peoples; If you will be obtaining consent from Elders, leaders, or other community representatives, provide details; If leaders of the group will be involved in the identification of potential participants, provide details; Provide details if property or private information belonging to the group as a whole is studied or used; if the research is designed to analyze or describe characteristics of the group, or individuals are selected to speak on behalf of, or otherwise represent the group; Provide information regarding consent, agreements regarding access, ownership, and sharing of research data with communities; Provide information about how final results of the study will be shared with the participating communities; Is there a research agreement with the community? -only one page -there is information regarding committee membership; REB 1 (human-focused) mentions that there is a Native Studies faculty members and a community member/native studies representative -REBs 2, 3, and 4 (health-related) has not indication of whether there are Indigenous members, only shows specialty 	(University of Alberta, 2022a, 2022b, 2022c, 2022d, 2022e).
Aurora College Research Institute	Northwest Territories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In addition to approval from an IRB or REB, a research license is necessary to do some forms of research in the Northwest Territories AND/OR the Aurora College Research Ethics Committee will review the research for compliance to TCPS2 if from this institution -Additional community research priorities must be considered, so the following organizations have offered their guidance to those planning research projects within their respective territories: Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board, Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute; Inuvialuit Regional Corporation; Northwest Territories Metis Nation; Smbaa 	(Aurora Research Institute, 2019).

		<p>K'e Dene Band; and Knowledge Agenda: Northern Research for Northern Priorities</p> <p>-Also use the updated (2003) version of "Ethical Principles for the Conduct of Research in the North" which lists 20 principles written by the Association of Canadian Universities for Northern Studies</p> <p>-includes spaces for Indigenous reviewers on the committee (not sure how many)</p>	
McGill University	McGill University Research Community	<p>-Question 7 on the application asks if Indigenous people will be involved (ie. if it is conducted on their territory, or Indigenous identity is used as a variable for the purpose of analysis; or interpretation of results will refer to Indigenous communities, peoples, language, history, or culture)</p> <p>-must include a plan for community engagement or justification of avoidance</p> <p>-room for support letters and other relevant documents (ie. research agreement between researcher and community/organization)</p> <p>-cannot seem to find who is on the ethics committees of any of the four REBs</p> <p>-references TCPS2</p>	(McGill University, 2022).
Carleton University	Carleton University Research Community	<p>-Two REBs: one for the Faculty of Public Affairs, Sprott School of business, and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and another for the Faculty of Engineering and Design, Faculty of Science, Department of Psychology, Institute of Cognitive Science, and any research that involves the collection of biological specimens of bodily fluids</p> <p>-Section 5 is dedicated to Indigenous Peoples and Community Engagement which includes: description of consultation processes, approvals/agreements that have been made, benefits to participating communities and peoples; participant involvement in research findings; and data ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP)</p> <p>-no mention of whether there are spaces for Indigenous scholars on IRB committees to assess the validity of research involving Indigenous peoples/communities (for either CUREB-A or B)</p>	(Carleton University, 2022a, 2022b, 2022c).
Nunavut Research Institute	Nunavut	<p>-Have different licenses available for people doing research in Nunavut, one specifically for social sciences research; health research; physical/natural sciences</p> <p>-Social sciences application asks questions about "Nunavut residents" and not specifically Inuit Peoples; must include a non-technical description of the project proposal in English and Inuktitut + consent forms too + space for list of community representatives that have been contacted + asks about traditional knowledge component of project (the same is for health research with Inuit peoples)</p> <p>-there is also a Health Research Application and a Physical Natural Sciences Application</p>	(Nunavut Research Institute, 2021).
University of Victoria	UVic Research Community	<p>The "Human Research Ethics Anonymized Application #19-9876" only offers one mention of First Nations individuals when asking if the research team intends to share the received anonymized data or biological materials with third parties in the future (ie. First Nations band councils being one of them)</p>	(University of Victoria, n.d.; University of Victoria, 2020; University of Victoria, 2021)

		<p>-Cannot gain access to the online application without having an institutional login</p> <p>-Within the annotated guidelines there is a section relating to research involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada; calls for in-depth community engagement that is determined by the researcher and relevant community; references the TCPS2 Chapter 9 and their 2003 protocols and principles (see literature review)</p> <p>-cannot find who is on the REB specifically, but I found the guidelines for composition for the HREB – "...will consist of five members, including men and women, of whom: i) at least two members have expertise in relevant research disciplines, fields, and methodologies covered by the HREB; ii) at least one member is knowledgeable in research ethics; iii) at least one member with no affiliation with the university is recruited from the community, iv) at least one member is knowledgeable in the relevant law, but not the university's legal council, or risk manager"</p> <p>-HREB can also include graduate students, ad hoc members, substitute members, and staff administrators</p>	
TCPS2	Canadian Research Institutions (universities, colleges, hospitals)	<p>-Joint policy of Canada's three federal research agencies: CIHR, NSERC, and SSHRC. Applies to agency and non-agency funded research that takes place under the auspices of the eligible institution and its affiliates (universities, colleges, hospitals, etc.)</p> <p>-outlines respectful relationships, collaboration and engagement between researchers and participants; as well as the need to respect a community's cultural traditions, customs and codes of practice</p> <p>-mutual benefits of research also important and strengthening research capacity</p>	(Government of Canada, 2019).
Yukon University	Yukon University Community	<p>Have a project that is a collaboration between the VP Indigenous Engagement and Reconciliation and the VP Research Development, entitled, <i>What about the land and the water?</i></p> <p>-explores how Yukon First Nations worldviews could be uplifted and celebrated through a research ethics process that considers all aspects of the environment, including the land and the water</p> <p>-project team interviewed five Elders and held a workshop with the President's Advisory Committee on First Nations Initiatives to gather perspectives on the fundamental principles of ethics when interacting with the land; the research team then examined the current REB process for opportunities and obstacles to adjusting the current REB process; then developed a series of scenarios for consideration, ranging from small scale adjustments to a complete restructuring of current processes</p> <p>-tangible initiatives being implemented in the short term include: the review of Yukon College's Policies of Research Integrity and Research Ethics; the development of a Yukon College ethics module that focuses on Yukon First Nations worldviews culture; and a commitment from the Research Services Office to explore future adjustments</p>	(Southwick, Darling, & Hancock, 2018)

Table 3. Notable international examples

Organization	Scope	Details	Source
University of Auckland	University of Auckland Research Community	<p>-Recently revised their human ethics process to incorporate Indigenous influences throughout (separate from the university's Health and Disability Ethics Committees (HDECs) and the Auckland Health Research Ethics Committee (AHREC))</p> <p>-Māori language is incorporated throughout</p> <p>-"How is the intended research consistent with Te Tiriti o Waitangi?"; in what ways is the research of interest to Māori? In what ways does the research align with Māori research interests? How have Māori been involved in the development of the project? How will the research benefit Māori?</p> <p>-Provides a list of suggested resources for Māori research ethics protocols</p> <p>-Section 4 dedicated to Māori-focused consultation and engagement; all researchers are asked to state in what ways they have engaged with Māori organizations or communities in the planning stages of the research and explain</p> <p>-How will Māori participate in this research project? Their family? Will participants be able to undertake the study in Māori language if wanted?</p>	(University of Auckland – Waipapa Taumata Rau: New Zealand, n.d.).
Victoria University of Wellington (Te Herenga Waka)	Victoria University of Wellington Research Community	<p>-University has a strategy to incorporate tikanga Māori (Māori customs and protocols) into research activities; to build cultural competence and help invoke university values and give effect to Te Herenga Waka - the university's Treaty of Waitangi Statute</p> <p>-university vision statement list several values that hopefully encourage commitment to tikanga Māori: akoranga (to teach and to learn); whanaungatanga (a sense of belonging); wahi matauranga (the pursuit of knowledge); kaitiakitanga (care and guardianship); manaakitanga (generosity, respect and hospitality); and rangatiratanga (leadership, nobility, autonomy)</p> <p>-ethics process requires all to explain ways in which research conforms to the university's Treaty of Waitangi Statute (*unable to gain access to the form b/c I am not enrolled as a student)</p> <p>-provide a list of resources to learn about Māori data sovereignty and ethical guidelines</p>	(Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, n.d.).
University of Otago	University of Otago Research Community	<p>-Has a "Research Consultation with Māori Policy;" consultation must begin before proposals are done and is required for all areas of research; must submit a form with proposal saying you did this step</p> <p>-consultation form: interest to Māori, any collaborations, and provide all other regular details of research</p> <p>-consultation form must be submitted to Nagi Tahu Research Consultation Committee (people of the South Island), as well as a submission of results (all to remain consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi)</p>	(University of Otago, n.d.).
Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres	AIATSIS	<p>Principles of ethical research:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Indigenous self-determination 2. Indigenous leadership 3. Impact and value 	(Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012).

Strait Islander Studies		<p>4. Sustainability and accountability.</p> <p>Recognition of the diversity and uniqueness of peoples, as well as of individuals, is essential.</p> <p>The rights of Indigenous people to self-determination must be recognized.</p> <p>The rights of Indigenous peoples to their intangible heritage must be recognized.</p> <p>Rights in the traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions of Indigenous peoples must be respected, protected and maintained.</p> <p>Indigenous knowledge, practices and innovations must be respected, protected and maintained.</p> <p>Consultation, negotiation and free, prior, and informed consent are foundations for research with or about Indigenous peoples.</p> <p>Responsibility for consultation and negotiation is ongoing.</p> <p>Consultation and negotiation should achieve mutual understanding about the proposed research.</p> <p>Negotiation should result in a formal agreement for the conduct of a research project.</p> <p>Indigenous people have the right to full participation appropriate to their skills and experiences in research projects and processes.</p> <p>Indigenous people involved in research, or who may be affected by research, should benefit from, and not be disadvantaged by, the research project.</p> <p>Research outcomes should include specific results that respond to the needs and interested of Indigenous people.</p> <p>Plans should be agreed for managing use of, and access to, research results.</p> <p>Research projects should include appropriate mechanisms and procedures for reporting on ethical aspects of the research and complying with these guidelines.</p> <p>**Outline of all principles AND how to apply the principle.</p>	
San Code of Ethics	South Africa	<p>-The San People created the San Code of Ethics which requires all researchers intending to engage with San communities to commit to four central values, namely fairness, respect, care and honesty, as well as to comply with a simple process of community approval.</p>	(South African San Institute, 2017).

		-Managed by the San Council; process should start with a research idea that is collectively designed, through to the approval of the project, and subsequent publications	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

PART II

Guiding question: *What are the guiding principles needed to do ethical research with*

Indigenous Peoples and communities?

The following is a list of the principles to do ethical research with Indigenous Peoples and communities. While this list may not be exhaustive due to the scope of this environmental scan and time parameters, themes have become evident in the literature that was referenced. Existing ethical frameworks that were mentioned have also been included.

Table 4. Guiding principles of ethical research in an Indigenous context

Principle	Source
Partnership	(Assembly of First Nations, n.d.; Ball & Janyst, 2008; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; Mashford-Pringle & Pavagadhi, 2020; Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee, 2008; OFIFC, n.d.; SCPOR, 2022; University of Victoria, 2003)
Equity	(Assembly of First Nations, n.d.; Health Research Council of New Zealand, n.d.; Kelley et al., 2013; South African San Institute, 2017)
Benefits and Capacity Building	(Alberta First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2022; Assembly of First Nations, 2009; Ball & Janyst, 2008; Bannister et al., 2005; Basile, McHugh, & Gentelet, 2021; First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba, n.d.; Government of Canada, 2019; Hayward et al., 2021; KDSSP, 2007; Ktunaxa Nation, 1998; L'nuey and Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI, 2021; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; Mashford-Pringle & Pavagadhi, 2020; Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee, 2008; OFIFC, n.d.; SCPOR, 2022; Six Nations of the Grand River, 2022)
OCAP (Ownership, Control, Access, Possession)	(Alberta First Nations Information Governance Centre, 2022; Assembly of First Nations, n.d.; Assembly of First Nations, 2009; Carleton University, 2022; First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba, n.d.; L'nuey and Mi'kmaw Confederacy of PEI, 2021; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; Mashford-Pringle & Pavagadhi, 2020; Noojmowin Teg Health Centre, n.d.; Parker et al., 2019; SCPOR, 2022; Toronto Metropolitan University,

	2017; UAKN, 2016; University of Alberta, 2022; University of British Columbia, n.d.)
Transparency	(Assembly of First Nations, 2009; Health Research Council of New Zealand, n.d.; Kelley et al., 2013; Mashford-Pringle & Pavagadhi, 2020)
TCPS2 – Chapter 9	(Aurora Research Institute, 2019; First Nations University of Canada, 2020; L’nuely and Confederacy of PEI, 2021; McGill University, 2022; Noojmowin Teg Health Centre, n.d.; SCPOR, 2022; Toronto Metropolitan University, 2017; University of Alberta, 2022; University of British Columbia, n.d.)
Community Involvement, Participation, and Engagement	(Assembly of First Nations, 2009; Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Studies, 2012; Ball & Janyst, 2008; Bannister et al., 2005; Basile, McHugh, & Gentelet, 2021; Government of Canada, 2019; KDSSP, 2007; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; Noojmowin Teg Health Centre, n.d.; Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee, 2008; OFIFC, n.d.; Parker et al., 2019; SCPOR, 2022; Toronto Metropolitan University, 2017; UAKN, 2016; University of Auckland, n.d.; University of Manitoba, n.d.; University of Victoria, 2003)
Honouring Indigenous Sovereignty	(Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012; Cape Breton University, 2022; Castellano, 2004; Hayward et al., 2021; Hseih, Chang, & Lakaw, 2019; Kuhn, Parker, & Lefthand-Begay, 2020; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; Parker et al., 2019; SCPOR, 2022; Unama’ki Institute of Natural Resources, 2007; University of Manitoba, n.d.; Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, n.d.)
Protection of Natural World for Present and Future	(Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2018; Kuhn, Parker, & Lefthand-Begay, 2020; Southwick, Darling, & Hancock, 2018; Unama’ki Institute of Natural Resources, 2007)
Trust	(Basile, McHugh, & Gentelet, 2021; Ball & Janyst, 2008; Hseih, Chang, & Lakaw, 2019; University of Manitoba, n.d.; South African San Institute, 2017)
Respect	(ACHH Initiative, 2017; Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012; Bannister et al., 2005; Basile, McHugh, & Gentelet, 2021; Government of Canada, 2019; Haddad, 2016; KDSSP, 2007; L’nuely and Mi’kmaw Confederacy of PEI, 2021; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; Mashford-Pringle & Pavagadhi, 2020; Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee, 2008; South African San Institute, 2017; Smith, 1999; Toronto Metropolitan University, 2017; UAKN, 2016; University of Manitoba, n.d.)
Patience	(Haddad, 2016; Parker et al., 2019)
Humility	(Haddad, 2016)
Interconnectedness and Relationships	(Ball & Janyst, 2008; Haddad, 2016; Government of Canada, 2019; Health Research Council of New Zealand, n.d.; OFIFC, n.d.)

Free, Prior, and Informed Consent	(Assembly of First Nations, n.d.; Assembly of First Nations, 2009; First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba, n.d.; KDSSP, 2007; Kwaymullina, 2016; UAKN, 2016)
Protection	(Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012; Ball & Janyst, 2008; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee, 2008; UAKN, 2016; University of Victoria, 2003)
Relevance	(Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012; Ball & Janyst, 2008; Health Research Council of New Zealand, n.d.; Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2018; Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc., 2014; L'nuey and Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI, 2021; OFIFC, n.d.; Parker et al., 2019; UAKN, 2016)
Reciprocity	(Ball & Janyst, 2008; Hayward et al., 2021; L'nuey and Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI, 2021; OFIFC, n.d.; SCPOR, 2022; UAKN, 2016)
Responsibility	(Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2012; KDSSP, 2007; L'nuey and Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI, 2021; University of Manitoba, n.d.; University of Victoria, 2003)
Cultural Safety	(Basile, McHugh, & Gentelet, 2021)

Throughout this environmental scan process, three things became evident: (1) there is a relatively limited number of free-standing or fully realized Indigenous ethics processes that exist for review, (2) those processes that do exist bear a similarity to institutional ethics review processes (with some exceptions such as the inclusion of language or the ownership of data), and (3) institutional review approval is most often also required for Indigenous research projects. It is for this reason that the aims of this search slightly shifted to include an identification of the principles that are highlighted as integral to the ethical completion of research with Indigenous Peoples and communities. *Table 4* contains the notable guiding principles that were shared by all the referenced institutions and organizations in *Tables 1, 2, and 3*, as well as notable literature that will be discussed further below. Within these organizations, the most frequently mentioned principles were benefits to and capacity building for communities and participants; community involvement and engagement; respect; honouring of Indigenous sovereignty; and relevance (in

both a research and cultural sense). The two pre-existing ethics frameworks that were most often referenced were the OCAP framework and the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 framework; specifically, chapter nine which pertains to research with First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples. In the international realm, the Treaty of Waitangi was referenced as well (University of Auckland – Waipapa Taumata Rau: New Zealand, n.d.; Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, n.d.; University of Otago, n.d.).

These findings are similar to that which was found by Langer (n.d.) in a Canada-wide survey to evaluate best practices in the ethical review of university-based research with Indigenous participants. They found that many universities refer researchers to TCPS2 chapter nine, as well as have questions in their application forms that address the issues discussed in chapter nine (Langer, n.d.). Additionally, they found that many institutional REBs do not formally require an Indigenous member and often rely on ad-hoc reviewers to provide additional review on files proposing to work with Indigenous Peoples and/or communities (Langer, n.d.). The existence of few free-standing Indigenous Research Ethics Committees was also found by Langer (n.d), as they focused primarily on institutional processes.

PART III

Literature Review – Risk versus Responsibility

This environmental scan process exists within a larger narrative that compares Indigenous and institutional understandings of ethics and research more broadly. It is from this place of comparison, and my own research endeavours, that I have come to see a fundamental difference between these two standpoints: institutional understandings of ethics are based in ideas of risk while Indigenous understandings of ethics are based in ideas of responsibility. This can be seen in the language that is used in ethics packages, as well as the worldviews that inform

each of these ways of life. This signals that ethics remain “complicated by their positioning in contested hierarchical domains where one set of morals and values, which generally reflect a colonial worldview, are prioritized, and valorized at the expense of others” (West-McGruer, 2020, p. 186). What has ensued as a result, is an ethical monopoly in which all projects are evaluated under the same standards despite differences in location, population, and so many other elements. Hsieh, Chang, & Lakaw (2019) consider this a kind of condescending ethics that prioritizes one overarching ethical correctness which intensifies hierarchies of power and knowledge in the research process, reinforcing the universal applicability of ethical principles, the primacy of the individual over community, and the prioritization of scientific discovery (West-McGruer, 2020). Thus, in what is supposed to be an ethical guarantee or safeguard, unethical research can and does still occur.

Under this front of ethical hegemony, Western frameworks are imposed on two levels: on the level of research and knowledge, and on the level of ethical judgment (Hsieh, Chang, & Lakaw, 2019), as the approval or disapproval of research projects signals what kinds of knowledge and research practices are condoned by the review committee. In Western and institutional contexts, a degree of risk avoidance is evident in ethics review processes (Hayward et al., 2021; Hsieh, Chang, & Lakaw, 2019) and has trickled into the language of Indigenous ethics processes (Assembly of First Nations, 2009; Ball & Janyst, 2008; Cape Breton University, 2022; Kelley et al., 2013; Kuhn, Parker, & Lefthand-Begay, 2020; Kwaymullina, 2016; Six Nations of the Grand River, 2022). In fact, the only application that I came across that did not include language of risk was that of the OFIFC (n.d.). I posit that this is similar to other systems of imperialism and colonialism that have impacted Indigenous ways of being, knowing, and doing for hundreds of years around the globe. In order to be valued as equal and taken seriously,

I hypothesize that Indigenous ethics review committees have often opted to mirror institutional ethics processes to be afforded the same weight as institutional boards. While this is speculative, it is apparent in the literature that the language of risk is prevalent in the world of ethics and that there is very little variation in current research ethics processes in what is known as Canada. However, this does not mean that intentions are the same.

Scholars have begun to argue that university REBs are narrowly focused on protecting reputations and focusing on legal matters rather than ensuring that researchers and institutions are meeting their responsibility to participants (Dingwall, 2012; Hedgecoe, 2016; Scharg, 2010; Stark, 2012). Research and ethics then become centred in the language of deliverables (Dingwall, 2012). When focusing on risks, this can be used to segregate certain groups from the general population based on their “risk behaviours” or characteristics, resulting in them being labelled as problematic or vulnerable (Hayward et al., 2021). This is a deficit-based understanding of research that places risks as inevitable within the research process. Focusing on negative narratives in this way gives power to disharmony, centring alienation and lack of relationships (Wilson, 2008). To assume risk and vulnerability among all research participants is paternalistic and limits autonomy for those involved in the research (Stewart et al., 2021). Hedgecoe (2016) provides an example of a UK-based university that denied the inclusion of student sex workers in a project to limit any associations that might be made with said university. In this light, ethics has come to be seen as a process of reputation management, influenced by larger governing and funding bodies (Dingwall, 2012; Hedgecoe, 2016). This has been associated with the growth of corporatism and managerialism within universities leading to heightened administrative bureaucracy (Dingwall, 2012).

Consequently, institutional review boards and/or research ethics boards are said to be champions of a new kind of censorship that “instead of attempting to repress popular opinion, it appeals to the moral sensibilities of a majority” (Hamburger, 2005, p. 276). This is a censorship of covert bureaucratic means rather than overt political and religious ends, giving review boards the power to grant permission of research projects and the ability to suppress any proposed research projects (Hamburger, 2005). Tierney and Corwin (2007) posit that this imparts an active infringement of academic freedom as review boards have the ability to regulate who is required to consent to research; stipulating the type of research questions allowed and location of research interactions; and by limiting research design. They expand by stating:

“What we are suggesting is that what is being taken out of an individual’s hands is the ability to make decisions as an autonomous researcher working within the healthy parameters that the academy previously had established. Instead, in a litigious environment, guidelines are developed that seek to ensure that the institution is not liable to any risk. The individual professor no longer fully decides the research design, who to protect, where to conduct research, or what to ask. The institution determines the answers, and if the individual disagrees, then the research shall not be done” (Tierney & Corwin, 2007, p. 397).

Alternatively, Indigenous understandings of ethics and ethical protocols leave room for relationality, requiring researchers to answer to all their relations, and reflect and act on how they are fulfilling their roles, responsibilities, and obligations in the research process (Hayward et al., 2021; Wilson, 2008). Thus, while there are many guiding principles that are shared as being integral to this process, large importance lies with cultural relevancy and cultural specificity. This comes through continued collaboration between researchers and communities so that the direct needs of Indigenous Peoples and communities can be known (Ball & Janyst, 2008; Castellano, 2004; Haddad, 2016; Hayward et al., 2021; Hseih, Chang, & Lakaw, 2019; KDSSP, 2007; Kwaymullina, 2016; Langer, n.d.; UAKN, 2016). To put this another way, ethical research

must be based in relational accountability which is anchored in community and demonstrates respect, responsibility, and reciprocity (Wilson, 2008). Kovach (2021) asserts that this entails continually asking yourself questions about trust, respect, and the axiological position of the cultures and places where research is being conducted. Importantly underpinning this side of the conversation is the understanding that from Indigenous perspectives, ethical codes of conduct serve similar purposes as the protocols that govern relationships with all our relations and cannot be narrowly understood as a set of rules to guide researcher behaviour (Castellano, 2004; Smith, 1999). Ethics are contextual and intimately connected to who we are, our values, and our positionality in the world (Castellano, 2004).

This leads to discussions of another foundational difference between Indigenous and Western understandings of ethics, which is who is considered as being involved in the research process. Bull (2016) poignantly highlights that non-Indigenous ideas of ethics focus primarily on the individual, but Indigenous understandings of the self are not so easily bound by the individual. Rather, Indigenous notions of the self include past, present, and future generations of community, as well as interconnections with humans, other spiritual entities, the land, ancestors, and more-than-human relations (Bull, 2016). Thus, individual consent becomes a point of contention when working with Indigenous Peoples that understand their positionality as being intimately connected with that of others. This is further complicated by the concept of pluralism, as the diversity among and within Indigenous communities makes it even more difficult to develop a widely applicable ethical decision-making process (Bull, 2016). This is particularly why relevance is a foundational tenet of Indigenous research; not only should the research questions be appropriate, but so too should the ethical practices that govern it.

Bibliography

- ACHH Initiative. (2017). Indigenous Health Research Advisory Committee. Retrieved from <https://achh.ca/education/ihrac/#:~:text=The%20Indigenous%20Health%20Research%20Advisory,health%20researchers%20from%20across%20Canada>
- Alberta First Nations Information Governance Centre. (2022). Welcome to the Alberta First Nations Information Governance Centre. Retrieved from <https://www.afnigc.ca/main/index.php?id=home>
- ArcticNet. (2021). *Inuit Research Advisors*. Retrieved from <https://arcticnet.ulaval.ca/about-us-committee/inuit-advisors/>
- Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. (2012). *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies*. Retrieved from <https://aiatsis.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-09/gerais.pdf>
- Assembly of First Nations. (2009). *Ethics in First Nations Research – Environmental Stewardship Unit*. Retrieved from https://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/rp-research_ethics_final.pdf
- Assembly of First Nations. (n.d.). *First Nations Ethics Guide on Research and Aboriginal Knowledge*. Retrieved from https://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/fn_ethics_guide_on_research_and_atk.pdf
- Aurora Research Institute. (2019). *Aurora College Research Ethics Committee (REC)*. Retrieved from <https://nwtresearch.com/research-services/research-ethics>
- Ball, J. & Janyst, P. (2008). Enacting Research Ethics in Partnerships with Indigenous Communities in Canada: “Do It in a Good Way.” *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 3(2), 33-51. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jer.2008.3.2.33>
- Bannister, K., Vines, R., Crookes, N., & Schrieber, G. (2005). *Standard of Conduct for Research in Northern Barkley and Clayoquot Sound*. Retrieved from https://achh.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Protocol_Northern-Barkley-and-Clayoquot-Sound.pdf
- Basile, S., McHugh, N.G., & Gentelet, K. (2021). Toolbox of Research Principles in an Aboriginal Context: ethics, respect, fairness, reciprocity, collaboration, and culture. First Nations of Quebec and Labrador Health and Social Services Commission, Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Université du Québec en Outaouais and DIALOG Network.
- Bull, J. (2016). Two-Eyed Seeing Approach to Research Ethics Review: An Indigenous Perspective. In W. C. Van den Hoonaard and A. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Ethics Rupture:*

- Exploring Alternatives to Formal Research Ethics Review* (pp. 167-186). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cape Breton University. (2022). *Mi'kmaw Ethics Watch*.
<https://www.cbu.ca/indigenous-affairs/mikmaw-ethics-watch/>
- Carleton University. (2022a). *CUREB-A Board Membership*. Retrieved from
<https://carleton.ca/researchethics/cureb-a/cureb-a-board-membership/>
- Carleton University. (2022b). *CUREB-B Board Membership*. Retrieved from
<https://carleton.ca/researchethics/cureb-b/cureb-b-board-membership/>
- Carleton University. (2022c). *Forms and Templates*. Retrieved from
<https://carleton.ca/researchethics/forms-and-templates/>
- Castellano, M. B. (2004). Ethics of Aboriginal Research. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 1(1), 98-114.
- Dingwall, R. (2012). How did we ever get into this mess? The rise of ethical regulation in the social sciences. *Studies in Qualitative Methodology*, 12, 3-26. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1042-3192\(2012\)0000012004](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1042-3192(2012)0000012004)
- First Nations Health and Social Secretariat of Manitoba. (n.d.). *Health Information Research Governance Committee*. Retrieved from <https://www.fnhssm.com/hirgc>
- First Nations University of Canada. (2020). *Research*. Retrieved from
<https://www.fnuniv.ca/about-us/policies/research/>
- Government of Canada. (2019). *TCPS2 (2018) – Chapter 9: Research Involving First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada*. Retrieved from https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/tcps2-eptc2_2018_chapter9-chapitre9.html
- Haddad, P. (2016). *How Indigenous Traditional Medicine and modern science are working together to combat diabetes*. Retrieved from <https://researchfeatures.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Dr-Haddad-Universite%CC%81-de-Montre%CC%81al-minority-health-2.pdf>
- Hamburger, P. (2005). The New Censorship: Institutional Review Boards. *The Supreme Court Review*. 271-355. <https://doi.org/10.1086/scr.2004.3536972>
- Hayward, A., Sjobolm, E., Sinclair, S., & Cidro, J. (2021). A New Era of Indigenous Research: Community-based Indigenous Research Ethics Protocols in Canada. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 16(4), 403-417.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/15562646211023705>
- Health Research Council of New Zealand. (n.d.). *Te Ara Tika Guidelines for Māori research ethics: A framework for researchers and ethics committee members*. Retrieved from

https://www.hrc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2019-06/Resource%20Library%20PDF%20-%20Te%20Ara%20Tika%20Guidelines%20for%20Maori%20Research%20Ethics_0.pdf

- Hedgecoe, A. (2016). Reputational Risk, Academic Freedom and Research Ethics Review. *Sociology*, 50(3), 486-501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038515590756>
- Hsieh, J., Chang, E. Y., & Lakaw, S. (2019). From Collective Consent to Consultation Platform: An Experience of Indigenous Research Ethics in Makota'ay. *Junctures*, 20, 71-86. <http://doi.org/10.43074/junc.20071>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2018). *National Inuit Strategy on Research*. Retrieved from <https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/ITK-National-Inuit-Strategy-on-Research.pdf>
- Inter Tribal Health Authority. (2007). *Research Protocol*. Retrieved from <https://ethicshub.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/7-Research-Protocol.pdf>
- Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project. (2007). *Code of Research Ethics*. <https://www.ksdpp.org/ksdpp-code-of-research-ethics.html>
- Kelley, A., Belcourt-Ditloff, A., Belcourt, C., & Belcourt, G. (2013). Research Ethics and Indigenous Communities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(2), 2146-2152. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301522>
- Kovach, M. (2021). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts* (Second edition). University of Toronto Press.
- Kuhn, N., Parker, M., & Lefthand-Begay, C. (2020). Indigenous Research Ethics Requirements: An Examination of Six Tribal Institutional Review Board Applications and Processes in the United States. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 15(4), 279-291. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1556264620912103>
- Ktunaxa Nation. (1998). *Ktunaxa Nation's Code of Ethics for Research*. Retrieved from <https://icwrn.uvic.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/KKTC-Code-of-Ethics.pdf>
- Kwaymullina, A. (2016). Research, Ethics and Indigenous Peoples: An Australian Indigenous perspective on three threshold considerations for respectful engagement. *AlterNative: an International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 12(4), 437-499. <https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.4.8>
- Langer, R. (n.d.). *Research Summary, Cross-country Survey: Best practices in the ethical review of university-based research with Indigenous participants*.
- L'nuey and Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI. (2 December 2021). *Application for L'nuey and Mi'kmaq Confederacy Research Ethics Board*. Retrieved from <https://mcpei.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Lnuey-and-MCPEI-Ethics-application-form-2-Dec-2021.pdf>

- Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre Inc. (2014). *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Manitoba First Nations: Principles, practices, and templates*. Retrieved from <https://www.mfnerc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Ethical-Research-in-Manitoba-First-Nations.pdf>
- Mashford-Pringle, A., & Pavagadhi, K. (2020). Using OCAP and IQ Frameworks to Address a History of Trauma in Indigenous Health Research. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, 22(10), 868-873.
- McGill University. (2022). *Research Ethics Board Office (REBs-1, 2, 3, 4)*. Retrieved from <https://www.mcgill.ca/research/research/compliance/human/reb-i-ii-iii>
- Noojmowin Teg Health Centre. (n.d.). *Manitoulin Anishinaabek Research Review Committee*. Retrieved from <https://www.noojmowin-teg.ca/programs-services/manitoulin-anishinabek-research-review-committee>
- Nunavut Research Institute. (2021). *Scientific research license application – Social Sciences and Traditional Knowledge Research Application*. Retrieved from <https://www.nri.nu.ca/scientific-research-licence-application-social-sciences-and-traditional-knowledge-research>
- Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council Research Ethics Committee. (2008). *Protocols & Principles for Conducting Research in a Nuu-Chah-Nulth Context*. Retrieved from <https://icwrn.uvic.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/NTC-Protocols-and-Principles.pdf>
- OFIFC. (n.d.). *Ethics*. Retrieved from <https://ofifc.org/research/ethics/>
- Parker, M., Pearson, C., Donald, C., & Fisher, C. B. (2019). Beyond the Belmont Principles: A Community-based Approach to Developing an Indigenous Ethics Model and Curriculum for Training Health Researchers Working with American Indian and Alaska Native Communities. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 64, 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12360>
- Scharg, Z. M. (2010). *Ethical imperialism: Institutional review boards and the social sciences, 1965-2009*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- SCPOR. (2022). *Indigenous Research Level of Engagement Tool*. Retrieved from <https://iceclearning.fnuniv.ca/>
- Six Nations of the Grand River. (2022). *Ethics Policy*. <https://www.sixnations.ca/resource/2022/05/ethics-policy>
- South African San Institute. (2017). *San Code of Research Ethics*. Retrieved from <https://trust-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/San-Code-of-RESEARCH-Ethics-Booklet-final.pdf>
- Southwick, T., Darling, S., & Hancock, B. (2018). *What about the land and the water? Yukon First Nations Worldviews and The Research Ethics Process*. Retrieved from

https://www.yukonu.ca/sites/default/files/inline-files/SSHRC%20grant%20%23612-2018-0163_Southwick_FINAL.pdf

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Stark, L. (2012). *Behind closed doors: IRBs and the making of research ethics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stewart, S., Fournier, C., & Indigenous Research Circle. (2021). *The Division of the Vice-President of Research & Innovation, Indigenous Research Circle*. Retrieved from <https://irn.utoronto.ca/downloads/indigenous-research-ethics-consultation-report-2.pdf>

Tierney, W. G., & Corwin, Z. B. (2007). The Tensions Between Academic Freedom and Institutional Review Boards. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(3), 388-398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800406297655>

Toronto Metropolitan University. (2017). Guidelines for Research Involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada. Retrieved from <https://www.torontomu.ca/content/dam/research/documents/ethics/guidelines-for-research-involving-indigenous-peoples-in-canada.pdf>

Urban Aboriginal Knowledge Network. (2016). *Guiding Ethical Principles*. Retrieved from https://uakn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Guiding-Ethical-Principles_Final_2016_12_03.pdf

Unama'ki Institute of Natural Resources. (March 2007). *Protocol for the collection and use of Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge (ATK) within the Park Canada sites of Unama'ki*. Retrieved from <https://ethicshub.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/5-Protocol-for-the-collection-and-use-of-Aboriginal-Traditional-Knowledge-ATK-within-the-Park-Canada-sites-of-Unama%E2%80%99ki.pdf>

University of Alberta. (2022a). *Human Research Ethics Forms and Templates*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/research/research-support/research-ethics-office/forms-cabinet/forms-human.html>

University of Alberta. (2022b). *Membership List – HREB Biomedical Panel*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/research/research-support/research-ethics-office/human-research-ethics/research-ethics-boards/reb-4/membership-list-reb4.html>

University of Alberta. (2022c). *Membership list – HREB – Health Panel*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/research/research-support/research-ethics-office/human-research-ethics/research-ethics-boards/reb-3/membership-list-reb3.html>

University of Alberta. (2022d). *REB 1 Committee Membership*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/research/research-support/research-ethics-office/human-research-ethics/research-ethics-boards/reb-1/reb-1-committee-membership.html>

- University of Alberta. (2022e). *REB 2 Committee Membership*. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/research/research-support/research-ethics-office/human-research-ethics/research-ethics-boards/reb-2/reb-2-committee-membership.html>
- University of Auckland – Waipapa Taumata Rau: New Zealand. (n.d.). *The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee*. Retrieved from <https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en/research/about-our-research/human-ethics/human-participants-ethics-committee-uahpec.html>
- University of British Columbia. (n.d.). *Indigenous Ethics and Research Review*. Retrieved from <https://ethics.research.ubc.ca/behavioural-research-ethics/indigenous-research-and-ethics-review>
- University of Manitoba. (n.d.). *Framework for Research Engagement with First Nation, Métis, and Inuit Peoples*. Retrieved from <https://umanitoba.ca/health-sciences/sites/health-sciences/files/2021-01/framework-research-report-fnmip.pdf>
- University of Otago. (n.d.). *Research Consultation with Māori*. Retrieved from <https://www.otago.ac.nz/research/maoriconsultation/index.html>
- University of Victoria. (n.d.) *Human Research Ethics Anonymized Application #19-9876*. Retrieved from https://www.uvic.ca/research-services/assets/docs/Ethics/rais-anonymized_application_form.pdf
- University of Victoria. (2003). *Protocols and Principles For Conducting Research in an Indigenous Context. Faculty of Human and Social Development*. Retrieved from <https://www.uvic.ca/hsd/research/igovprotocol.pdf>
- University of Victoria. (2021). *Research Involving Humans*. Retrieved from file:///Users/whiteowl/Downloads/RH8105_1250_.pdf
- University of Victoria. (2020). *UVic Human Research Ethics Board Guidelines*. Retrieved from <https://www.uvic.ca/research-services/assets/docs/Ethics/Annotated%20Guidelines%20HRE%20Application%20Form.pdf>
- Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. (n.d.). *Māori research practices*. Retrieved from <https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/research/support/maori-research-practices>
- West-McGruer, K. (2020). There's 'consent' and then there's consent: Mobilising Māori and Indigenous research ethics to problematize the western biomedical model. *Journal of Sociology*, 56(2), 184-196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783319893523>

Wilfrid Laurier University. (2022). *Centre for Indigegogy*.
<https://www.wlu.ca/academics/faculties/faculty-of-social-work/centre-for-indigegogy/index.html>

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Yellowhead Institute. (n.d.). *About us*. <https://yellowheadinstitute.org/about/#>