

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the **Federal Level**



July 2026



**FIRST NATIONS
MAJOR PROJECTS
COALITION**

About the First Nations Major Project Coalition

The First Nation Major Projects Coalition (FNMPC) was established in October 2015 by First Nations that chose to establish a collective approach to proposed major resource projects in their territories.

The FNMPC's vision is for member First Nations to work collaboratively, cooperatively, and cohesively towards the enhancement of economic well-being for member Nations, understanding that a strong economy relies on a healthy environment, supported by vibrant cultures, languages, and the expression of traditional laws. A key purpose of the FNMPC is to safeguard the air, land, water, and medicine sources from the impacts of resource development by asserting its members' influence and traditional laws on environmental, regulatory, and negotiation processes.

The FNMPC provides on-request support to its member-Nations that are involved in IAs and project development on an individual basis. FNMPC members also work together to create shared approaches and strategies for best practices. The FNMPC is one of the largest grassroots Indigenous service organizations in Canada, providing environmental and economic support.

Impact Assessments in Canada

An Impact Assessment (IA) is a process that examines the potential harms and benefits a proposed project may have on s. 35 rights, the environment, and people (health, socio-economic conditions, culture, and traditional harvesting) before a decision to approve the project is made. This process looks at management steps that can lower potential harms and increase project benefits. An IA informs the decision about whether a project should be approved and the conditions that must be in place to minimize the potential impacts.

In Canada, IA for major projects is conducted by the federal, provincial, and territorial governments. In some cases, governments work collaboratively on the assessment of a project.

For this document, statutory IA processes follow a federal, provincial, or territorial statute, such as the federal IA process under the *Impact Assessment Act* (2019).

First Nations have historically been left to the periphery of Canadian federal, provincial, and territorial IA processes, as IAs and related environmental policy development have largely occurred without the direct participation of First Nations in whose territories major projects have been proposed. Where it has occurred, Indigenous groups' involvement in IA processes has generally been limited to providing basic inputs, such as baseline Indigenous Knowledge. Moreover, Indigenous Nations have been excluded from meaningful control over the IA process, outcomes, and decision-making. In short, Indigenous perspectives have been underrepresented in IA in Canada.

In recent years, First Nations have become increasingly involved in IA as part of a broader movement to assert their inherent jurisdiction and rights in respect of major project development decisions within their traditional territories. Additionally, there is increasing pressure on

government and industry to understand collaboration with First Nations as an imperative rather than an impediment to major project development. This movement has been prompted by First Nations' demand for the recognition of the right of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with respect to any major project proposed within their territories. Critical court cases have paved the way for a new set of relationships between First Nations, the government, and project proponents.

Disclaimer

This Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes for the federal jurisdiction was developed by the First Nations Major Projects Coalition (FNMPC) to provide First Nations with an overview of the federal Impact Assessment (IA) processes and opportunities for First Nation participation. This document is intended to support understanding and engagement. It does not constitute legal advice or reflect all possible IA processes and requirements in every context.

The Jurisdictional Scan is based on public information and legislation available when it was drafted in April 2026. Given the constantly evolving nature of IA processes, requirements, and best practices, First Nations are encouraged to confirm information directly with the relevant Crown agency and to seek additional details about any recent regulatory changes to IA processes.

Crown IA and consultation processes can also vary depending on the context of a proposed project and other factors. In some cases, there is a lack of clear guidance from the Crown on IA and consultation processes. An absence of existing guidance does not preclude First Nation engagement on a given aspect of the IA process. Where guidance exists, there may be flexibility in how it is applied. First Nations may request engagement on specific aspects of an IA and may agree on processes with proponents and the Crown that are specific to the First Nation or the project being assessed. First Nations are encouraged to engage early with proponents and Crown agencies to clarify expectations, negotiate appropriate consultation agreements, and assert their rights and title in relation to project-specific IAs.

The information in this Jurisdictional Scan is not intended to be prescriptive. It focuses on Crown statutory IA processes and opportunities for First Nation participation, but does not replace First Nations' knowledge and expertise, nor does it attempt to define the scope of First Nation rights, title, and community objectives. Each First Nation's laws, governance structures, and relationships to their territories are unique and should guide how they choose to participate in IA processes.

Glossary of Impact Assessment Terms

Cumulative Impacts	Changes to the environment, rights, culture, and/or society and their consequences that are caused by the combined impacts of past, present, and future actions.
Impact Characterization	Describing and evaluating the characteristics of potential positive and negative impacts on a valued component resulting from a project, often using parameters like magnitude, duration, frequency, reversibility, likelihood, and geographic extent.
Impact Statement	Detailed technical document, usually in the form of compiled technical reports often between 5,000 and 20,000 pages in length, prepared by the proponent in a manner that is intended to meet the requirements set out in the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.
Impacts	Positive or negative outcomes of an action or activity that result directly or indirectly resulting from a project.
Indigenous-led Impact Assessment	A process where one or more Indigenous nations define the scope and process of assessing impacts and identify potential benefits of a proposed project to be responsive to their unique contexts.
Project Impacts	Changes to the environment, rights, culture, and/or society and their consequences that are caused by a proposed project that is undergoing an impact assessment.
Statutory Impact Assessment Process	An impact assessment process that follows a federal, provincial, or territorial statute, such as the federal IA process. (This includes processes by which a First Nation and a federal or provincial government has both agreed to a process through a land claim that is subsequently recognized in a statute.)
Valued Component (or "Value")	Cultural, environmental, economic, health, social, and other elements of the natural and human environment that are identified as having scientific, social, cultural, economic, historical, archaeological, or aesthetic importance.
Mitigation	Mitigation is any action that is designed to avoid, reduce the severity of, or offset/ compensate for a potential project impact. This can be done in many ways, from modifying the project design or moving the location of project components, to improving environmental management systems, among other options. Monitoring is not considered mitigation.
Residual Impacts	The adverse impacts of a project on a Valued Component or right likely to remain after committed mitigation measures are applied; effectively the impacts of a project that are unlikely to be fully mitigated with committed-to measures in place.

Significance Determination / Severity Determination	Based on the impact characterization, concluding if a proposed project's environmental, rights, culture, social, or economic impacts are acceptable or not. This will often inform a final decision about the project.
---	--

Glossary of Terms Specific to the Federal Level

The Crown	The Crown is a political concept used in Canada that represents the Sovereign (currently King Charles III) in right of Canada, including provinces and territories. The term refers to the executive power and capacity of the Sovereign; however, in practice, it refers to the government.
Canadian Impact Assessment Registry (Registry)	Website maintained by the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC) that contains all project files relevant to the IA process. To access the Registry, click here .
Cooperation Agreement	Agreements that set out how federal and provincial/territorial governments will work together on assessments for major projects.
Initial Project Description (IPD)	The document prepared by proponents that outlines preliminary information about the proposed project and is provided to the IAAC during Phase 1.
Summary of the Issues	Outlines the key issues that the IAAC considers relevant for the federal IA process for a project. The proponent's response to the Summary of Issues will support decision-making by IAAC on whether an IA is required under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> .
Impact Statement	A document prepared by a proponent that details the potential environmental, health, social, and economic impacts of a proposed major project. Under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> , the Impact Statement must include project alternatives, mitigation measures, and effects on Indigenous rights and interests to inform federal decision-making.
Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)	The document prepared by the IAAC during Phase 1 that outlines the information and studies that are required to be included in the proponents Impact Statement.
Detailed Project Description (DPD)	An updated version of the IPD that is prepared by proponents during Phase 1 based on input received by IAAC and the public, including First Nations.
Impact Assessment Report (IA Report)	The IA Report is prepared during Phase 3 by the IAAC or by the Review Panel and is based on the information provided by the proponents and on feedback received by the public, First Nations, and other parties.
Indigenous Engagement and Participation Plan	An Indigenous Engagement and Participation Plan is developed during the Planning phase for projects requiring an environmental assessment under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> that informs community-specific consultation plans, where appropriate.

Conditions	Legally enforceable requirements issued by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to address and manage a project's potential adverse effects as conditions for project approval.
Indigenous Governing Body (IGB)	A council, government or other entity that is authorized to act on behalf of a First Nation group, community or people that holds Rights recognized and affirmed by section 35 of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> .
Project List	Identifies "designated projects" that are determined to have the greatest potential for adverse and complex effects in areas of federal jurisdiction related to the environment for which a federal impact assessment may add value, over and above other federal regulatory oversight mechanisms (e.g., authorizations, licenses, and permits).
Decision Statement	The document issued by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change during Phase 4 that informs proponents and the public, including First Nations, of the IA decision outcome and sets out enforceable conditions.
Indigenous Co-Administration Agreements	Agreements that allow Crown and Indigenous governing bodies to formally share decision-making at key points throughout the federal IA process.

Glossary of Federal Legislation

Impact Assessment Act (2019)	Federal legislation passed in 2019 and amended in 2024 that establishes the federal IA process to assess the potential environmental, social, and economic impacts of major projects under federal jurisdiction. The <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> is administered by the IAAC.
Physical Activities Regulation	Regulation under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> that designates major projects requiring a federal review. It is also referred to as the Project List.
Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (2012)	Federal legislation passed in 2012 and replaced by the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> in 2019 that established the legislative basis for the federal IAs in most regions of Canada. The <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> is administered by the IAAC.
United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act (2021)	Act that affirms the rights of Indigenous peoples and advances the implementation of United Nations' Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as an international human rights instrument that can help interpret and apply Canadian law. It also provides a framework to advance implementation of the Declaration at the federal level.
Section 35 of the Constitution Act (1982)	Recognizes and affirms the existing Aboriginal and Treaty Rights of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples in Canada. These inherent rights are not defined in the Act, but include rights to Aboriginal title, rights to use lands and resources (hunting, fishing, and trapping), self-government rights, and rights to cultural practices.

Duty to Consult

The Duty to Consult is a constitutional obligation stemming from the honour of the Crown and Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. It requires the Crown to consult and accommodate Indigenous groups when contemplating conduct or decisions that might adversely impact potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights.

Table of Contents

About the First Nations Major Project Coalition	2
Impact Assessments in Canada	2
Disclaimer	3
Glossary of Impact Assessment Terms.....	4
Glossary of Terms Specific to the Federal Level.....	5
Glossary of Federal Legislation	6
Table of Contents.....	8
1. Introduction	9
1.1 Purpose of the Jurisdictional Scan.....	9
1.2 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada	9
2. The Federal Impact Assessment Process.....	9
2.1 Key Impact Assessment Legislation at the Federal Level.....	9
2.2 Roles and Responsibilities in the Federal Impact Assessment Process	12
3. Overview of the Federal 5-Phase Process and Key Engagement Opportunities for First Nations	12
4. First Nation Consultation at the Federal Level	17
5. Emerging IA Trends at the Federal Level	18
6. Further Support and Guidance	19
References.....	20
Appendix 1: Overview of the Integrated Assessment Process	22
Appendix 2: Summary Table of Impact Assessment Process in Canadian Jurisdictions	24

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Jurisdictional Scan

This Jurisdictional Scan is intended to provide First Nations with an introduction to the federal Impact Assessment (IA) process. It summarizes the most relevant information within the IA legislation for First Nations and how to maximize a Nation's participation in the IA process. Through their involvement, First Nations have the opportunity to advocate for their views, concerns and information pertaining to the proposed major project to be considered and incorporated into project-related decisions. In this manner, First Nations can advance their rights and interests.

1.2 Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada

Canada is built on the lands of First Nations. The Crown's relationship with First Nations is grounded in a recognition of Inherent Rights, Aboriginal Rights and Treaties, including Peace and Friendship Treaties, Numbered Treaties, and Modern Treaties. These elements form the foundational legal framework and relationship between Canada and First Nations. Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, recognizes and affirms this, making these Rights legally binding and central in federal processes, including IA processes.

The [Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Information System \(ATRIS\)](#) is an interactive map that First Nations can refer to for up-to-date, site-specific information on the potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty Rights of Aboriginal peoples across Canada.

2. The Federal Impact Assessment Process

2.1 Key Impact Assessment Legislation at the Federal Level

A federal IA may be required for a project, depending on the type of project, its location, and potential impacts, under either:

- The [Impact Assessment Act](#) (IAA), and related regulations:
 - [Physical Activities Regulations](#): Identifies designated projects (Project List) that have the greatest potential to cause adverse effects within areas of federal jurisdiction.
 - [Order Designating Certain Excluded Classes of Projects](#): Exempts minor, low-risk projects on federal lands from mandatory IAs.
 - [Information and Management of Time Limits Regulations](#): Specifies information requirements for proponent(s) and circumstances under which legislated timelines may be suspended.
- The [Canadian Environmental Assessment Act](#) (CEAA 2012).
 - Relevant only for projects that were grandfathered under its provisions and continues to undergo an IA process as defined by the CEAA, 2012 guidelines.

Changes to Federal IA Process with the IAA

The IAA introduces a broader, more integrated approach to the federal IA process by expanding the scope of IAs to include social, health, and economic impacts, in addition to environmental impacts. The IAA also strengthens requirements for First Nation consultation and participation throughout the IA process.

- Read Part II of FNMPC's [Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal Impact Assessment](#) for more details about how the IAA changed to federal IA processes.

The IAA establishes the framework for evaluating the environmental, social, health, and economic impacts of a project and for the prevention or mitigation of significant **adverse effects within federal jurisdiction**. The Physical Activities Regulations (also known as the 'Project List') identifies that projects that may require an IA. The Project List covers 10 different sectors:

1. National Parks / Protected Areas;
2. Power Lines and Pipelines;
3. Renewable Energy;
4. Mines and Mills;
5. Hazardous Waste Management;
6. Transportation;
7. Defense;
8. Oil and Gas;
9. Nuclear Facilities; and
10. Water Projects.

Amendments to the IAA in 2024 clarified that the Minister has discretionary authority to designate a proposed project that is not on the Project List if the project may cause adverse federal effects. The Minister may, upon a designation request by First Nations, designate a project that is not on the Project List; however, this is subject to the limitation on the Minister's authority under the IAA.

Around one third of sectors included in the Project List are primarily provincially regulated but have the potential to cause adverse effects on areas of federal jurisdiction. These sectors may be reviewed as part of a federal IA process or through a joint federal-provincial IA process; however, federal decision would focus only on adverse effects within federal jurisdiction.

What are these 'Adverse Effects within Federal Jurisdiction'

Amendments to the IAA in 2024 clarified the definition of 'adverse effects within federal jurisdiction' for the federal IA process. In summary, this refers to the non-negligible negative impacts/changes that a project may have on areas that fall under federal responsibility, such as:

- Environmental components, including fish and fish habitat, aquatic species at risk, migratory birds, and other federally protected environmental components;
- Federal lands, including, but not limited to, national parks, Indian reserves, and military bases;
- Marine environments;
- Transboundary and interprovincial waters, including international waters;
- Other federally regulated health, social, or economic matters; and
- Indigenous peoples, including impacts on:
 - Cultural and physical heritage;
 - Traditional land and resource use;
 - Sites or structures of historical or archaeological significance; and/or
 - Health, social, and economic conditions.

The Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC) is the federal agency that is responsible for reviewing federal IAs for major projects under the IAA and the CEAA, 2012, and also acts as the **Crown Consultation Lead** for First Nations consultation activities.

- For projects that involve activities regulated by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) or the Canada Energy Regulator (CER), the Minister must refer the IA to an integrated review panel (refer to Appendix 1 for details).

“One Project, One Review”

A key principle of the IAA is co-operation with other jurisdictions, such as provinces, territories, and First Nations, with the goal of a “one project one review” approach. The federal government is currently in the process of establishing this ‘one project, one review’ process by negotiating **Cooperation Agreements** with provincial/territorial governments.

- Refer to this [webpage](#) for the federal government’s progress in negotiating Cooperation Agreements under the IAA with provincial/territorial governments.

Under the IAA, there are provisions for **Indigenous Co-administration Agreements**. These agreements allow the Crown and **Indigenous Governing Bodies** to formally share decision-making at key points throughout the federal IA process.

- For more information, refer to the [Discussion Paper on Indigenous Impact Assessment Co-Administration Agreements](#).

Other Types of Assessments Outlined under the IAA

In addition to the IAAC-led EA, the IAA outlines other types of assessments that could be undertaken. These are expanded upon in Part II, Section 1 of FNMPC’s [Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal IA](#), and include the following:

1. [Strategic Assessments](#): These assessments evaluate policies, plans, programs, and common issues relevant to IAs to understand the potential impacts of development and guide the identification of standardized mitigation measures.
2. [Regional Assessments](#): These assessments can be requested by First Nations and are conducted in accordance with a term of reference that defines the objectives, scope and timelines. These assessments can be carried out with First Nations and can examine the positive and adverse effects of past, present, and/or future activities within a specific region.
3. [Review Panel Assessments](#): The Minister may refer an IA to an independent, expert panel appointed by IAA. IAAC supports the work of the independent review panel, and review panels must hold a public hearing, lead engagement during the IA phase and prepare an IA report with recommendations and conclusions. The Cabinet decides whether the significance of federal effects is justified in the public interest.
4. [Integrated Assessment](#): A streamlined IA process for projects led by IAAC with lifecycle regulators (i.e., CER or CNSC) to combine the federal IA requirements with the lifecycle regulator’s requirements in a single review.
5. [Substituted Assessments](#): Allows another jurisdiction to replace the federal IA with their own process if certain conditions are met. The decision to substitute the federal assessment process with another jurisdiction requires consultation with First Nations that may be affected.

2.2 Roles and Responsibilities in the Federal Impact Assessment Process

Several parties with distinct roles and responsibilities are involved in the IA process:

Government Regulators	IAAC	Leads and manages the assessment of all federally designated major projects. Responsible for posting information received by all parties during the IA process on the Registry. Acts as the Crown Consultation Lead and is responsible for leading Indigenous consultation and engagement everywhere apart from the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, and Nunavut.
	Independent Review Panel	When an IA is required for a project regulated by a lifecycle regulator, the assessment is undertaken by an Independent Review Panel.
Decision-Makers	Minister of Environment and Climate Change	Makes the public interest determination during Phase 4 for IAAC-led Assessments. Issues a Decision Statement for the project, which includes a list of legally binding Conditions for the project.
	Governor-in-Council	Makes the public interest determination during Phase 4 if the IA is a Review Panel Assessment or if the Minister refers decision-making authority for the IAAC-led Assessment to the Governor-in-Council.
Other Parties	Proponents	Provides information about the proposed project. Is responsible for engaging with the public and First Nations. Addresses issues raised throughout the IA process.
	First Nations	First Nations participate throughout the IA process in key moments and are consulted by the IAAC throughout the IA process.

Learning Resources and Tools for Federal IA Processes

The FNMPC has created a [public 8-part video series](#) that provides First Nations with more information on how to navigate the federal IA process under IAA.

For additional information about the federal IA process, refer to Part II of FNMPC's [Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal Impact Assessment](#).

3. Overview of the Federal 5-Phase Process and Key Engagement Opportunities for First Nations

This Section only provides an overview of the phases and engagement opportunities of the IAAC-led IA process. For more detail about the phases and engagement opportunities in the federal IA process, refer to Part II of FNMPC's [Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal Impact Assessment](#).

For information about the phases and engagement opportunities in other types of assessments, refer to IAAC's [Impact Assessment 101 webpage](#).



Figure 1: Federal Impact Assessment Process (Impact Assessment Agency of Canada)

Phase 0: Early Engagement

The federal IA process does not formally include an “Early Engagement” phase; however, IAAC encourages proponents to engage early with First Nations to support an efficient IA process. Phase 0 should begin when the proponents start considering a project or activity within a First Nation’s Territory. Phase 0 continues until Phase 1 begins and allows everyone to prepare for the IA process through early relationship building.

- Federal guidance for proponents early engagement with First Nations is available [here](#).
- For more information about the importance of early engagement, or “Phase 0”, refer to FNMPC’s [‘The Case for Phase 0: Improving Impact Assessment Efficiency and Effectiveness.’](#)

Roles and Responsibilities in Phase 0	
Proponents	Begin engagement early with First Nations and share clear information about the project and commit to working in good faith.
First Nations	Share interests, concerns, and expectations; identify capacity needs; begin developing community-driven priorities.
IAAC	Not directly involved. IAAC may be made aware of the information gathered during Phase 0 once the federal IA process begins.

Expected Outcomes of Phase 0 → Stronger early relationships and shared expectations that support meaningful First Nations participation in Phases 1 to 5.

Phase 1: Planning Phase

Phase 1 begins when IAAC posts the proponent’s **Initial Project Description (IPD)** on the [Canadian Impact Assessment Registry](#) (Registry) and lasts up to 180 days. Key activities are:

- Proponents develop and submit the IPD for IAAC to post on the Registry.

- First Nations can review and comment on the IPD on the Registry, which will inform the development of the **Detailed Project Description (DPD)**.
- IAAC consults with First Nations, the public, and other parties to identify any key issues, concerns, and interests related to the IPD.
- IAAC develops a **Summary of Issues**, based on the comments received during consultation, that will be provided to the proponents and posted on the Registry.
- IAAC works with First Nations to develop an **Indigenous Engagement and Participation Plan (IEPP)** guiding First Nation consultation throughout the IA process.
 - Community-specific engagement plans or protocols may also be developed with IAAC to complement the IEPP.
 - First Nations can negotiate provisions in Indigenous Co-Administration Agreements to allow for shared decision-making throughout the federal IA process.
- Proponents respond to the Summary of Issues and prepares the DPD. Once finalized, the DPD is shared with IAAC to be posted on the Registry.

IAAC reviews the DPD to determine if an IA is required for the project. If an IA is required:

- IAAC drafts the **Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (TISG)**, which are finalized following consultation with First Nations, the public, and other parties.
- The final TISG is provided to the proponents and is posted on the Registry alongside a **Notice of Commencement** for the IA for the project.

Roles and Responsibilities in Phase 1	
Proponents	Prepares the IPD, responds to IAAC's Summary of Issues, and develops the DPD.
IAAC	Undertakes consultation activities for the IPD to identify issues and concerns to be included in the Summary of Issues. Collaborates with First Nations to develop the IEPP. Determines if an IA is required based on the DPD and, if so, prepares the TISG and the Notice of Commencement for the project.
First Nations	Can review and comment on IPD and participate in IAAC-led consultation to identify initial concerns to be in the Summary of Issues. Collaborates with IAAC to develop the IEPP and participates in IAAC-led consultation on the requirements for the IA in the TISG.

Expected Outcomes of Phase 1 → IAAC publishing the TISG and a Notice of Commencement for the IA of a project on the Registry.

Phase 2: Impact Statement Phase

During Phase 2, proponents have up to 3 years to prepare the **Impact Statement** for the proposed project, based on the TISG. The Impact Statement identifies and assesses the potential impacts of the project, how people and Indigenous Rights may be affected, and the proposed mitigation measures. Key activities include:

- Proponents prepare and submit the Impact Statement to IAAC.
- IAAC reviews the Impact Statement to determine whether it meets the information requirements outlined in the TISG.

- A 30-day comment period allows First Nations and the public to review and submit comments on the Impact Statement through the Registry.
- If information gaps are identified in the Impact Statement by IAAC or other parties, the proponents are requested to provide that information before the IA process can proceed to the next phase.

Roles and Responsibilities in Phase 2	
Proponents	Prepares and submits the Impact Statement and responds to information requests submitted by the IAAC, First Nations, or other parties.
IAAC	Reviews the Impact Statement against the requirements in the TISG and notifies First Nations and the public of the comment period for the TISG. Requests additional information from proponents as needed.
First Nations	Reviews and comments on the Impact Statement and identifies information gaps, as needed.

Expected Outcomes of Phase 2 → IAAC posts a **Notice of Determination** on the Registry once the Impact Statement has met the TISG's information requirements.

Phase 3: Impact Assessment Phase

Phase 3 involves preparing the **Impact Assessment Report (IA Report)** by either IAAC or an independent Review Panel, depending on the assessment type. The timelines for Phase 3 vary accordingly¹. Key activities include:

- The IAAC or Review Panel conducts a technical review of the information that has been provided by the proponents about the project to prepare the IA Report.
 - The IA Report includes input received from First Nations, the public, federal experts, and other jurisdictions (i.e., provincial jurisdictions).
 - First Nations may co-write sections as part of the IA Report to provide their perspectives on the adequacy of consultation:
 - **Crown Consultation and Accommodation Report:** For IAAC-led Assessments, these document the Crown's consultation with First Nations, reports any views shared during the consultation process, including potential accommodation measures identified, and presents the Crown's conclusion on the adequacy of consultation.
 - **Consultation Summary:** For Review Panel Assessments, this section of the IA report summarizes the comments received from the public, including First Nations.
- The IAAC or Review Panel develops draft enforceable Conditions to mitigate the potential negative impacts of the project.
 - Draft Conditions are posted on the Registry for review and comment by First Nations and the public.

Roles and Responsibilities in Phase 3
--

¹ An IAAC-led Assessment has a maximum time limit of 300 days whilst the Review Panel Assessment has a time limit extending between 300 and 600 days.

IAAC or Review Panel	Conducts a technical review of information received during Phase 1 and Phase 2 to develop the IA Report and identifies draft Conditions. Finalizes the IA Report and the Conditions based on comments received.
First Nations	Provides comments on the IA Report and identifies potential draft Conditions. May draft relevant parts of the IA Report.

Expected Outcomes of Phase 3 → The final IA Report is submitted to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change (Minister).

Phase 4: Decision-Making Phase

In Phase 4, the Minister or the Governor-in-Council makes a decision on the project based on the IA Report and public-interest factors. Timelines may vary depending on who the decision-maker is².

Once a decision is made, the Minister issues a **Decision Statement**. This is posted on the Registry alongside the final IA Report. The Decision Statement indicates whether the project may proceed and outlines the legally binding Conditions that the proponents must follow.

- The Decision Statement must consider impacts on First Nations peoples and their Rights, in addition to any views raised by First Nations during consultation activities.

Roles and Responsibilities in Phase 4	
Minister	Makes a determination on the project for IAAC-led Assessments. Issues a Decision Statement, which includes a list of the legally binding Conditions, for all projects undergoing an IAAC-led or Review Panel-led Assessment.
Governor-in-Council	Makes a determination on the project for Review Panel Assessments or when the Minister referred decision-making authority for an IAAC-led Assessment.
IAAC	Posts the Decision Statement and final IA Report on the Registry.

Expected Outcomes of Phase 4 → A Decision Statement published on the Registry that indicates whether a project is allowed to proceed, and under what Conditions.

Phase 5: Post Decision Phase

If the Decision Statement allows the project to proceed, Phase 5 begins and continues throughout the life of the project. Key activities include:

- Proponents begin obtaining additional authorizations and permits, as required.
- Ongoing compliance with the Conditions set out in the Decision Statement, including the implementation of monitoring, follow-up, and adaptive management programs.
 - There are opportunities for First Nations to be involved in the development and implementation of these programs throughout the life of the project.

For more guidance on First Nations participation during federal IA processes, refer to Part III of FNMPC's [Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal Impact Assessment](#) or to Section 4.0 of IAAC's [Guidance: Indigenous Participation in Impact Assessment](#).

² If the Minister is making the decision, Phase 4 can last up to 30 days. If the Governor-in-Council is making the decision, Phase 4 can last up to 90 days.

4. First Nation Consultation at the Federal Level

The IAAC serves as the **Crown Consultation Lead** for all federal IAs and is responsible for coordinating participation by other federal authorities or lifecycle regulators, as appropriate. The IAAC's consultation and engagement approach is guided by [Policy Context: Indigenous Participation in Impact Assessment](#), which ensures IAs are done in a manner that respects the Rights of First Nations that are recognized and affirmed in section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* and aligns with Canada's commitment to implement the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* by supporting the principle of **Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)**.

As part of consultation, the IAAC is responsible for working with First Nations to support their participation in IAs and in Review Panel Assessments by:

- Collaborating with First Nations to develop and implement an IEPP;
- Negotiating Co-Administration Agreements to work in partnership with First Nations throughout the assessment process;
- Offering Participant Funding to First Nations; and
- Consulting First Nations to identify issues and potential impacts on the exercise of rights;
- Consulting First Nations on the draft **Terms of Reference (ToR)** (for Review Panel Assessments), the draft IA Report and the proposed draft Conditions.

There are four types of guiding agreements that First Nations may use during federal IA processes to support effective consultation. They are listed below but described in more detail in Part III of FNMPC's [Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal Impact Assessment](#):

- The IEPP, which is developed between IAAC and each First Nation;
- A workplan developed with IAAC, which can be attached to or separate from the IEPP;
- A **Process Agreement** with proponents; and/or
- A Co-Administration Agreement done between an IGB and IAAC that allows First Nations to outline decision-making and governance responsibilities for a federal IA process.

Once the IA is completed, IAAC transfers the Crown Consultation Lead function to the lead federal authority, which is often the federal department, agency, or lifecycle regulator responsible for overseeing a particular project.

- Refer to Section 5.5 of the IAAC's [Guidance: Indigenous Participation in Impact Assessment](#) for information about the lead federal authority's role in First Nations consultation post-decision.

Available Funding for First Nations' Consultation and Participation

To support First Nation participation in federal IAs, First Nations can apply for funding through IAAC's [Participant Funding Program](#) (PFP). To apply for this funding, First Nations must:

1. Access the application form for the assessment you are interested in on the [Federal IA Registry](#). Once downloaded, fill out the application with the correct information.
2. Submit the completed application form and supporting documents by email to fp-paf@iaac-aeic.gc.ca before the application deadline.

Although federal funding is available, this amount typically does not cover all the costs associated with a First Nation being involved in an IA. As such, it is recommended that the First Nation negotiate additional IA-related funding from the proponents.

5. Emerging IA Trends at the Federal Level

Ongoing Concern: ‘Fast-Tracking’ and Streamlining Federal IA Processes

Since 2025, the federal government has moved toward expediting large infrastructure and industrial projects considered in the national or public interest. The [One Canadian Economy Act](#) includes measures to fast-track and streamline IA processes. Policy initiatives are being designed to shorten timelines, streamline approvals, and, in some cases, allow projects to proceed with reduced assessment requirements or without a full IA.

While the details and implications of this legislative change continue to evolve, the overall direction has important implications for First Nations. First Nations may be expected to identify and communicate potential impacts on their rights, lands, and cultures within much shorter time frames. Meaningful participation in IA may require significantly greater financial, technical, and human resources to meet shorter timeframes. As opportunities for public participation in IA processes narrow, community groups, organizations, and other interested parties may increasingly look to partner with First Nations, recognizing the central role Nations play in protecting lands and waters for present and future generations.

Emerging Practice: Legal Challenges to the *Impact Assessment Act*

In May 2022, the Alberta Court of Appeal found that the IAA could allow the federal government to overstep into areas of provincial jurisdiction, including energy projects, mining, and land management. In 2023, the [Supreme Court of Canada ruled that the IAA was largely unconstitutional](#).

The Supreme Court found that the IAA risked overstepping federal jurisdiction by allowing key decisions (i.e., determining if an IA is required for a project) to be influenced by considerations that are not under federal jurisdiction. It was also found that the Act’s definition of “federal effects” extended beyond the scope of federal jurisdiction and encroached on provincial responsibilities.

- This [brief](#) provides a detailed summary of the central amendments to the IAA and their implications for the federal IA process.

Despite these amendments, uncertainty remains as to whether the revised IAA still infringes on provincial authority over natural resources. For example, in 2024, Alberta asked the Alberta Court of Appeal to rule on whether the amended IAA continues to violate provincial rights. The outcomes of that litigation are not known as of early 2026, creating ongoing uncertainty about the constitutionality of the amended IAA. This is something First Nations should monitor, even if the province where they are located has not taken a position on the constitutionality of the amended IAA.

6. Further Support and Guidance

Support and Guidance Material for Further Learning

Key resources developed by the FNMPC that should be reviewed by First Nations to gain more understanding of the federal IA process include:

1. The [public 8-part video series](#) about the federal IA process under IAA; and
2. [Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal Impact Assessment](#).

Additional materials that First Nations should review to understand the federal IA process includes:

3. [Guidance: Indigenous Participation in Impact Assessment](#)

References

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. 2020. "Impact Assessment Act." [https://api.cnscc-](https://api.cnscc-ccsn.gc.ca/dms/digital-)

[medias/impact_assessment_act_presentation_2020_en.pdf/object](https://api.cnscc-ccsn.gc.ca/dms/digital-medias/impact_assessment_act_presentation_2020_en.pdf/object).

First Nations Major Project Coalition, Angel Ransom, Trefor Smith, Alistair MacDonald, Tania Salerno, and Justin Page. 2020. "GUIDE TO EFFECTIVE INDIGENOUS

INVOLVEMENT IN FEDERAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT." https://fnmpc.ca/wp-content/uploads/FNMPC_Guide_Oct15202_FINAL.pdf.

First Nations of Quebec and Labrador Sustainable Development Institute. 2025. "The Federal Impact Assessment Process: Description, Ideas and Examples for Indigenous Peoples' Involvement." 2031. <https://iddpnql.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/fnqlsdi-impactassessment-en.pdf>.

Government of Canada. 2016. "Crown Consultation With Indigenous Peoples in Federal Impact Assessment." July 2, 2016. <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/programs/aboriginal-consultation-federal-environmental-assessment.html>.

Government of Canada. 2025. "Impact Assessment Process." July 25, 2025. <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/programs/impact-assessments-101/impact-assessment-process.html#phase3>.

Government of Canada. June 2024. "The Amended Impact Assessment Act." 2024. https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/iaac-acei/documents/acts-regulations/Amended_Impact_Assessment_Act.pdf.

Indigenous Advisory Committee. "Discussion Paper on Indigenous Impact Assessment Co-Administration Agreements." Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, 2025. <https://letstalkimpactassessment.ca/lets-talk-indigenous-co-administration-agreements>.

Taylor, Tim. 2023. "Impact Assessment Acts." Regulations and the Environment. May 5, 2023.

<https://pressbooks.openeducationalberta.ca/mruenvregs/chapter/impact-assessment-acts/>.

West Coast Environmental Law. "Brief: Amendments to the Impact Assessment Act." 2024.

<https://www.wcel.org/sites/default/files/publications/2024-08-28-Brief-IAA-amendments-web.pdf>.

Appendix 1: Overview of the Integrated Assessment Process

Some projects are subject to oversight by **lifecycle regulators**, which are responsible for regulating the project's activity throughout its life. The lifecycle regulators are:

- [Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission](#) (CNSC): Regulates projects that use nuclear energy and/or materials under the [Nuclear Safety and Control Act](#).
- [Canada Energy Regulator](#) (CER): Regulates pipelines and power lines under the [Canadian Energy Regulator Act](#).

Integrated Assessments incorporate the regulatory requirements of the lifecycle regulator into the federal IA process. Below is a description of the parties involved in Integrated Assessments:

Integrated Review Panel	Made up of members who work with the lifecycle regulator and are appointed by IAAC. Leads engagement activities during Phase 3, including holding public hearings for the public, First Nations, and other parties about the project. Prepares the IA Report, with recommendations, with IAAC that is be provided to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change during Phase 4.	
IAAC	Supports the lifecycle regulator in establishing the Integrated Review Panel and managing the Integrated Assessment process. Responsible for posting all information on the Registry.	
Minister of Environment and Climate Change	Refers projects requiring an Integrated Assessment to the Integrated Review Panel. Issues a Decision Statement for the project based on the decision made by the decision-maker, which includes a list of legally binding Conditions for the project.	
Governor-in-Council	Responsible for making the public interest determination on projects undergoing an Integrated Assessment.	
Other Parties	Proponents	Provides information about the proposed project and addresses issues raised throughout the IA process.
	First Nations	First Nations participate throughout the IA process in key moments and are consulted by the Integrated Review Panel

Integrated Assessments follow the same 5-phase process:

- Phase 1: Planning
 - Proponents submit their IDP to IAAC, which is posted on the Registry to allow First Nations and the public to provide comments and flag concerns.
 - IAAC develops and issues the TISG along with a Summary of Concerns.
 - The Minister refers the project to an Integrated Review Panel.
- Phase 2: Impact Statement
 - Proponents prepare their Impact Statement.
 - IAAC and the lifecycle regulator establish the Integrated Review Panel.
 - IAAC, the lifecycle regulator, First Nations, and the public review the Impact Statement and submit information requirements as needed.
- Phase 3: Impact Assessment
 - The Integrated Review Panel conducts its assessment of the project by considering its potential impacts and any comments submitted.

- Engagement activities with First Nations and the public continue, including public hearings led by the Integrated Review Panel.
 - The Integrated Review Panel and IAAC develop an IA Report that is submitted to the Minister to support decision-making during Phase 4.
- Phase 4: Decision
 - The Governor-in-Council determines whether the project should be allowed to proceed.
 - If approved, the Minister issues a Decision Statement with Conditions.
- Phase 5: Post-Decision
 - The Integrated Review Panel makes the licensing decision for the project based on the Integrated Assessment.

Once the Integrated Assessment is completed, IAAC will transfer the Crown Consultation Lead function to the lifecycle regulator (i.e., CNSC or CER) responsible for overseeing the particular project.

- Refer to Section 5.6 of IAAC's [Guidance: Indigenous Participation in Impact Assessment](#) for information on their role in First Nations consultation.

Appendix 2: Summary Table of Impact Assessment Process in Canadian Jurisdictions

The table below presents the relevant laws, regulations, Crown agencies, and First Nation consultation requirements for IA processes in various Crown jurisdictions in Canada. The table also summarizes key challenges and concerns First Nations may have with IA processes in each jurisdiction and provides resources for further reading.

In addition to the challenges and concerns outlined in the table below, there are several that relate to most or all jurisdictions. Neither these nor the jurisdiction-specific concerns in the table below should be considered an exhaustive list. These are not the product of extensive research but are rather the observations of experienced practitioners in the field of IA. First Nations participating in IA processes may have concerns that are specific to their own Nation or even to a specific project. However, many of the concerns below can be expected to be relevant for First Nations participating in Crown IA process in Canada. Concerns that may be relevant in most or all jurisdictions in Canada include, but are not limited to, the following:

- There is a lack of clear guidance on Crown processes for fulfilling the Duty to Consult, especially in several provincial jurisdictions.
- Proponents are often tasked with fulfilling aspects of the Duty to Consult but do not always do so in a way that is meaningful or fulsome.
- First Nations often find Crown consultation to be inadequate in that it focuses disproportionately on providing notification and information rather than collaborative engagement and shared decision-making.
- There is a lack of clear guidance and requirements for early engagement (i.e., before the project officially enters the Crown's official IA system) between First Nations and proponents in the design of the project and the assessment process.
- There is often a lack of decision-making authority for First Nations on projects and assessment processes and outcomes, plus a lack of clear processes and requirements for obtaining First Nations' Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC).
- The scopes of IAs are often defined too narrowly and focus disproportionately on biophysical effects at the expense of fulsome assessment of impacts to Indigenous rights and values.
- First Nations' objectives, indicators, thresholds, and responses are not frequently or meaningfully used in the assessment of biophysical and socio-cultural impacts. Instead, proponents and Crown assessors rely disproportionately on Western metrics, resulting in disagreements about impacts and mitigation measures.
- There is a lack of clear requirements for proponent and Crown funding for First Nations' participation in IAs, especially at the provincial level.

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

Jurisdiction Name	Key Laws and Regulations	Relevant Crown Authority	Indigenous Consultation Requirements and Guidance	Challenges and Concerns for First Nations	Further Reading (i.e., Guidance material, etc.)
Federal	Impact Assessment Act (IAA, 2019) Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA, 2012) Physical Activities Regulations Order Designating Certain Excluded Classes of Projects Information and Management of Time Limits Regulations	Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC)	Guidance: Indigenous Participation in Impact Assessment	Lack of adequate consultation and consensus-seeking with First Nations. Lack of decision-making authority for First Nations. Challenges to the constitutionality of IAA (2019) and fast-tracking legislation may result in rushed timelines and/or disregard for First Nations' Rights.	FNMPC's public 8-part video series about the federal IA process under the IAA (2019) FNMPC's Guide to Effective Indigenous Involvement in Federal Impact Assessment
British Columbia	Environmental Assessment Act 2018 (EAA) Reviewable Projects Regulation (under the EAA)	BC Environmental Assessment Office (EAO)	Guide to Consensus-Seeking under the Environmental Assessment Act, 2018 Guide to Involving Proponents when Consulting First Nations	Lack of committed-to participant funding in place in BC for First Nations to access during the EA process. New timelines under Bill 15 may result in rushed timelines and disregard for Indigenous Rights.	EAO's User Guide: Introduction to EA under the Provincial Environmental Assessment Act (2018) Tsilhqot'in Nation Overview of the BC Environmental Assessment Process Indigenous Nations' Guidance for Participating in EA Process Commenting on Major Projects
Alberta	Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act (EPEA)	Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) (for oil, gas, and coal)	Policy on Consultation with First Nations on Land and Natural Resource Management, 2013.	First Nations are not considered to be full partners with Alberta when assessing the impacts of proposed projects.	Alberta's Environmental Assessment Process Overview

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

	Activities Designation Regulation (under the EPEA) Responsible Energy Development Act (REDA)	development projects) Alberta Environment and Protected Areas (AEPA) (for all other types of projects not covered by the AER)	Guidelines on Consultation with First Nations on Land and Natural Resource Management 2014.	Concerns about the regulatory independence of the AER. Alberta's challenge of the constitutionality of IAA (2019) may result in disregard for First Nations' Rights.	Environmental Assessment Program: Frequently Asked Questions Cumulative Effects Assessment in Environmental Impact Assessment Reports
Saskatchewan	Environmental Assessment Act	Ministry of the Environment - Environmental Assessment and Stewardship Branch (EASB)	Government of Saskatchewan First Nation and Métis Consultation Policy Framework (CPF) Proponents Guide: Consultation with First Nations and Metis in Saskatchewan Environmental Impact Assessment Proponent Handbook: Voluntary Engagement with First Nation and Métis Communities to Inform Government's Duty to Consult Process.	Lack of meaningful consultation with First Nations on proposed projects. Support for Alberta's challenge of the constitutionality of IAA (2019) may result in disregard for First Nations' Rights.	Guidelines for an Environmental Assessment High Level Overview of the Environmental Assessment Process Guidelines specific to developing and assessing specific documents for the EIA process: • Technical Proposal Guidelines; • Guidelines for the Terms of Reference and Environmental Impact Statement; and • Technical Review Guidelines. Guidelines for specific types of projects undergoing an EIA: • Environmental Review Guidelines for Oil and Gas Activities; and • Mineral Exploration Guidelines for Saskatchewan
Manitoba	The Environment Act The Dangerous Goods Handling	Environmental Approvals Branch (EAB)	Interim Provincial Policy for Crown Consultations with First Nations, Métis Communities and Other	In the screening stage, the EAB decides if a project has the potential to impact Indigenous rights and is not required to consult with First Nations on this decision.	Information Bulletin – Environmental Assessment and Licensing under The Environment Act

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

	<i>and Transportation Act</i> Classes on Development Regulation		Aboriginal Communities (2009)	Mandatory consultation with First Nations comes after project plans have been drafted and submitted. Unclear role for First Nations in IA processes. Outdated consultation policy (2009). Criticism of the “One Project, One Review” process.	Environment Act Proposal Report Guidelines
Ontario	Environmental Assessment Act (1990) Ontario Regulations 51/24 (Exemptions from the Act and from Part II of the Act); Ontario Regulation 616/98 – EA Deadlines Ontario Regulation 345/93 – Private Sector Developers.	Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MCEP)	Code of Practice for Consultation in Ontario's EA Process Environmental Assessments: Consulting Indigenous Communities	Bill 5 – Protect Ontario by Unleashing our Economy Act, 2025 weakens environmental protections, concentrates decision-making power for the province, allows for special exemptions from EA, and reduces opportunities and quality of First Nations' engagement and involvement.	Guide to Preparing Environmental Assessments Willms & Shier Environmental Law's Environmental Assessment Primer
Quebec (Southern QC)	Environment Quality Act (EQA)	Ministère de l'Environnement, de la Lutte contre les changements	Guide on the Information and Consultation Process Carried out with Aboriginal Communities by Proponents	Shortened assessment timelines may reduce opportunities for and quality of Indigenous consultation.	Reference Guide for the Regulation Respecting the Environmental Impact Assessment and Review of Certain Projects (French only)

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

	Regulation respecting the environmental impact assessment and review of certain projects Regulation respecting the regulatory scheme applying to activities on the basis of their environmental impact	climatiques, de la Faune et des Parcs (MELCCFP)	of a Project Subject to the EA procedure (also available in French). Aboriginal Community Consultation Policy Specific to the Mining Sector. Information for Developers and General Information Regarding Relations with Aboriginal Communities in Natural Resource Development Projects. Guide for Project Proponents on Public Participation before the Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement (French only)		Understanding RAEFIE. Guide à l'intention de l'initiateur de projet à propos du processus de participation publique sous l'égide du Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement (Guide for project initiators regarding the public participation process under the auspices of the Bureau of Public Hearings on the Environment) (French only) Environmental Assessment in Southern Quebec - Overview (Ministry of Environment, climate change, wildlife and parks) Guide on the Information and Consultation Process Carried out with Aboriginal Communities by Proponents of a Project Subject to the EA procedure. Directive pour la réalisation d'une étude d'impact sur l'environnement (Directive for implementation of an impact study on the environment) (French Only)
Quebec (Northern QC)	The James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBNQA)	James Bay Advisory Committee on the Environment (JBACE)	Consultations Conducted by the Proponent: Expectations of the Review Committee (specific to Cree Territory)	Assessment outcomes and conditions are not respected by proponents.	Environmental Assessment of Northern Projects Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Review Procedure

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

	Regulation respecting the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure applicable to the territory of James Bay and Northern Québec		Reference Guide on Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Procedures Applicable in Nunavik (specific to Inuit and Naskapi Territory)	Concerns about overlapping federal, provincial, and First Nations jurisdictions	James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement Section 22 Guide for proponents under Section 23 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement
New Brunswick	The Clean Environment Act The Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation - Clean Environment Act Projects that must be registered under the EIA regulation	Environmental Impact Assessment Branch (EIA Branch) in the Department of Environment and Local Government	Duty to Consult and Indigenous Consultation Key opportunities for First Nations during a Comprehensive EIA	Lack of clear requirements or processes for early engagement. Requirements to consider impacts and protect First Nations rights are vague. It is unclear how the duty to consult will be fulfilled during project assessments. Majority of consultation is done by the proponent, with limited involvement by the EIA Branch. Lack of clarity of role for First Nations in the Technical Review Committee. Concern about the “One Project, One Review” process.	Guide to Environmental Impact Assessment in New Brunswick
Prince Edward Island	Environmental Protection Act Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines	Department of Land and Environment	Mi'kmaq-Prince Edward Island-Canada Consultation Agreement	Specific consultation guidelines for an EIA are developed on an individual basis. First Nations are not necessarily given specific guidelines or privileges. The province is responsible to carry out	East Coast Environmental Law. “Environmental Impact Assessment: A Legal Toolkit for Prince Edward Island”, 2025

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

				the duty to consult and ensure potential impacts to First Nations' Rights and Title are appropriately identified, mitigated, and/or accommodated, but how this occurs is not clearly laid out.	
Nova Scotia	Environment Act Environmental Assessment Regulation Environmental Assessment Review Panel Regulations	Environmental Assessment Branch (EAB) in the Department of Environment and Climate Change	2010 Mi'kmaq-Nova Scotia-Canada Consultation Terms of Reference Government of Nova Scotia Policy and Guidelines: Consultation with the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia The Canada-Nova Scotia Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation regarding Duty to Consult	Lack of clear guidance on how First Nations should be involved in Phase 1, specifically around designating project for EA and determining its "class". Lack of clear guidance on First Nation participation in Phases 3 and 6, specifically on how Mi'kmaq knowledge and inputs are considered in those processes. Current ministerial decision-making timelines for both Class I projects (50 days) and Class II projects (275 days) are too short to allow for adequate Mi'kmaq participation and accommodation.	Environmental Assessment in Nova Scotia (Slide Deck) Environmental Assessment Process The Role of Proponents in Crown Consultation with the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia Fact sheet for 2025 amendments to the Environmental Assessment Regulations
Newfoundland and Labrador	Environmental Protection Act (2002) Environmental Assessment Regulations (2003)	Environmental Assessment Division (EA Division) in the Department of Environment, Conservation and Climate Change Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Energy Regulator	Government of Newfoundland and Labrador's Aboriginal Consultation Policy on Lands and Resource Development Decisions Pekuakamiulnuatsh, the Essipit, and the Nutashkuan Consultation and Accommodation Protocol	Lack of clear requirements or processes for early engagement. Depth of consultation during the EA is determined by the province based on proposed activity and extent of possible impacts to asserted rights. There is a lack of clear guidance for First Nations involvement and Consultation Guidelines are developed for each EA.	Guide to the Environmental Assessment Process Transparency of Environmental Assessments in Newfoundland and Labrador Purpose of Environmental Assessment Canada Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

Yukon	Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Act (2003) Assessable Activities, Exceptions and Executive Committee Projects Regulations (2005) Decision Body Time Periods and Consultation Regulations (2005)	Yukon Environmental Socio-Economic Assessment Board (YESAB)	Umbrella Final Agreement (UFA) YESAB's Proponent Consultation Guidance for Executive Committee Screenings	YESAA is a single, territory-wide assessment regime, which can fail to recognize the diversity of First Nation's governance systems across the Yukon. Under YESAA, final decision-making still rests with colonial governments. Settlement Lands often cannot address wider cumulative effects that occur across entire Traditional Territories.	Impact Assessments in Canada's North Overview of the Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Act (YESAA) The YESAB Assessment Process
Northwest Territories	Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act (MVRMA) (1998) Preliminary Screening Requirements Regulations (1998) Exemptions List Regulations (1998)	Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (Review Board)	Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board Engagement and Consultation Policy (2013) Reference Bulletin on Consultation and Engagement in EIA	The Review Board has yet to develop EIA-specific consultation and engagement policies for First Nations and Inuit. The Major Projects Office's accelerated approval process for priority projects in the NWT could streamline the EIA process for certain projects that may have the potential affecting First Nations and Inuit rights and interests.	Review Board's Step-by-Step Information webpage Review Board's EIA Guidelines Overview booklet
	Inuvialuit Final Agreement (1984) Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic	Environmental Impact Screening Committee (EISC) Environmental Impact Review Board (EIRB)	Inuvialuit Final Agreement (1984)	Lack of clear requirements or processes for early engagement with Inuvialuit.	EISC's Environmental Impact Screening Guidelines EIRB's Environmental Impact Review Guidelines

Jurisdictional Scan of Impact Assessment Processes at the Federal Level

	Assessment Act (2003) ³				
--	--	--	--	--	--

³ Developments proposed in the Yukon North Slope, although located within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, are first assessed by YESAB under the Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Act. If the YESAB identified the potential for the development to impact current and future Inuvialuit harvesting, the proposed development is referred to the EISC to be screened under the Inuvialuit Final Agreement.