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**Executive Summary**

The Nunavut Housing Corporation (NHC) is leading the development of an Action Plan to address Nunavut’s housing crisis – the Blueprint for Action on Housing (BPAOH). The BPAOH will serve as a strategic action plan to be implemented over the next ten years. The Action Plan is a Government of Nunavut (GN)-wide perspective on the issues, solutions, and actions required to address housing challenges in Nunavut.

This report is the second of two reports that have been produced to summarize the work completed to-date by the NHC and contracted consultants, DPRA Canada, in developing the BPAOH. To inform the development of the BPAOH, the NHC has hosted two rounds of engagement sessions with Nunavut government and interagency stakeholders – supplemented by interviews and focus groups. This second summary report provides a summary of feedback received from the second round of engagement sessions.

The primary objective of the second round of engagement sessions was to develop specific actions to be included in the BPOAH. The sessions were structured according to the four (4) main goals and nine (9) key topics of discussion that address these goals. The goals were outlined in the Government of Nunavut’s Long Term Comprehensive Housing and Homelessness Strategy (2013). Each of these goals and topics will be addressed through the development of actions and commitments that will contribute greatly to addressing Nunavut’s housing crisis. These 4 goals and 9 topics are as follows:

**Goal 1: Removing Barriers to the Supply of Housing**

1. *Topic: Land Development*
2. *Topic: Capital Planning/Infrastructure Coordination*

**Goal 2: Reducing the Costs of Housing**

3. *Topic: Workforce Development*
4. *Topic: Technological Innovation*
5. *Topic: Municipal Financing*

---

1 For a full description of feedback received during the first round of engagement, please refer to the document, “BPAOH – Summary Report of Round One Engagement Sessions”. 
Goal 3: Increasing Investment in Housing

6. Topic: Investment/Building a Stronger Business Case

Goal 4: Defining Housing Demand Factors

7. Topic: Care/Supportive Housing
8. Topic: Affordability Options
9. Topic: Meeting the Housing Needs of GN Employees

The second round of engagement built on the success and momentum of the first round of engagement. With participation from over 100 representatives from the GN and interagency organizations, considerable progress was made towards the development of the BPAOH. (Appendix A provides a full list of participants.)

A high-level summary of the action items that were identified during each of the engagement session to address Nunavut’s housing needs is provided in Section 3 of the Report. This section does not provide an analysis of findings, but rather a descriptive summary of the key points that were raised.

The findings identified in this report will be used to inform the development of the BPOAH.
1.0 Introduction

The Nunavut Housing Corporation (NHC) is leading the development of an Action Plan to address Nunavut's housing crisis – the Blueprint for Action on Housing (BPAOH). In April 2016, the NHC contracted DPRA Canada to assist with this work.

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report provides a summary of work completed to-date by the NHC regarding engagement sessions for the BPAOH. Specifically, the report summarizes the feedback received from the second round of engagement sessions with Nunavut government and interagency stakeholders. A report on the first round of engagement that summaries the key issues, challenges and potential solutions to Nunavut's housing landscape is also available. Information from the first round of engagement is not included in this report. This report is intended to inform the development of the BPOAH. 1.2 Background to the BPAOH

The BPAOH is the third component of the NHC's three-part approach to addressing Nunavut's housing needs. The BPAOH will build on the groundwork laid in the Framework for the Government of Nunavut's Long-term Comprehensive Housing and Homeless Strategy (2012) and on the four strategic goals identified in the Government of Nunavut's Long Term Comprehensive Housing and Homelessness Strategy (2013) (“the Strategy”).

The Action Plan will draw upon the goals and objectives of the Strategy and be comprised of realistic, achievable and holistic actions brought forward by multiple government and agency stakeholders to respond to Nunavut's housing challenges. The Action Plan is intended to represent a GN-wide perspective on the issues, solutions, and future actions required to address housing challenges in Nunavut.

1.3 Structure of the report

The following sections of this report will present an overview of the NHC’s approach to the development of the Blueprint for Action on Housing, as well as a summary of the recently completed first round of engagement sessions.

The Report is structured as follows:

1.0 Introduction
2.0 Approach to Developing the BPAOH
3.0 Report on the Round Two Engagement Sessions
4.0 Next Steps to Develop the BPAOH
2.0 **Approach to Developing the BPAOH**

Development of the BPOAH will take a whole-of-government perspective on the issues, solutions and future actions required to address housing challenges in Nunavut. The NHC is using a multi-stakeholder engagement session approach to realize this objective.

To inform the development of the BPAOH, the NHC delivered a series of engagement sessions – supplemented by interviews and small focus groups – in May and June 2016 involving 11 GN departments and interagency partners. Feedback from participants on housing issues, challenges, and possible solutions with respect to each of these topics (as captured in this report) will inform the development of the BPAOH’s actions and commitments.

The engagement sessions were structured according to the four (4) main goals outlined in the Strategy. Each goal is associated with one or more key topics of discussion that, if addressed, will contribute greatly to addressing Nunavut’s housing crisis.

The four goals of the Strategy, as well as the 9 associated topics of discussion, are presented in Figure 1 below:

*Figure 1: Strategy Goals and BPAOH Engagement Discussion Topics*
2.1 Engagement Process

The engagement process for the development of the BPOAH began in April 2016 and is currently nearing its completion. Post-engagement, NHC will draft the BPOAH and coordinate an interdepartmental review through the Policy Officials Committee. A full list of engagement activities is identified in the table below.

In early April, NHC conducted a series of pre-engagement interviews with senior management across GN departments. These interviews provided an opportunity for NHC and departments to discuss underlying issues related to addressing Nunavut’s housing challenges, and how departments’ mandates were related to addressing these issues. During these sessions departments identified the key participants that should be involved in the engagement sessions.

Subsequent to the pre-engagement interviews, in advance of Round 1 of the engagement sessions, NHC produced and distributed 5 discussion “primers” addressing the Goals of the Housing Strategy and the specific topics of engagement. The first round of engagement included 9 half day sessions to address 9 key topics / challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1 – 8</td>
<td>Pre-engagement interviews (7)</td>
<td>51 participants: DFS, NAC, EIA, ENV, JUS, QEC, FIN, EDT, EDU, CGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2-6</td>
<td>Round 1: Engagement Sessions (9)</td>
<td>100+ participants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16- 27</td>
<td>Follow up focus engagements with senior management (3+)</td>
<td>GN -14 departments / agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30 - June 3</td>
<td>Round 2: Engagement Sessions (8)</td>
<td>100+participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>DMC Session</td>
<td>To be confirmed with DMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Blueprint Drafting</td>
<td>NHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8 -19 (tentative)</td>
<td>POC / Departmental Review Period</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.1 Multi-Stakeholder Engagement Sessions: May 2\textsuperscript{nd} – May 6\textsuperscript{th}, Iqaluit

From May 2\textsuperscript{nd}– 6\textsuperscript{th}, 2016, the NHC undertook the first round of engagement, hosting a total of nine (9) half-day engagement sessions in Iqaluit – one for each of the 9 topics of discussion. The primary objectives of the first round of engagement sessions on the BPOAH were to:

i. Identify the needs and issues underpinning/specific to the nine topics of discussion; and

ii. Identify potential options and/or solutions to the issues identified.

Each session was approximately 2.5 to 3 hours in duration and began with an introductory presentation provided by the NHC to set the context of Nunavut’s housing crisis.

Participants were asked to focus on the primary issues underpinning the topic of discussion before shifting to focus on potential solutions. DPRA recorded participant feedback on flipchart notes which were then synthesized to inform a comprehensive summary report.

On the whole, participation from representatives during all nine sessions was considered by the NHC to be meaningful and fulsome, with high levels of participation from the various stakeholders. Over 100 representatives from multiple departments and/or agencies participated in the first round of engagement.

2.1.2 Round One Summary Report

A comprehensive summary report was produced at the conclusion of the first round of engagement sessions. The report provides a high-level summary of what was said at each of the engagement sessions regarding Nunavut’s current housing needs, challenges and possible solutions\textsuperscript{2}.

The report presents a description of the key points that were heard during the engagement sessions for each of the nine topics of discussion. The following components were captured for each topic of discussion:

\textsuperscript{2} Please refer to the summary report “BPAOH – Summary Report of Round One Engagement Sessions” for a full description of the issues, challenges and potential solutions that were identified in round one.
a. **Issues:** Provides context and identifies the underlying need explored by participants as it relates to the strategy goal and the specific topic at hand.

b. **Challenges:** Examines the challenges that currently limit successful action to address these needs.

c. **Potential Solutions:** Proposed solutions or potential approaches to address housing challenges, including identified stakeholders and opportunities for interlinkages with other GN / Nunavut initiatives.

### 2.1.3 Focused Discussions with Key Departments for Round Two

In the weeks following the first round of engagement, the NHC and DPRA conducted a series of focused discussions with key departments. Discussions were mainly conducted at the Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM) or Director-level.

ADM’s and Directors were provided with a brief summary of their department’s participation during the first round of engagement. From here, they were engaged on potential suggest solutions to issues of relevance their department that were identified during the round one engagement sessions. Departments were also requested to review ongoing initiatives or business plan priorities and notify NHC of those that could support the BPOAH.

The following departments were interviewed: Education (EDU), Community & Government Services (CGS), and Finance (FIN). The Policy Officials Committee was also engaged during this time.

### 2.1.4 Development of Engagement Tools for Round Two

In preparation for the second round of engagement, a set of engagement tools were created to facilitate group discussion towards developing action items. The engagement tools provided a summary of the key issues, challenges and potential solutions that were captured during the first round of engagement, and presented this information in both narrative and table format. The engagement tools are included with Appendix C of this report.

Participants received the engagement tools in advance of the second round of engagement sessions. Hard copies of the engagement tools were also provided at each of the engagement sessions.
2.1.5 Preparations for Round Two Engagement Sessions

Participation in each of the nine sessions was confirmed by way of electronic meeting invitations, with certain participants being invited to multiple sessions. Follow-up phone calls were completed with those individuals who did not respond electronically.

2.1.6 Multi-Stakeholder Engagement Sessions: May 30th – June 3rd, Iqaluit

From May 30th – June 3rd, 2016, the NHC undertook the second round of engagement on the BPOAH, hosting a total eight (8) half-day engagement sessions in Iqaluit. The primary objectives of the second round of engagement sessions on the BPOAH were to:

i. Identify potential options and/or solutions to the issues identified, and;

ii. Identify and develop concrete action items that might be taken to address issues identified.

Each session was approximately 2.5 to 3 hours in duration and began with a brief introduction of the topic of discussion by NHC. Please refer to Appendix B for a sample agenda from the engagement sessions.

Discussions were guided by the tables that were provided in the engagement tools and also projected on screen. Participants were asked to focus on the potential solutions identified during the first round of engagement in order to develop specific actions that could be included in the BPOAH. DPRA recorded participant feedback on flipchart notes which were then synthesized to inform the summary presented in the following section.

---

The session for the topic of Municipal Financing was cancelled due to low attendance.
3.0 Report on the Round Two Engagement Sessions

Building on the success of the first round of engagement, the second round of engagement sessions offered a similar level of in-depth engagement on behalf of stakeholders. All GN departments and/or agencies were represented during the sessions along with key external stakeholders. Over 100 representatives participated in the second round of engagement. A complete list of participants is included in Appendix A of this report.

Below is a summary of the discussion from these engagement sessions.

3.1 A Summary of What We Heard in Round Two

This section provides a high-level summary of the key findings that were identified during the second round of engagement sessions. The primary objective of the second round engagement sessions was to build upon potential solutions identified during the first round of engagement to develop realistic and implementable action items to address issues and barriers of Nunavut’s housing landscape. This is not an analysis of findings, but rather a summary of the key points that were raised.

Summaries for each of the nine sessions are organized as follows:

a. **Potential Solutions**: Proposed solutions or potential approaches from the first round of engagement to address housing challenges, including identified stakeholders and opportunities for interlinkages with other GN / Nunavut initiatives.

b. **Summary of Key Findings towards Action Items**: Proposed actions to support identified solutions. Actions must be realistic and achievable and identify department leads and/or partners, associated timeline, and oversight committee.

3.1.1 GOAL I: Removing Barriers to the Supply of Housing

**Topic 1: Land Development**

New housing construction is dependent on the availability of developed land. Currently, the high cost of developing land and the infrastructure necessary to support it, prevents proactive lot development and neighbourhood planning in most communities.
a. Potential Solutions

Over the immediate and short term, it was suggested that greater collaboration within the GN, and between the GN and community governments, is required to better understand priorities and coordinate land development. There is also an immediate need for more robust community-specific information (e.g., inventory) to inform the various stages of infrastructure development (from land planning through to building construction).

Over the medium and longer term, it was desired that the GN encourage land availability and construction by creating incentive policies in order to develop additional residential land, stimulate construction, and help grow the private market. As well, investments staff training and retention strategies in areas such as land administration, logistics, and financing are important additional incentives that should be strengthened in order to make planning process more efficient and effective.

b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

An action item that was identified is that a working group comprised of CGS Planning & Lands and Community Development, NHC and the hamlets be established to facilitate increased coordination of land and community planning processes. The overall objective of the working group is to identify common community information requirements and improve baseline data (e.g. granular material status, available lots, drainage plans, inventory of connecting municipal infrastructure). The working group would meet annually during the third week of October to align with the Capital Planning process. The working group will be responsible for the creation of short-term (3-5 years) Development Plans to augment existing, longer-term community plans. Development Plans will be updated annually by CGS and NHC.

NHC and CGS have committed to identifying the housing and land development needs in each community over the next 3-5 years. An additional action item to inform NHC planning processes will be for CGS to regularly provide NHC with an up-to-date list of vacant lots in each community. As well, NHC will participate in the scoping and design of a Request for Proposal (RFP) being developed by CGS for an upcoming review of community plans.

Action items were discussed to assist with the collection of community-specific baseline data. Participants identified the need for NHC to consult with CGS on the scope and parameters of a review of existing geotechnical reports. CGS and NHC will consult with the NRI to determine
if research funding is available for such a project. The results of the review will be recorded in a Community Development Database, or other information portal that is accessible to land and infrastructure development stakeholders.

Another action item that was identified was for the NHC and CGS to approach municipalities to gauge appetite for the private development of land, including land surveying and titling processes. A tabletop study of private land development in Nunavut and similar jurisdictions will be undertaken to improve understanding and inform decision-making. NHC will also identify the housing need in each community so as to inform private sector priorities for development.

Capacity issues and staff turn-over continue to impact the daily business and overall operational ability of municipalities in Nunavut. An action item was for a business case to be developed to increase the travel budget for CGS staff travelling to communities to provide valuable on-the-job training and support. As well, CGS will investigate the option of transitioning to an electronic system for land files to increase redundancy and efficiency into the land administration system.

Topic 2: Capital Planning/Infrastructure Coordination

GN capital funding is spread across a variety of service areas based on need and departmental mandates. Departments and agencies must compete for the same resources each year when seeking to develop or maintain capital infrastructure, resulting in an inherently competitive capital allocation process.

a. Potential Solutions

A formalized, holistic and organized approach to infrastructure projects, land development, and capital planning processes could be pursued to coordinate government action over longer-term planning horizons. To facilitate increased collaboration between departments and agencies and the potential alignment of capital needs, there is a need to develop a more efficient approach to the prioritization of government funds.

Participants noted it is important to determine what communities really need. This could include exploring ways of clearly identifying departmental roles and responsibilities when it comes to community-based infrastructure requirements. Further, the use of the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) platform could be built upon to help departments to plan and prioritize community infrastructure needs.
b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

To increase collaboration between departments and agencies with respect to capital planning, an action item was developed for CGS to draft a **discussion paper for Deputy Ministers** to request the **ICSP process** be formally expanded to include input from all GN departments and agencies. **Baseline data needs** for ICSPs and a **protocol for regular updating** will also be identified within this discussion paper.

Another action item that was identified was to conduct an **interdepartmental review of the ICCP process** to re-evaluate its purpose and scope. **Greater analysis** of infrastructure ‘asks’ prior to going to the ICCP is necessary. **Financial analysts** should be included on the ICCP to build in critical analysis into the current system. **CGS will review capital substantiation sheets** to determine ways to include a discussion of social and economic factors of proposed infrastructure.

To address issues of competition and increased strategic direction for allocating limited GN capital, a **standardized prioritization process** for infrastructure requests should be developed and applied. An action item that will initiate progress towards this objective will be the completion of a **jurisdictional review** of infrastructure prioritization models used elsewhere. Key findings from this review will inform the Quality of Life Committee on the development of **criteria** that are considerate of Nunavut’s socio-economic circumstances.

A key component of implementing a holistic, coordinated approach to infrastructure development in Nunavut is the development of a 20 Year Strategic Plan to guide GN capital investments over the long-term. The forthcoming Economic Development Strategy II will be useful tool for informing long-term government priorities for economic development and can also be used to inform the development of a 20 Year Strategic Plan. To ensure that infrastructure priorities are not lost with the arrival of a new government, a list of infrastructure priorities should be developed (possibly coordinated through DMC) during the last quarter of the administrations’ mandate, and provided to the new government as recommendations for transition planning, to be considered in the development of its new 4 year mandate and priorities.
3.1.2 GOAL II: Reducing the Costs of Housing

Topic 3: Workforce Development

Nunavut’s pool of skilled labourers, particularly in the areas of construction, maintenance and administration of housing and related infrastructure, is small. This impairs the ability of the NHC to maintain its buildings, limits the capacity of the construction industry to build more private dwellings and in some cases, prevents individuals from purchasing homes due to high maintenance costs.

a. Potential Solutions

A strong local workforce will enable the GN to build and maintain housing more efficiently and therefore reduce these costs. There is a need to fill gaps in Labour Market Information (LMI) through additional data collection, and determine trends and potential actions across sectors.

Identification of opportunities for partnerships and better coordination between departments, agencies and the private sector involved in local workforce development is key to strengthening Nunavut’s capacity to meet the demands for housing and associated infrastructure. An important outcome is the development of a comprehensive training continuum to outline existing programs and spending that support and sustain ongoing training and skills development. Career development programming should be Nunavut-specific and flexible to meet the needs of participants and employers, and be informed by a career pathways approach of matching training and competency requirements to occupations.

b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

The Department of Family Services (DFS) is currently in the planning stages of conducting an Employer’s Survey. This is an important existing initiative that will help address the lack of labour market information (LMI) and analysis. In the immediate to short term, an action item that was identified is for DFS to coordinate input from departments and agencies into the design of the survey. Another action item will be the establishment of an interdepartmental committee, chaired by DFS, to inform on and coordinate existing and planned labour market initiatives across the GN. The results of the Employer’s Survey will be disseminated within the government by way
of this committee. Participants also identified the need for a **centralized place for labour market statistics**, such as the old Community Workforce Database that existed under EDU. The **Nunavut Bureau of Statistics** should be approached to fulfill this role.

Another important existing initiative identified is the upcoming Inuit Labour Force Survey being conducted by Nunavut Implementation Panel. NHC will engage with EIA, who represents the interests of the GN on the Panel, to determine how departments can have input on the design and outcomes of the survey.

To further contribute to workforce planning, an action item that was identified is for the **NHC** to **identify categories of positions** within its own organization, and that of the Local Housing Organizations (LHOs) that are vacant. Establishing trends in employment vacancies will assist the NHC in identifying the necessary training and workforce development initiatives that could be pursued. Additional resources that could assist NHC in this task include: the 2013 **Nunavut Economic Outlook** and DFS’ draft “**In Demand Career Occupations in Nunavut**” document.

An overarching action item that was identified was that a **comprehensive training continuum** be developed. This training continuum will foster a “**career pathways**” approach to workforce development that involves systematically mapping out occupations by their associated skills, competencies, training, and education requirements. **DFS** has already begun to map out certain occupations in its draft “**In Demand Career Occupations in Nunavut**” document; **NHC** and other departments will review this document and **make recommendations** to **DFS** on any occupations that are missing.

The link between workforce development and education was made on more than one occasion. One action item that was identified is for **NHC** to work with **EDU** to ensure that **foundational training and education requirements** for housing related positions are built into **K-12 school curriculum** to better prepare students upon graduation. One existing example of this is the “**Building Trades Helper**” program being led by **DFS** in collaboration with **NHC** and **NAC**. An action item for **NHC** is to ensure its continual involvement in the development of this program and assist DFS in engaging the private sector, LHOs, and other GN departments to provide valuable on the job training for students. With respect to apprenticeship opportunities, **CGS** and **NHC** will work together with the **hamlets** to **revise and improve** the dated **Nunavut Early Apprenticeship Training program** (NEAT) based on lessons learned.
There was also general consensus that an action item could be to revisit the definition of “occupation” in territorial legislation to ensure that it is considerate of the realities of Nunavut’s workforce. To support this review, a *jurisdictional review of occupational standards* across territories and provinces should be completed to determine what is appropriate for Nunavut to adopt. NHC will also *engage the LHOs* to determine if the current occupation standards are necessary, or if they create a barrier to employment, to further support this initiative.

**Topic 4: Technological Innovation**

The costs of housing in Nunavut are significantly higher relative to the rest of Canada. There is a need to explore how technological innovation can help reduce the costs associated with building and maintaining housing. Given the high cost of utilities across the territories, more *energy efficient homes* and more sustainable energy solutions could have large impacts on the costs of housing over the long-term.

**a. Potential Solutions**

*Greater collaboration* between GN departments and agencies as well as *partnerships with the private sector* on potential projects will enable more economical construction and maintenance options. Any technological improvements proposed should be *piloted* first to test their applicability in the North and Nunavut, specifically. As well, the *benefits, risks and costs* (construction and O&M), of specific technologies require greater analysis, using measureable data. It was suggested that focus be directed on first improving current technological tools before turning to adopt other newer technologies that must be integrated and managed. Important questions to ask are: “*Is the technology ‘doable’ for Nunavut?*” “*Is it ‘learnable’?*” “*Is (use of) the technology ‘maintainable’?*”

Lastly, further exploration of *alternative energy sources* and technologies to foster *climate change adaptation* is necessary. QEC for example, is looking into the use of solar panels, and suggested harnessing waste heat in all communities and a forthcoming net-metering policy as opportunities for NHC and small independent power producers (IPP).
b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

An action item that was identified to improve the process of adopting new technologies in Nunavut is to **formalize a process to vet new technologies**. Such a process would help to ensure that any new technology was appropriate within the Nunavut-context and able to be properly integrated, maintained and repaired. An action item identified was the development of a **directive for departments to self-assess decisions to invest in new technology** that included the following protocol:

i. Application of clear scientific methodology for testing,

ii. A pilot program component,

iii. Comprehensive data gathering and analysis, and

iv. Supported by a business case to justify its adoption.

NHC identified an action to adopt the use of an **Innovation Test Centre** as part of its process for piloting of new technology (as per the protocol identified above) through the use of the Arviat Sustainability House. NHC will finalize a process and circulate to departments for review and feedback.

**QEC** is moving forward with a net-metering policy to facilitate two-way power production, and will be pursuing amendments to legislation to allow for small independent power producers in Nunavut. An existing action for the **NHC** is to continue assisting QEC in this important initiative by piloting net-metering technology on select homes in Nunavut through the installation of solar panels. An action item is for the **Nunavut Research Institute** to provide data on solar panel feasibility to further support this work.

Another existing initiative that was recognized was the ongoing work of the **Department of Environment (ENV), Climate Change Section** in developing a series of **permafrost hazard maps**. An action item is that **NHC, ENV, and CGS** should meet to discuss an appropriate process for including **permafrost hazard maps** and the **online Permafrost Databank** into existing **NHC and CGS planning and development frameworks**, for example in community plans and new Development Plans. Lastly, another action item is for **NHC** to provide advance warning of the location of new housing construction so that **ENV and NRI** can direct research opportunities accordingly.
**Topic 5: Municipal Financing**

The operation and maintenance costs for social housing are significant and increasing year over year.

**a. Potential Solutions**

There is a need to investigate the level and appropriateness of control given to municipalities in regulating and determining the costs of municipal services and land development, as well as explore potential alternative financing models, including increased investment from the GN and increasing private ownership to alleviate pressures on NHC. It was suggested that there be multiple partners (government and private) to offset costs, including collaboration with RIAs for services on Inuit owned lands.

More efficient delivery of services will potentially reduce high housing service delivery costs to Hamlets and the NHC. Greater oversight of rate charges and operating costs may provide transparency on hidden subsidies and true costs to NHC and others. Finally, borrowing best practices from communities that have been successful in managing their budgets may help other communities to become more efficient.

**b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items**

Due to low confirmed attendance and as a result of focused discussions with CGS prior to the second round of engagement, the session for Municipal Financing was cancelled.

An action item that was identified during discussions with CGS was for **CGS to** strike a working group to begin the implementation of recommendations identified in the Water Sewer Service Subsidy Policy (WSSSP) review\(^4\) report. The working group will be comprised of municipal, CGS, and NHC staff.

Another action item that was proposed is for CGS to explore changes to the way NHC is billed for utilities and services to residential units. One suggested approach would be to have a “residential subsidy” agreement between CGS and NHC, similar to the model that is currently in place with QEC. As well, it was discussed that there is a need for a mechanism to tie the economic rate with that of the residential rate in order to standardize rate increases across the board.

\(^4\) A program review of the WSSSP was conducted in November 2015 to better understand how the transparency of the subsidy and its allocation can be improved.
In addition, another suggested action item is to engage the Nunavut Association of Municipalities (NAM) in a 'service level standard' discussion to illuminate best practices for reducing operating costs. It was noted that the current model for service delivery does not provide a natural incentive for the municipality to control costs, as all costs are ultimately paid by the GN and the NHC (the only ‘economic rate’ payers).

Further actions have been incorporated under other Issues.

3.1.3 GOAL III: Increasing Investment in Housing

Topic 6: Investment/Building a Stronger Business Case

Nunavut needs greater investment in housing to increase stock and to provide a diversity of housing options. There is a need to develop a strong and successful business case that demonstrates, amongst other factors, that direct investments in housing provide economic stimulus with measurable outputs in the Territory.

a. Potential Solutions

The development of a stronger business case will require a review Nunavut statistics to identify the gaps in housing. It is important to quantitatively demonstrate existing gaps, identify what is needed to remedy the gaps, and show the potential results from proper investment in housing that would address those gaps. The Nunavut Bureau of Statistics and Statistics Canada are important partners in this endeavour.

A coordinated capital planning approach would help reduce competing priorities across GN departments and should be demonstrated as proof during lobbying efforts of the Government of Nunavut’s commitment to housing.

b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

To address issues with data gaps, collection and use, participants identified the following key action items:
i. Develop an evidence-based framework to support a business case for more housing. **NHC** will lead this process and coordinate input from all departments, with oversight from the Quality of Life Committee.

ii. **NHC** will identify the data requirements to be included in the business case and consult with the Nunavut Bureau of Statistics to source existing data.

iii. **NHC** and the Nunavut Bureau of Statistics will work together to identify data gaps based on this analysis and determine an approach to filling data gaps through partnerships with departments and external agencies (e.g. Statistics Canada, SEMC Data Map).

iv. Key performance indicators needed to support the evidence-based framework and quantify impacts and need will be identified.

**NHC** will prepare a summary and/or discussion of current data gaps as a result of this process for review by the Building Capacity Committee. Statistical data collection is a GN-wide need, however it is possible that consensus on GN priorities may be reached in order to streamline efforts. One potential starting point that was suggested to source existing data is the existing Socio-economic Monitoring Committee (SEMC) Data Map.

Participants discussed the need for increased coordination of Nunavut’s priorities both internally and externally. To address internal coordination challenges, an action item to develop an interdepartmental Committee on Infrastructure was proposed. The primary objective of the Committee is to support the ICCP process through the prioritization of infrastructure requests from departments. To this end, the Committee will oversee the development of a standardized prioritization process, as well as a CGS’ review of capital substantiation sheets, as was originally raised during the Capital Planning/Infrastructure Coordination session. In addition, the Committee will oversee the development an evaluation tool for infrastructure justification to be included with RFDs. The Committee will be comprised of Assistant Deputy Ministers and will meet semi-regularly.
An action item that was identified to assist in coordinating external priorities for lobbying is for the NHC to consult with EIA to develop an approach for putting forward GN housing priorities at the federal, territorial and provincial level. Potential venues where coordinated GN messaging with respect to housing would be beneficial include the Council of the Federation-Aboriginal Affairs Working Group, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), and during negotiations to update priorities between the GN and NTI (i.e. Clyde River Protocol).

Opportunities to align priorities with Inuit organizations will be further explored. One action item that was identified is the creation of an Integrated Infrastructure Work Plan. The Integrated Infrastructure Work Plan will coordinate the GN’s infrastructure priorities with those of NTI over the short term (2 years). The Work Plan will take into consideration the GN infrastructure prioritization system as well as the federal funding cycle to establish timelines for investment in housing and other critical infrastructure. NHC and CGS will engage EIA in the creation of this Work Plan. As well, an Integrated Infrastructure Work Plan could support an existing NTI initiative to meet with GN Deputy Ministers to discuss the possibility of establishing a GN-NTI infrastructure working group. Lastly, to further support the increased participation of Inuit organizations in infrastructure development, an action item is for the GN to share with NTI its processes for identifying infrastructure need and prioritization, and the NCIAC process.

An action item that was identified to support increased investment in housing is for the GN to engage with Nunasi Corporation (possibly through the Sustainable Development Committee [SDC]), the business arm of Inuit organizations, on potential investment opportunities. Another action item is for NHC, CGS and other key departments to explore ways to access funding not eligible to the GN to assist municipalities, not-for-profit organizations, and LHOs.

3.1.4 GOAL IV: Defining Housing Demand Factors

Topic 7: Care/Supportive Housing

Nunavut’s care and supportive housing options are lacking. For those individuals with underlying social, mental or physical health issues, or who are homeless for more complex reasons than simply lack of available shelter, targeted housing options outside of public housing are necessary.
a. Potential Solutions

**Partnerships with the not-for-profit sector** can assist in filling gaps in the care and supportive housing continuum. The GN should explore ways of assisting non-profit organizations, such as through capacity building, grants and contributions, and the implementation of information-sharing mechanisms.

Nunavut’s small population presents an opportunity for the GN to take a **family by family approach** where the needs of communities, families and individuals could be assessed on a case basis. Increased GN **departmental collaboration** on protocols and process as well as additional research and data collection will be required to support this approach. As well, there are opportunities for departments to collaborate to align **programming needs with infrastructure development** to maximise the impact of the GN’s limited capital budget.

b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

A number of existing initiatives were identified to support and strengthen the not-for-profit sector in Nunavut. Currently, **DFS** is working to simplify and streamline **contribution agreements** with not-for-profit groups. As well, **DFS** will be presenting to the Quality of Life Committee to inform on the challenges faced by non-for-profits. To further augment the work being undertaken by DFS, an action item is for a **review of the Societies Act** to be conducted. The primary objective of the review will be to find ways to **support small local non-profit groups** by reducing administrative burden. In addition, another action item that was identified is for the **NHC** in collaboration with key departments (e.g. DFS, JUS, and Health), to present a proposal to the Quality of Life Committee for an **optional, tax deductible wage donation program for GN employees**. Diverted wages will be awarded to a Nunavut-based not-for-profit group to increase capacity and resources. A review of similar jurisdictions with wage donation programs in place (e.g NWT) would assist in informing the development of a program for Nunavut.

An action item that was identified is to establish a **single entry point** for the non-for-profit sector to access information about grants and contributions programs. A current initiative that could contribute to this action item is that of the **Nunavut Roundtable for Poverty Reduction’s Makimaniq Plan II**, which specifies the need to establish an **umbrella agency** to provide financial, administrative and capacity support for not-for-profit sector clients. The BPOAH supports the initiatives of the Makimaniq Plan II and NHC engage
with the **Nunavut Roundtable for Poverty Reduction** to further contribute to this work.

Lastly, it was discussed that the GN has a role to play in supporting the initiatives of not-for-profit models, such as Habitat for Humanity. In acknowledgment of the role that GN employees have in facilitating the success of certain initiatives, a suggested action item is for the GN-HR to increase understanding of, and/or streamline paid leave options (e.g. special leave or “volunteer days”) to allow employees to partake in volunteer activities.

Purpose-built housing combines departmental programming with government-subsidized housing. One action item regarding purpose-built housing is to conduct a **needs assessment** of **NHC tenant groups** to clarify and inform the roles and responsibilities of departments. To support this assessment, **NHC** will draft and share a **information-sharing protocol** with key departments. Another action item that was identified to assist the NHC in managing incoming requests for purpose-built units is for the **NHC** to **develop a project management and intake process**. This process would outline NHC’s protocol for receiving requests and consulting with departments during the planning and design stages to **ensure that purpose-built units adequately meet programming needs**. In the interim however, it was suggest that **NHC** contract out the planning and design of purpose-built units that are outside of status quo to expedite the process.

Purpose-built housing presents an opportunity for departments to collaborate on infrastructure requests; an action item that was identified is for **DFS** and **NHC** to coordinate to align **DFS programming needs with the prioritization of NHC infrastructure asks** in order to strengthen a business case during the capital planning process. Externally, **NHC** will work with **QIA** to assess the feasibility of **alternative private-public programming** for the provision of purpose-built housing, such as the model used by the Makivik in Quebec.

Another action item is for **NHC** to collaborate with **CGS** and **municipalities** to develop an **online inventory of infrastructure assets**. Departments will have access to the inventory of infrastructure assets and status so that **opportunities for repurposing buildings can be identified**. The online inventory will be updated annually in conjunction with the Development Plan planning cycle.
Topic 8: Affordability Options

Nunavut lacks the necessary housing options to meet the diverse needs of its residents. The current suite of options is limited and movement from public housing to privately owned or rented accommodation is unaffordable for all but a very few. These gaps in the housing continuum perpetuate a cycle of insufficient and inadequate housing, deteriorating social conditions, and a deepening dependence on government housing.

a. Potential Solutions

Ensuring sufficient affordable housing in each community requires a range and diversity of housing options – a continuum of housing. Private home ownership program supports should also be developed and expanded. In addition, affordable housing options could be increased and paired with incentives that encourage mixed income housing options and offset the cost of maintenance and repair.

It was further suggested that partnerships with the private sector (e.g., mining companies) may help identify housing solutions to meet the needs of Nunavut’s growing mining workforce, and the impacts on housing in communities closest to operating mines.

Investments in education in order to address socio-economic disparity, systemic issues and improve financial literacy with respect to saving and budgeting will benefit household affordability. Best practices in similar jurisdictions should be reviewed and applied to home-grown solutions that support Nunavummiut transitioning out of government-subsidized housing.

b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

Participants in this session discussed the need to engage private industry in the provision of affordable housing. One action item that was identified is for NHC to consult with EDT as part of its regular involvement in the Socio-economic Assessment Committee to develop coordinated messaging on the need for and benefits of private investment in housing prior to discussions with mining industry proponents (e.g. TMAC, Agnico-Eagle, Baffinland). Other action items identified the need for the NHC, over the long term, to consult with regional Inuit associations on establishing housing as a priority during Inuit Impact Benefit Agreement (IIBA) negotiations. The Sustainable Development Committee (SDC) may be best suited to provide oversight to these initiatives.
To further encourage the construction of affordable housing by the private sector, an additional action item for the NHC to work with EDT to assess the feasibility of establishing a small business subsidy program to fund small Nunavut-based contractors was identified. As well, NHC will investigate new methods for attracting investment into the territory for housing construction. For example, NHC will look into the feasibility of developing an RFP wherein contractors assume the costs of housing construction and property management on the condition that if the contractor cannot sell or rent the building within a specified timeframe, NHC will buy-back the unit.

To address the 3,000 unit gap in Nunavut’s housing continuum, an action identified is for the NHC to conduct a demographic needs assessment to determine the housing needs of clients. This assessment will enable NHC to identify where clients are along the housing continuum and in this way, influence NHC priorities with respect to piloting alternative housing models. The following alternative housing models were identified by participants for NHC to investigate their feasibility in Nunavut: co-op housing programs, condo programs, and rent-to-own programs. NHC is also currently conducting a review of previous affordable housing programs (e.g. HAP, Access and MAP programs) that could assist in identifying future programming. Lastly, NHC will explore the Habitat for Humanity model for building, maintain and subsidizing houses.

A further action item that was identified is for FIN and NHC to analyze the current staff housing subsidy as it compares with the subsidy given to GN employees living in privately owned accommodations. The objective of this analysis is to determine appropriate subsidy levels that can encourage staff housing tenants to transition out of government-subsidized housing and into private rental or homeownership.

Legislative requirements and municipal zoning can potentially enable affordable housing options, as a result the following action item was identified, together with CGS, the NHC will assess the feasibility of undertaking legislative amendments that encourage the provision of more affordable housing. For example, one potential solution could be to implement zoning requirements that require a certain percentage of houses built in a community be affordable. Related to municipal zoning changes, an additional action item that was identified is for NHC and CGS to assess the market to determine the potential for secondary suites in market communities. As part of this assessment, NHC will review the use of secondary suites in similar jurisdictions (e.g. NWT). NHC and CGS will work together to identify regulatory barriers and/or needs in order to promote, facilitate and regulate secondary suites. CGS will consult with
municipalities to gauge interest for rezoning for this purpose, and NHC will identify appropriate tools to incentivize secondary suites, based on information gathered during the jurisdictional review.

The high cost of home repair and maintenance presents a significant barrier to transitioning out of government-subsidized housing for many Nunavummiut. Therefore, an action item identified is for the NHC to explore the feasibility of implementing a “maintenance grant” for homeowners to offset maintenance and repair costs. In addition, the following model could be further explored by NHC – in communities that lack local contractors, LHO’s could expand their services to the community at a fee. In communities where there are local contractors, LHO’s could begin contracting out maintenance and repair work to reduce pressure on staff resources and promote local business development.

Another action that was recommended is for the NHC to explore suggestions to restructure the Nunavut Down Payment Assistance Program (NDAP) in order to incentivize the building of new houses. To address financial literacy challenges, an action item for the NHC, in collaboration with departments, to develop a “Toolkit for Renters and Homeowners” was identified. The toolkit will include information on budgeting and saving as well as programs available to employees. The toolkit will be made available through a number of different venues, including financial institutions (where applicable), LHOs, as part of the regular GN employee orientation package, and online.

**Topic 9: Meeting the Housing Needs of GN Staff**

The current GN Staff Housing program cannot meet the housing needs of all employees. There is a deepening dependence on government-subsidized housing to attract and retain government employees and movement to homeownership or private market rental remains limited. It is important to try to find ways to more effectively promote transition out of staff housing and into homeownership or private market rental.

a. Potential Solutions

There is a need for greater collaboration, coordination, communication between departments, and also with external stakeholders for housing and policy development. There needs to be better coordination between the NHC and respective departments in matching positions with available and suitable staff housing stock.
Examination of the Staff Housing Program could assist with better defining its purpose/objectives and the Program’s role over the long-term, as well as to determine how to increase the capacity of existing stock to meet staff needs. The current GN Staff Housing program attempts to address both staff recruitment and retention, an evaluation of the recruitment and retention strategy could shift the focus more to recruitment and away from using it as a retention tool.

Lastly, a review of GN housing allowances could help to identify ways to promote / incentivize transition out of staff housing to homeownership and private rental. Lastly, discussions pointed to increasing self-reliance of Nunavummiut in order to reduce dependence on government or an employer for housing.

b. Summary of Key Findings for the Development of Action Items

Participants agreed that the current Staff Housing Program requires review. Therefore, a key action item that was identified is for NHC to develop an options paper to be presented to the Quality of Life Committee or the Building Capacity Committee, depending on which is the most appropriate venue. The options paper will include a suggested process for policy review, potential objectives of the staff housing program, problematic components of the current policy, and research and data required to support the development of policy options. The options paper will also be an important tool for initiating a GN-wide conversation to define the goals and objectives of a revised staff housing program.

Another action that was identified that will support overall changes to the staff housing program is to conduct a demographic study of current staff housing tenants. The objective of the study is to identify who the tenants are (i.e. out of territory vs. Nunavummiut), what affordable options exist and for which tenants. The demographic study will be further augmented by NHC/FIN data on staff housing need in each community, compared to total available units. Together, this information will assist in identifying potential target employee groups for NHC homeownership programming and in developing appropriate policy tools to support transitions out of government subsidized housing, such as rent scaling or rent-to-own models.

Another action item that was discussed was to review the current prioritization system used to match employees with staff housing to make better use of existing staff housing stock. The NHC has started this work.
in the “Meeting the Needs of GN Employees” document produced in 2014; however additional work with FIN is required. Another action that will come as a result of this review will be the development of an analysis tool to be included with RFDs and FMB submissions for new positions to confirm the availability of staff housing. The results of the review and the analysis tool will be shared at the Building Capacity Committee. In the interim, an action item is for NHC and FIN-HR to work together to develop a process for the reallocation of vacant units based on staffing waitlist in each community. This process will also be presented to the Building Capacity Committee for deliberation.

A cost-analysis of alternative approaches to staff housing delivery to assess their feasibility is another action item that will be undertaken by NHC. Suggestions for alternative approaches include switching to a lease-only model whereby NHC leases staff housing units from private developers, and privatization of NHC’s portfolio to realize investment opportunities from extracted equity. In addition, NHC will engage FIN-HR in a discussion on the cost of living in staff housing versus the cost of living in privately owned housing, and explore the suggestion of raising salary levels as a trade-off for decreasing the staff housing subsidy.

An action item that will support the objective of transitioning employees out of staff housing is for the GN to conduct an Employee’s Survey of current staff housing tenants to gather baseline information and gauge appetite for homeownership. Based on the result of the Employee’s Survey, NHC and FIN-HR will then be able to assess the need for a business case to deliver counselling services to employees interested in homeownership. Lastly, NHC will develop a “Toolkit for Renters and Homeowners” (as introduced in the Affordability Options topic). The toolkit will include information on budgeting and saving as well as programs available to employees interested in transitioning out of government-subsidized housing.
4.0 Next Steps to Develop a BPAOH

Next steps include confirmation and validation of what was identified in round two. This will occur during a final round of engagement planned for later June 2016. This third round will further synthesize findings with a focus on building upon and refining implementable action items over the next ten years (immediate, short, medium and long-term).