

FEEDBACK REPORT
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MCK RATITSÉNHAIENHS
MAY 21, 2026

Date Received	Feedback	Response
March 21, 2026 Presentation	2.2.1: Add "...with community input and a focus on restorative practices"	It has been added. It is also important to note that varied methods of community consultation are used to gather community input for the political priorities. The KGOV project is having dialogue on this matter of reviving restorative practices.
	3.1: Change to "to each other, letsenhaienhs and Ratsenhaienhs as equals". This was suggested to reflect male or female they are equals.	Added "as equals".
	3.4: Add somewhere in here "and the impact on the next seven generations".	Added this to section 4.3.
	3.5: Change this to "representative of the community".	No changes made. Leader has to be used. They have to be a leader. They are leading. They are selected to lead not just represent.
	4.2.7: Is it important to have that in there? Traditional bodies will say we are in the white man's boat. Remove it or state the ideology behind it.	Changed the word from "Defend" to "Be mindful of..."
	5.4.3: Add: "...including the training taken by the Ratitsénhaienhs"	Added.
	5.5: To be a lead should have some knowledge or qualifications to lead that portfolio, not just an "interest".	Add into section 6 "knowledge..."

	5.6.5: Add this to 4.2.7 “Kanien’keha:ka values.”	Changed “defend” to “be mindful” in section 4.2.7.
	6.1: Suggested that this be in the Election Law.	Noted. That’s coming up for amendment. It would have had to been requested for this round of amendments.
	Add a new section below section 6.1: “6.2 Portfolio leads must have relevant knowledge and skills to be considered as Portfolio Leads.”	Added.
	<p>Suggested to remove the words “available”, change the verb “improve” to “improving” and delete “including but not limited to”</p> <p>6.2 letsénhaienhs/Ratsénhaienhs must participate in training and commit to improving their skills in,</p> <p>6.2.1 Governance;</p> <p>6.2.2 Verbal and written communications, including computer skills;</p> <p>6.2.3 Conflict resolution and mediation;</p> <p>6.2.4 Leadership, representation, and advocacy;</p> <p>6.2.5 Negotiations;</p> <p>6.2.7 Problem solving;</p> <p>6.2.7 Interpersonal relations and diplomacy; and</p> <p>6.2.8 Coping and stress management.</p> <p>Is there a way to show this was done - report card that the Chief has done any of this work?</p>	<p>This is now new section number 6.3</p> <p>The word available needs to remain as there is not always training available. Verb “improve” to remain active so don’t change it to “improving” and leave in “including but not limited to” as there may be other skills to improve that are not listed here so it should not be exhaustive.</p>
March 21, 2026 Email	When the TOR references "in good standing" pertaining to the alternate for the grand chief, how are we defining " in good standing"? I think we need to define what that means.	No complaints against them either internal or external. Upholds the Oath of Office (Referenced within this are all the governance documents that all Ratsénhaienhs must respect. In compliance with...)
March 22, 2026 Email	2.3: Really broad statement. How is this going to protect the organization from EDS, DIRECTORS, GMS, GOING OUTSIDE THEIR Scope/Purpose/Mandate. We need to work together on issues,	This is a misunderstanding of what is meant by this. Not putting a blocker on anyone. The purpose of this document is not to provide oversight to GM’s.

	<p>planning, operations. Why do we need a specific mandate to intervene. A mandate will take too long. It should be reworded.</p>	<p>Protecting Ratitsénhaienhs because following a change of command.</p> <p>Added for clarification: "...unless requested to do so by a Director or Executive Officer or formally mandated by the Ratitsénhaienhs."</p>
<p>April 6, 2026 Email</p>	<p>Title: Unnecessary term. Enactment entails it was approved. Use similar format to Code of Conduct to be consistent.</p>	<p>This reference will be made consistent with the Code of Conduct which is "Approved via MCED # /year on date".</p>
	<p>1.1: Both the Election Law and Code of Conduct reference MCK Ratitsénhaienhs in their respective "purpose" sections.</p> <p>No mention of "election representatives" in the Code, but the Law uses the term twice - once in the Preamble and another in the "Jurisdiction" - for relevant comparative purposes.</p> <p>Suggestion to simplify the statement to end according to track change. Also, I do not believe a reference to a guiding document is necessary. If it is kept, I would separate the statements to have the guiding document a standalone statement for better comprehension.</p>	<p>No change. The community vision is the guiding document and is important.</p> <p>It was decided to keep it as originally stated.</p>
	<p>2.3: As written, the statement does not make sense. Inferring from context, I believe the reference is to an individual (Ratsénhaienhs/latsénhaienhs) so that should be specified at the very least.</p> <p>Also, there is an Executive Limitations Policy and a Framework document outlining interactions between Executive Office and Ratitsénhaienhs. There needs to be alignment between all three (3) to avoid problems with interpretation and decision-making.</p>	<p>Changed "they" to the "MCK Ratitsénhaienhs"</p> <p>Both these documents are undergoing a review with that alignment being kept in mind.</p>

	3.3: 1.1 uses “roles” not duties.	Fixed them to be consistent.
	3.4 & 3.5: The essence of 3.4 and 3.5 are captured in the Code of Conduct. Seems repetitive to have in here.	No change. It was agreed that this is a separate document and important to leave in.
	4.1: How would this be done? Suggest it be removed. (I know it’s mentioned in 4.2.9, but it’s better placed there).	No change. Liaising with portfolios, etc. Leave collective well-being in.
	4.1: Not sure what this clause means. Consider a rewrite. Suggestion: Act as responsible stewards of the organization as well as the community. (or something to this effect)	No change. Leave uphold and ensure. Consensus that the statement is well done. Paramount to the Ratitsénhaienhs. Need to effectively govern.
	4.3: Consider a reference to “seven generations” thinking instead.	[Added “mindful of the impact to the next seven generations”]
	Title: Duties and Responsibilities of the Ratitsénhaienhs As previously noted, 1.1 uses “roles” not duties. Be consistent with terminology. See quick reference below: A role defines a person’s function or position within an organization, team, or process. A duty is a specific task or obligation that is required as part of a role. A responsibility refers to accountability for outcomes, decisions, or areas of work.	No change. General roles are in the previous section. This section pertains to specific duties and responsibilities.
	5.3: Suggested rewording: 5.3 “The MCK Ratitsénhaienhs are expected to: 5.3.1 Attend and participate in all scheduled Council, Portfolio and Community meetings, notifying the community when absent for whatever reason; 5.3.2 Ensure follow up to decisions of the MCK Ratitsénhaienhs; 5.3.3 Ensure all necessary correspondence is addressed; and 5.3.4 Participate on portfolios team(s) and any committee(s) to engage with files as assigned.”	Accepted the rewording.

	5.4.2: Unless further clarified with more concrete action/expectation (actually it's a responsibility section), this is an empty statement.	No changes. Left it to be broad.
	5.4.3: Too broad and vague. Might also be understood to include operations, which is outside their purview (more for EXO to communicate).	No change. "global activities" means high level.
	5.4.4: Would remove; if going to keep, then rewrite to something like: "Redirect operation inquiries and/or concerns to the proper administrative/operational authority within MCK". Similar word change to 5.4.6 (see track change).	Keep 5.4.4. wording - don't want it to be task specific.
	5.4.6: Suggested rewording: "Direct community members with concerns and issues, regardless of their specific portfolios, to the appropriate authority/individual within MCK; and"	No change. 5.4.6: Keep it as is to be clear that chiefs don't just direct people but listen and assist as required.
	5.5: Four of the first five points open with "as Portfolio Leads". Consider grouping them together (and adjusting subpoints) or removing the qualifier entirely. I defer to the GAT, but it is important to differentiate between role of the Lead and other assigned Chiefs on a Portfolio. Refer to the Portfolio Team TORs for wording and general structure of content to ensure alignment.	Minor edit. Leave original wording. Take out "leadership".
	5.5.6 In practice, the Portfolio Coordinator does this.	Changed it to "Ensures" that Ratitsénhaienhs' approval of the portfolio mandate is obtained as it is the Portfolio Chief that must ensure that this is done.
	5.5.7: Repetitive to 5.5.2.	No change. It's not the same – 5.5.2 is general direction in the portfolio to ensure implementation of the mandate while 5.5.7 (now 5.5.3) is strategic direction which is different. Moved this up to 5.5.3. Change to "Portfolio lead.... In collaboration with the other portfolio chiefs..."
	5.5.9: I don't believe there is capacity for Chiefs to do any monitoring. In reality, it's often left to strategists. Also consider, how would this be enforced?	Changed wording to "Regularly report" and keep in "prior to communicating it". Now new section 5.5.10

	5.5.10: To whom is this input to be provided? Specify to avoid confusion.	Depends on who is carrying on the project within that portfolio so if specify would be too limited. Now new section 5.5.11
	5.5.11: There's a nice templated statement in the PT TOR. Consider a copy/paste here as replacement.	Unable to identify the statement referenced. Keep this in. Now new section 5.5.12
	5.8.1: Already stated (in different word) in 4.1.	Removed.
	6.1: There are five clauses in this statement. Consider splitting into numbered sub-statements (6.1.1; 6.1.2, etc.) for easier comprehension.	Done.
	6.2: Suggested deletion of "including, but not limited to".	No change. Need to leave in "including, but not limited to". Now new section 6.3
	6.3: Commitment is good, but it's a half-step. There is no mention of them being able to demonstrate any improvement. The document is silent on the "proof" aspect as well as any possible repercussions for not improving (difficult to measure) or not attending classes (easy to measure).	No change. Leave in "continue". We can eventually look at how to document this or report on this. Now new section 6.4
	7.1: Consider specifying the sections (X through XX).	No change. It's all the sections.
	7.3: The Election Law does not allow for an alternate to be "proposed". Even if the GC is temporarily absent, no one can assume to role or act as a replacement. 34.4 Should the position of Ohén:ton Í:iente'/ Ohén:ton Í:rate' ne Ratitsénhaienhs become vacant due to death, resignation or removal from office, six (6) months or more before Election Day, the vacancy must be filled through a by-election. Suggested deletion of sections 7.3-7.8 and 7.10-7.11.	No change. There are valid reasons why this is included here. One is for the Council to function more efficiently when there is a temporary absence of the GC, such as vacation, business travel, sick leave, etc. When the GC is absent, there is a need for someone to stand in their place not only for administrative reasons, but also in the event of an emergency (internal to the community or due to external reasons). This person must be just as informed on all MCK/political matters as the GC is. It is not just appointing a Chairperson for meetings. It is also for someone to take the lead. The second reason this has been included in the TOR is to close the gaps in the Election Law in the event that the GC position becomes vacant (and is not just a temporary absence but because the GC resigned, has been removed or has unexpectedly been called to the Sky World). The Election Law now provides for a by-election to take place up to the last 6 months of a term when that seat is vacant. In order for the

		<p>Council to function efficiently while awaiting the newly elected GC, and to ensure that the transfer of the responsibility to that newly elected GC is carried out smoothly and effectively (succession planning), this section is needed. If the position of GC becomes vacant within the last 6 months of the term, there will be no by-election but there is still the need for someone to lead both politically and administratively.</p> <p>The GAT worked very hard to ensure that this section was carefully drafted so that it was not contrary to the Election Law but rather complimentary.</p> <p>The GAT decided that it must stay in the TOR.</p>
	7.9: See wording suggestion in 4.1 comment box → [Suggestion: Act as responsible stewards of the organization as well as the community. (or something to this effect)]	<p>See GAT response to suggested wording in 4.1.</p> <p>GAT suggests taking out the “ing” leave it as “protect”.</p>
	<p>7.10: This is an absolute term. It’s basically a guarantee. Legal will likely bristle at its use here (and possibly in other parts of the document).</p> <p>As an aside, I would remove this statement and the subsequent one (including the three (3) sub-statements entirely).</p> <p>There is no way the GC can realistically be expected to do any of that. (food for thought: which of the GCs of recent memory were experts on business/professional ethics?! None of them were/are.)</p> <p>Suggested deletion of sections 7.10-7.11</p>	Consult legal services.
	Title: Duties and Responsibilities of the Ohén:ton Í:iente/Í:rate ne Ratitsénhaienhs See comment in section heading (5.1).	See response of GAT to that comment in that section.
	8.2.8: Seems more for the OCC Director or CPA (separately or together) to handle.	No change.It’s not their role. It’ the GC. OCC director and CPA have nothing to do with this. It is the Executive Assistant to the GC.
	8.2.16: Suggested to delete section.	No change. Leave this in. This is what the GC does.

	8.2.18: Never heard of this. Is this a new initiative?	Yes. It is tied to the supervisory role that the GC has with respect to the Executive Director.
	9.1: See comment box in 6.1 for format/presentation.	See response in 6.1. Made the same changes.
	11.1: Considering how long it took the GAT to address this document, is 3 months really enough time? Consider a 6-month window.	This is only an internal review at this stage. The GAT is not involved.