
Kluane National Park and Reserve Economic Impact Study

APPENDIX

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Luigi Zanasi Economist
The Outspan Group Inc.
Research Northwest
Inukshuk Planning & Development

March 10, 2005

Kluane National Park and Reserve Economic Impact Study

***Appendix:
Community Feedback***

Table of Contents

<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>1 Introduction</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2 Community feedback</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2.1 Steering Committee general comments and direction</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2.2 Public comments</i>	<i>6</i>
2.2.1 Comments identified by the Steering Committee	6
2.2.2 Other comments	11

Kluane National Park and Reserve Economic Impact Study

Appendix ***Community Feedback***

1 Introduction

This Appendix has been prepared for the Kluane Economic Impact Study to summarize feedback on the September 15, 2004 draft version of the study and to summarize how the study team has responded to the feedback. The Kluane Economic Impact Study consists of a summary report and six background reports. The six background papers are:

1. Baseline Economic Profile
2. Economic Impact Analysis
3. Economic History of the Kluane Region
4. Community Economic Comparison Analysis
5. Economic Benefits Framework
6. Community Interviews

All papers are available in PDF format at <http://www.yukonomics.ca/reports/kluane/>

Feedback on the September 15, 2004 draft has come from a number of sources and in a number of forms. The Project Steering Committee provided written feedback and the issues raised by the committee are the first dealt with in the sections below. We also received a considerable amount of feedback in verbal form at a public meeting held in Haines Junction on October 28, 2004. We also met with the Kluane Park Management Board, some Park staff, and members of the public at an open house in Haines Junction on October 30, 2004. Finally, we have received a letter containing extensive written feedback from one community member.

The structure of this Appendix is straightforward. For convenience, the feedback is grouped into a number of sections below. All written comments/questions/criticism are reproduced as received and are followed by a summary of how we have responded in the relevant report(s), and the reasons for our response. Verbal feedback was captured using notes from the various meetings. We've attempted to summarize any overlaps from the verbal feedback.

2 Community feedback

2.1 Steering Committee general comments and direction

“Close any gaps between the terms-of-reference and the work completed.”

The Request for Proposals for the study, dated January 28, 2002, laid out the following objectives:

1. Determination of the economic impact of Kluane National Park and Reserve on the Kluane region, the community of Haines Junction, CAFN, KFN and the Yukon Territory.
2. Development of an economic profile of Haines Junction and the Kluane region that considers the role of Kluane National Park and Reserve in the local economy.
3. Assessment of other economic values associated with Kluane National Park and Reserve.
4. Development of a case study involving a qualitative and quantitative investigation of the dynamic factors that have had an impact on how Kluane National Park has affected the economy of Haines Junction and surrounding region.
5. Delivery of a workshop that will allow the community and local First Nations to better understand the local economy and factors that are influencing its future economic direction. The workshop will allow the community and local First Nations to use the study as a means of discussing future directions.

The scope of work section of that Request for Proposals provided more detailed requirements and suggestions for how the objectives should or could be met. Some of the key points in the scope of work are summarized below under the overall objectives:

Economic impact

1. [T]he project could involve the development of a set of indicators to gauge broad social and economic considerations.
2. Consideration should be given to estimating the direct and indirect/induced economic impacts of Kluane National Park and Reserve, most likely through models using some form of input/output analysis.
3. The time periods to be considered are: pre-1943 (briefly), the establishment of the Kluane Game Sanctuary from 1943 to 1973; the establishment of Kluane National Park and Reserve from 1973 to 1977 and the operational period of the park from 1977 to 2002.
4. Spatially, the study should primarily consider impacts on Haines Junction but also examine regional, First Nations and territory-wide impacts.

Baseline economic profile

1. This may be best achieved through a sectoral analysis of key sectors in the local economy.

Assessment of other economic values

1. These values include both use and non-use values of the park, including option, bequest and existence values as well as consideration of ecological processes that are protected through the national park designation of the region.
2. The consulting team should be guided by national and international work in this area and consider qualitative assessments of these values as well as quantitative data.

Development of a case study

1. This analysis should involve both qualitative and quantitative analysis, considering what parts of the community may have benefited and how they have benefited: considering the broad dynamic factors that have influenced how the community has been affected.

2. This analysis should also consider factors which could increase the potential benefits for the community.
3. This analysis could provide useful lessons for future development plans for Haines Junction, other communities and First Nations adjacent to parks and protected areas.
4. The case study should consider the local economy prior to the establishment of the park and the economic activities that were curtailed.
5. This case study could involve a holistic community development approach to understanding how the community has developed and to what makes the local economy “tick”.

Two proposals were received responding to the original terms of reference. The Steering Committee liked features in both proposals and asked the two proponents to combine forces stating:

The Steering Committee would like to draw on the excellent qualities shown in these proposals, to undertake a Study that would satisfy the spirit of the RFP, and include:

- A comparison of economic impacts on Haines Junction and other Yukon (i.e. ‘not near to parks’) communities, similar to that suggested in the Zanasi proposal.
- A comparison of economic impacts on Haines Junction to other (non-Yukon) ‘near to parks’ communities, similar to that suggested in the Outspan proposal.
- The Workshop component of the Study to include:
 - Three workshops, in:
 - Haines Junction for the general public
 - Haines Junction for Champagne and Aishihik First Nation
 - Burwash Landing for Kluane First Nation
 - Each workshop to include:
 - Afternoon ‘Round Table’
 - Evening ‘Information Session’
 - Costs of hosting workshops to be covered by the Steering Committee.
- The Case Study component of the Study to include:
 - Directions/Recommendations to increase future benefits of KNPR on the region.
 - Overview of ‘Lost Opportunities’ cost of KNPR on the region.

We believe that the study now completed has met all of the specific requirements of the contract and all of the spirit of the original request for proposals, with the exception of specific workshops for the Champagne & Aishihik First Nations and Kluane First Nation. We continue to be prepared to do so at the request of the CAFN and KFN.

“Create an appendix to show how the consultant and Steering Committee responded to the public concerns.”

This paper, *Appendix: Community Feedback*, is the consulting team’s response to the concerns of both the public and the Steering Committee.

“Eliminate all potentially inflammatory language.”

We have eliminated all language that any reviewers identified as sensitive or might be construed as such in the Summary Report and all of the background reports.

“The First Nations’ contribution to the economy needs to be clarified and better acknowledged.”

We have responded to this concern by expanding the sections relating to First Nation’s contribution to population growth and the economy in both the *Economic History* and *Community Comparison* background papers.

Specifically, in the *Community Comparison* paper, we have further explored the limited available Census and other data and attempted to analyze the First Nation contribution to population and economic growth in Haines Junction. In the *Economic History* background paper, we have added a section on the growth of First Nation governments. Unfortunately, detailed data on employment and spending that would allow us to distinguish the contributions of the four levels of government to the economies of the community of Haines Junction and the Kluane region is either not available or was not made available to us.

“The report should focus on defensible economic data, and avoid subjective arguments and conclusions.”

The overall project has and continues to have defensible economic data as its core, though not sole, focus. We have made every effort to remove conjectures and conclusions that are not directly supported by data, economic or otherwise.

“The sociological observations on community perspectives on the park do not belong in this technical report since no specialized or rigorous social analysis was completed.”

This comment from the Steering Committee is somewhat troublesome and contradictory given the terms of reference. It poses a dilemma for the consultants. First, identifying this project as a “technical report” seems to imply that the *Kluane National Park and Reserve Economic Impact Study* is intended to be a narrow, technical report confined entirely to economic data and its interpretation. This was obviously not the expectation spelled out in the terms of reference or start-up meeting with the Steering Committee. Indeed, the original RFP, the terms of reference, and the direction given by the Steering Committee clearly show that this is intended to be a very broad, multi-disciplinary examination of the impact of KNPR, which includes a rigorous, technical economic component.

The specific comment that observations on community perspectives do not belong in this report runs entirely counter to the requirements, spirit and intent of this project as laid out in the original RFP. It is also inconsistent with, the approach set out in our proposal to the RFP, which was accepted by the Steering Committee and to direction we have received during the course of this project.

We have been directed and required to interview members of the community to gain insight on community perspectives and to use qualitative data in addition to quantitative data. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine how this project could possibly, “provide useful lessons for future development plans for Haines Junction, other communities and First Nations adjacent to parks and protected areas” as laid out in the terms of reference without discussing community perspectives on the economic impacts of the Park.

However, to accommodate this request, most general references to community perspectives have been removed. In the *Economic History* background report we have added a discussion on the 1987 survey of Haines Junction residents done for the Haines Junction Economic Development Plan which provides a valuable empirical data point on community expectations for economic development as well as the issue of public access to KNPR. That study was brought to our attention by a member of the Steering Committee. Another section has also been added extracting community expectations about the access issue from the public documentation compiled during the park management planning processes because it is part of the public record.

“The local interviews were incomplete in that they did not include enough members of all communities. It was a small and likely slanted sample that is presented in the report as a definitive community survey on attitudes to the park's contribution to the economy. The survey was not rigorous in its sampling of the full range of community perspectives. This point should be clarified in the report, or the survey results removed altogether, or placed in an Appendix, since they do not support the conclusions based on economic data.”

We acknowledge that the local interviews were not complete and were not a rigorous or representative sample of community perspectives. We did not intend to present the results of the survey as being definitive in any way. We share the overall concern with the local interviews and raised it on a number of occasions during the course of the project.

In response we have clarified just how the survey was conducted, how the list of interviewees was chosen and by whom, how many refused the interview, how many could not be contacted, and how many were residents of Haines Junction versus Burwash Landing or Destruction Bay. We have also explicitly stressed the issues of unrepresentative sampling.

Given the importance assigned to gathering community input and qualitative data in the terms of reference and in follow-up discussions with the Steering Committee, we feel that it would be entirely inappropriate to remove the survey results altogether (or confine them entirely to an Appendix) as suggested above.

“Conclusions in the report should be based on economic data. Recommendations should be cast as part of a bridge to the next stages of planning the area's economy.”

We believe all our conclusions are based on available economic and empirical data. We do not make any recommendations as such. As required by the terms of reference, we only drew what we believe are:

"lessons for future development plans for Haines Junction, other communities and First Nations adjacent to parks and protected areas."

We believe that our report provides a wealth of information and its limitations are all identified and acknowledged. We hope that it is and will continue to be useful to the community and the region for economic planning, park management, community development and future regional tourism planning. We are pleased to note that CAFN, KFN and Parks Canada have already used (and, in fact, directly quoted) our study in a presentation they made to a national body.

“It should be clarified that the report is intended to assess the economic impacts of the park on the region, and all regional communities, not just Haines Junction. (We recognize that you indicated the difficulty in obtaining data from very small communities).”

We have clarified and stressed that the intent was to assess the economic impacts of the park on the entire region and all regional communities in the *Summary Report*. We also explain the data collection limitations that occur in trying to obtain information on very small communities such as preserving individual confidentiality and breaking out data that has already been aggregated.

2.2 Public comments

2.2.1 Comments identified by the Steering Committee

Indicate references and sources to support information provided. The report needs to be accountable for data and views presented.

This comment seems to be aimed specifically at the *Summary Report*. In response we have added footnotes and other references. We have also reviewed the background papers and added more footnotes and other references where they might be required.

Make it clear who requested the report in the first place and for what reasons.

The *Draft Summary Report* listed the governments and organizations that commissioned this report and acknowledges the participation of those who sat on the Steering Committee. We have added an explanation of the intent of the project to the *Summary Report*.

Make it clear this is a technical economic analysis report.

We have added an explanation in the introduction to the *Summary Report* that this is intended to be a broad and multi-disciplinary examination of the impact of KNPR with technical economic analysis being a crucial part of that examination.

In the first paragraph of the report, “longstanding perception by some in Haines Junction.....” – the creation of Kluane National Park and Reserve has not had a net positive impact on the community. The comment that the report offers what “actually” happened has to come out– take any reference or comments about explanations for the community attitude and to “separate symptom from cause”. There are points throughout the report related to the negative perceptions and assumptions related to these – take any and all of these out.

All of the problematic wordings identified have been removed.

The key findings of the report give the impression that great amounts of money are coming into Haines Junction from the park. This is what people most strongly reacted to.

We have estimated the "Gross Domestic Product" (i.e. the size of the economy) in Haines Junction and the Kluane region and related the estimated economic impact of KNPR to that number.

The charts and graphs that offer explanation of these key findings are confusing and difficult to relate to the findings.

We have attempted to improve the graphs and charts to make them clearer.

There is no real substantiation of the expenditures claimed to be for purchases in the community. People reacted strongly to this. It may help to acknowledge what is not purchased in the community – gas and auto services is a point often brought up in the community. Parks Canada buys bulk fuel and has their own service maintenance person. Any work is tendered and often goes to contractors outside the community – VRC recap is a very recent example. These are what people are most aware of so to say Parks spent all this money in the community needs a lot more clarity or else take it out. Maybe an accounts reading at Madley’s if that exists. That is the only place they can purchase goods in town. Services – which ones did they use, how often?

We stand by our local expenditure numbers. They were calculated by going over every single invoice Parks Canada paid in 2002. The work was done by a long-time Haines Junction resident familiar with the community. Our researcher went over all expenditures and assigned whether the expenditure was spent on a Haines Junction business, a Kluane region business, a business located elsewhere in the Yukon or a business located outside the Yukon. This one-year “snapshot” represents the best available information that could be obtained within the scope and budget of this project.

The \$2.11 million in Parks Canada expenditures is the amount of taxpayer’s dollars used to maintain this wilderness park that is managed to maximize ecological integrity and minimize access. The value of having a wilderness area as expansive and protected is of value in this region. The reason for KNP is to ensure this piece of wilderness remains intact for time and ever. Economic benefit is not a reason for the park. I think this is an important point that needs to be stated. A clear message from the

community is that no one wants HJ to be another Banff. The wilderness aspect is what is most valued and appreciated and a key quality of the marketed businesses here.

In response to this comment we have explicitly stated in the *Summary Report* that economic development or benefit is not the sole purpose of the park.

Information that needs to be added to the report related to direct measurable economic impacts to the community include:

1. The tax base offered from the Park to the Village,

That figure was already included in the *Economic Impact* background paper.

2. Value of water and sewage development prior to the establishment of the Park,

We could not obtain that information. We have noted that water and sewage systems and other community infrastructure, as described to us by a number of informants, including the interviewees, was probably an important factor in the population growth experienced by the community, especially in the 1970s.

3. # of employees who have stayed in the community for more than 5 years and have established residency in the community.

That information is simply not available.

4. An aside can be that community is people and relates to their economic contributions from purchasing food, gas, and other services offered in the community plus the social benefits from volunteerism, support to recreation and cultural activities

We could add that statement and we believe it is quite true, but it would contradict the direction given by the Steering Committee on avoiding value judgements that cannot be substantiated by economic data.

More detail is required regarding the key finding of annual payroll. How many staff are permanent, seasonal, temporary, local home-owners or renters? How many live in parks housing? How many employees are FN or community members? What is the actual impact to the economy of the Territory or region from having the 28.5 person years?

We have calculated and presented the direct impact of the number of employees and payroll in the *Economic Impact* background paper. Note that we chose not to calculate "induced" impacts, i.e. the effects of KNPR employees spending their income in the community. There are two reasons for this. First we did not want to exaggerate the effects of the limited opportunities to spend in the community and be seen to engage in "advocacy" analysis. Secondly, reliable multipliers, which would be required to undertake this, are not available for small communities.

The detailed data on individuals is not available and could result in breaches of privacy.

The figures offered related to visitor spending require greater substantiation. It is difficult to believe 75,478 non-resident visitors come to KNP and each spend an average of \$42.50. Explain the formula and assumptions of per-person spending amounts. Interviews with local businesses would suggest a different analysis of visitor numbers and spending.

Opinions on this issue vary considerably, going from the KNPR actually reducing potential tourism spending because of limited access, to almost all tourism spending being due to the Park. We have attempted to estimate the amount of Park-related tourism spending based on the actual empirical evidence we had: a 1994 study on Park visitations and 1999 data on tourism spending from the Yukon government's visitor exit survey. The numbers were, of course, pro-rated to reflect the reduction in

number of visitors the Kluane region experienced between 1994 and 1999. While it is easy to speculate or to make other assumptions, we chose to base our analysis on the only actual complete data we had.

In any case, the direct impact of visitor spending on a local economy is relatively small, only a small portion of total tourist dollars remain in the community as local businesses have to buy their inputs outside the community. This is shown not only by the economic models we used, but also by some consideration of how much of a gasoline purchase, meal, or hotel room dollar remains in the community. For example, mark-up on gasoline is somewhere between 2 and 10 cents per litre. The rest of the price goes to the wholesaler and eventually to refineries and oil producers.

However, in response to the specific concern that our assumptions and rationale were not clearly stated, we have explicitly acknowledged the arguments in favour of reducing the number and spending of visitors associated with KNPR and added explanations, particularly in the *Summary Report*.

Take out the interviews information because it is incomplete and aggravates rather than builds anything constructive.

We were required to do the interviews as part of the terms of reference, and the best we can do is report what we actually heard.

There needs to be some further acknowledgement of economic impact from CAFN and KFN – positive and negative.

As we pointed out above in response to the Steering Committee comments above, we have responded to this concern by expanding the sections relating to First Nation's contribution to population growth and the economy in both the *Economic History* and *Community Comparison* background papers.

Parks Canada has compiled a variety of statistics on backcountry use and general visitor use in the Park. This data should be included, at least a side-bar, in the report, to show another dimension of the economic impact of the park.

This has been done in both the *Economic Impact* background report and the *Summary Report*.

The interview refusals need to be stated. More information on the interviews is needed. People are not too pleased with a selective choosing of interviewees. This could be biased. There was not enough emphasis on the interview comments and opinions. They show up as a side bar, not important. Interviews were supposed to be given to 50 people on a suggested list. We need to know where the refusals were, HJ, Burwash, Destruction Bay? It is important to know where the people who were interviewed were from.

More details on the interview process have been provided in the *Community Interviews* background paper.

The analysis and conclusions offered on page 11 minimize other factors attributed to economic growth in Haines Junction while maximizing any factor associated with the park. The park has had obvious value to the economy of this community. Take the conclusions out. Important other factors are omitted, including economic contributions created by the St. Elias Convention Center and the contribution of government services now centered in Haines Junction including Department of the Environment and the Marine Branch. These omissions give the impression this report is an exaggerated "advocacy analysis", a term used on page 2 describing what the author attempts to avoid

The analysis on page 11 is based on the *Community Comparisons* background paper. That paper has been considerably re-written based on community feedback.

The communities selected for comparison do not have enough in common with HJ. The jobs are different, municipal services were also different back in the 70's.

The data does not support the assertion that the other Yukon communities selected for comparison were so different from Haines Junction that comparison is meaningless. In the *Community Comparison* background paper we acknowledge the differences in detail and also enumerate the similarities. It should also be noted that the act of averaging data from 5 actual communities to create a single proxy community for comparison to Haines Junction acts to reduce any individual differences.

YTG presence is also a significant factor not shown. The teachers at the St. Elias Community School are a stable work force. This is also significant and not shown.

Specific data on employment by the different levels of government is not available (except for information provided to us by the Village of Haines Junction).

The First Nations have a higher degree of education, this is significant.

Education is perhaps the most important factor in explaining people's incomes. Unfortunately, we have no data at the community level for education levels by First Nations (or any other group). Statistics Canada would not publish such data as it could run into confidentiality problems.

Many alternate factors to the economic development of Haines Junction were suggested:

- ***There has been a general increase in highway traffic over the years, this includes tourists and freight heading to and from Alaska.***
- ***Haines Junction has been a recognised stopping point for many years. In addition to the wider range of services we offer, we have the best store and best gas prices north of Whitehorse.***
- ***The opening of the Skagway road created the "Golden Circle Route" (Whitehorse - Skagway - Haines Junction - Whitehorse), much promoted by tourism.***
- ***Each fall there is an exodus of Alaskans who return each spring to claim their oil benefit cheque.***
- ***For many years, at Easter, there has been a large gathering of snowmobilers at the Haines Summit. They buy gas and supplies on both their outward and return trips through Haines Junction.***
- ***Haines Junction has been extraordinarily active and community spirited from before the park's formation. For example a large community hall was built in 1967 and a new curling rink shortly after, to replace an already existing rink. The construction and the many bonspiels, dances and other social events held each year must have had an economic spin off.***
- ***This community spirit has continued through succeeding years, resulting in several large well established week-end long annual events: examples - Alsek Music Festival, Kluane to Chilkat bike race, Silver Sled dog sled races.***

It is worth noting that many of the above take place outside tourist season and none in or because of the park. Each makes an economic contribution.

These have all been considered as far as possible where actual data is available. The economic impacts of different community activities each merit their own separate analysis, and it would be beyond the scope of this study to undertake an analysis of them all in detail.

2.2.2 Other comments

In addition to the above community concerns identified by the Steering Committee, our notes, and notes from the Park Management Board, indicate a number of other comments, concerns or issues expressed at the public presentation on October 28, 2004 and the KNPR Management Board workshop on October 30, 2004, and by one letter we received from a local resident.

The contribution of the Park to tourism spending is not as great as the report shows.

Opinions on this issue vary considerably, going from the Park actually reducing potential tourism spending because of limited access, to almost all tourism spending being due to the Park. We have attempted to estimate the amount of Park-related tourism spending based on the actual empirical evidence we had: a 1994 study on Park visitations and 1999 data on tourism spending from the Yukon government's visitor exit survey. The numbers were, of course, pro-rated to reflect the reduction in number of visitors the Kluane region experienced between 1994 and 1999. While it is easy to speculate or to make other assumptions, we chose to base our analysis on the only actual complete data we had.

In any case, the direct impact of visitor spending on a local economy is relatively small, only a small portion of total tourist dollars remain in the community as local businesses have to buy their inputs outside the community. This is shown not only by the economic model we used, but also by some consideration of how much of a gasoline purchase, meal, or hotel room dollar remains in the community. For example, mark-up on gasoline is somewhere between 2 and 10 cents per litre. The rest of the price goes to the wholesaler and eventually to refineries and oil producers.

Eliminate the effect of tourism spending from the economic impact or present it separately as it is controversial.

We had calculated and presented the impact of tourism spending separately in the draft *Economic Impact* background paper but not in the draft *Summary Report*. We now include it in the *Summary Report*.

In response to the implied concern that our assumptions and rationale were not clearly stated, we have explicitly acknowledged the arguments in favour of reducing the number and spending of visitors associated with KNPR and added explanations, particularly in the *Summary Report*.

Include social factors such as educational levels, immigration that make the community an attractive place to live in and retire in.

We have included a section on social indicators in the *Baseline Economic Profile* background paper, including information on immigration, education levels, and pension incomes.

Putting the results of the local interviews in a text box in the Summary Report implies that they are unimportant, a side issue. Local views need to be highlighted and treated with respect.

We have now placed the summary of local interviews in the main body of the *Summary Report* and added considerable detail on how and why the interviews were conducted.

We wish to stress that we do respect local views and have made every effort to make them (in so far as we can obtain data) a part of this study.

You shouldn't be comparing Haines Junction to other communities. Communities are made up of people and all people are different so you shouldn't be comparing them. Other communities are too different from Haines Junction to make the comparison meaningful.

We simply do not agree that it is inappropriate to compare the economies of communities. Comparing the economic indicators of communities (from the very small to the national against each other and over time)

to measure what is happening and then attempting to figure out why it is happening is an important tool used in economics.

The idea of using a "control" group to examine differences is, in various guises, a basic tool used in almost all social and physical sciences. In this particular case, if there were no major differences between Haines Junction and the "average" community, we could state with confidence that the KNPR did not have a major effect on the economic development of the community. However, the fact that Haines Junction has developed faster and is more prosperous than the "average" community does not automatically allow us to attribute the differences to the KNPR. Other factors that could account for all or a portion of the differential economic development must be identified and analysed.

You should be looking at investment in the community, and who is investing.

We agree completely, but, unfortunately, the data to perform this type of analysis is just not available. Investment is an important component of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) when measured by the expenditure method (see *Baseline Profile* background paper for a discussion of this). Investment is particularly important not just because of its immediate impact, but also because it increases the future income earning capacity of the economy.

Investment, as measured in GDP, includes new residential construction; capital spending by government; business capital spending on buildings, structures, machinery and equipment; and changes in inventories. The only numbers available relate to building permits, which are not necessarily indicative of the total construction actually put in place (the important number). In any case, they are not published for Haines Junction or the Kluane region. Geographical breakdowns on capital spending by the different levels of government are not available, although it might be possible to glean spending on specific road projects. Information on business investment in machinery and equipment is simply not available at the local level, nor is information on inventory changes.

Even if numbers on total investments were available, for the purposes of this project, we would still need more detail on who made the investments and why, so that we could distinguish between investments related in some way to KNPR and other investments. Again, information is simply not available to do this.