

# Final Minutes



---

## **Martha Kostuch Legacy Workshop (MKLW) Organizing Committee Meeting #7**

Date: June 29, 2009  
Time: 9.00 – 2.30  
Place: CASA

### **In attendance:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Stakeholder group</b>
Ann Baran	Southern Alberta Environmental Group
Kerra Chomlak	CASA (morning)
Carmen Gilmore	Alberta Energy
George Murphy	Alberta Environment
Krista Phillips	CAPP
Terry Sly	Alberta Water Council
Jennifer Allan	CASA

George Murphy chaired the meeting, which convened at 9:10 a.m. Quorum was achieved.

### **Action Items:**

<b>Action items</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Due</b>
7.1: Carmen will contact Peter Watson about the opening welcome, including a few words about Martha.	Carmen	July 30
7.2: Jennifer and Terry will develop a template for the case study presentations.	Jennifer / Terry	Sept 7
7.3: Jennifer and George will contact Municipal Affairs about speaking in the case study session.	Jennifer /George	July 30
7.4: Terry will work with AWC to choose an appropriate case study once the template is developed.	Terry	Sept 22
7.5: Jennifer will work with CASA to choose an appropriate case study once the template is developed.	Jennifer	Sept 22
7.6: George Murphy to contact Bev Yee about moderating the panel.	George	July 30
7.7: Jennifer and Terry to compare stakeholder lists to identify other stakeholders who could speak on the Stakeholder Perspectives Panel	Jennifer / Terry	July 30
7.8: Jennifer to talk to Christine Macken and Kim Sanderson about possible speakers to discuss Martha's non-environmental work.	Jennifer	July 30
7.9: Ann to contact Myles Kitagawa to speak at the Martha tribute.	Ann	July 30
7.10: Krista to contact John Squarek to speak at the Martha tribute.	Krista	July 30
7.11: The CASA Secretariat will contact Martha's family to see if they would like to speak during the tribute.	Kerra	July 30
7.12: Team members will report back from stakeholder review on the tools at the July teleconference.	All	July 30
7.13: Jennifer, Terry and Krista will talk about the best way to facilitate the AWC's and CASA sectors, in particular the industry sector.	Jennifer, Terry, Krista	Sept 22
7.14: George will provide a contact for CEMA to identify any groups who may want to be part of the self-selection process.	George	Sept 7
7.15: Jennifer will work with Jean Moses to develop key messages for marketing	Jennifer / Jean	July 30
7.16: Jennifer will work with the financial administrator to determine the best way to administer a fee.	Jennifer	July 30

## 1) Administration

### a. Agenda/Objectives

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved by consensus.

### b. Minutes

The minutes of Meeting 6 were approved by consensus.

### c. Action Items Follow-up

Action items	Who	Due
6.1 Provide a copy of the presentation to team members.	Kerra	Done
6.2 Negotiate a contract with the Matrix based on the direction of the project team and include catering, A/V and room rental costs.	Jennifer / Kerra	Done
6.3 Provide team members with a biography for the second speaker.	Jennifer	Done

#### **d. CASA update**

CASA's board meeting June 24 was very productive. The recommendations for a Clean Air Strategy and most recommendations from the Electricity Framework Project Team were approved. Minister Renner and his Parliamentary Assistant were in attendance for a portion of the meeting.

There are other relevant events happening: Oct 19 and 20 is the Airshed Council's conference and November 10 is the Priority Setting workshop. The board is thinking of changing it's December meeting to an evening session December 1 to facilitate attendance by CASA board members.

#### **e. AENV Martha Kostuch Legacy Projects update**

The Consensus Certificate Program through the Alberta Arbitration and Mediation Society (AAMS) is set to launch this fall. The introductory course was piloted last week. The purpose of the course is to compare consensus decision-making with other models and provide a basic understanding of what to expect from a consensus process. Other courses will include some already offered through AAMS. The group is still working out the details of how someone will become "certified."

## **2) Day One Programme**

The team worked on the agenda. Appendix A to these minutes is the next version of the agenda, as well as possible speakers.

Overall, the team expressed interest in broadening the workshop beyond environmental issues to show consensus can be applied to a myriad of issues in formal and more informal situations.

**Action item 7.1: Carmen will contact Peter Watson about providing the opening welcome and including a few words about Martha.**

#### Session 2: Keynote address

The team discussed the role of they keynote address with the Paul Emond. The team would like Paul to attend the entire day and provide a summary at the end of the day that wraps up day 1 and alludes to day 2's events. The keynote address itself should:

- Discuss the concept of consensus and its successes and challenges (without stepping on the case studies)
- Introduce the tools that will be developed in Day 2 to provide a link
- Discuss the future of consensus decision making: the influence of social media
- How consensus is applied beyond environmental issues, in a community or social context

#### Session 4: Case Studies

The team talked about the purpose and process for the case studies. Generally, these sessions are intended to share experiences and lessons rather than teach anyone how to use consensus. The team

preferred a deeper analysis of successes, obstacles and how the team overcame their struggles of 3-4 case studies, rather than a survey of many case studies. Stakeholder's views is the subject of the afternoon panel, so it would be valuable to have a neutral presentation, rather than each sector's assessment of how the consensus process was applied. Also, it may be difficult to secure a speaker from each sector for these days.

**The team agreed** that a neutral secretariat representative would give the presentation. However, the presentation would be created with the input, and agreement, of all three sectors. The CASA secretariat can help facilitate that process. The presentations should be built on a shared template that could include: successes, sector perspectives, challenges, secretariat / convenor learnings, etc. Possible case studies include: CASA, AWC and Municipal Affairs (the heal the harm program). It was noted that the process is what is critical in selecting a suitable case study, not necessarily the content.

**Action item 7.2: Jennifer and Terry will develop a template for the case study presentations.**

**Action item 7.3: Jennifer and George will contact a rep from Municipal Affairs about speaking.**

**Action item 7.4: Terry will work with AWC to choose an appropriate case study once the template is developed.**

**Action item 7.5: Jennifer will work with CASA to choose an appropriate case study once the template is developed.**

#### Session 5: Consensus: How is it working?

The team briefly discussed this session, but has more work to do to develop a template or framework for the conversation. Generally, each sector would be asked how consensus operates from their perspective. Speakers would ideally have project team experience in multiple forums such as CASA, AWC and/or CEMA.

**Action item 7.6: George Murphy to contact Bev Yee about moderating the panel.**

**Action item 7.7: Jennifer and Terry to compare stakeholder lists to identify other stakeholders (particularly from industry and government sectors).**

#### Lunch

Lunch should be 90 minutes to allow time for the Emerald Awards video and a few short speeches about Martha.

**Action item 7.8: Jennifer to talk to Christine Macken and Kim Sanderson about possible speakers to discuss Martha's non-environmental work.**

**Action item 7.9: Ann to contact Myles Kitagawa to speak during the Martha tribute.**

**Action item 7.10: Krista to contact John Squarek to speak during the Martha tribute.**

**Action item 7.11: The CASA Secretariat will contact Martha's family to see if they would like to speak during the tribute.**

### **3) Day Two Programme**

The team discussed the options for tools to develop during the second day. It was boiled down to four options:

1. Screening tool: The purpose of the tool would be to help determine if an issue is suitable for a consensus process. Team members have heard this raised as an issue in their experience with

consensus in Alberta. The screening tool would serve as a pre-assessment to ensure consensus processes are appropriate.

2. Communications tool: There were two gaps identified that a communications tool could address. First, guidelines or principles to help team members take decisions back to their sectors would be useful. While at the table addressing multiple interests yields the solutions, it can be difficult to bring these back to various sectors because team members may have to explain the rationale and /or other sector's views. There are also issues around getting feedback and increasing engagement in some sectors. Second, a tool to help communicate the benefits of consensus to the "external" audiences would be useful.
3. Clarify and prioritize interests tool: This tool would help organizations clarify their interests and assess their priorities even as the work of the team progresses or shifts direction
4. Innovation and creativity tool: A tool to help spawn creative, out-of-the-box thinking.

**The team agreed** to work in a facilitated process on Day 2 to address Option 2 in the morning and Option 1 in the afternoon. If there is time in the morning, Options 3 and 4 would be considered.

The team will consult with their stakeholder groups on the two tools described and agreed to above (Options 1 and 2) to increase buy-in and ensure we're addressing the needs of consensus practitioners in Alberta.

**Action item 7.12: Team members will report back from stakeholder review on the tools at the July teleconference.**

**The team agreed** an additional objective / conversation for the second day is to determine if, and how, continued input from workshop participants should be conducted.

## 4) Day 2 Selection Process

The team is trying to balance the need for inclusivity and diversity of opinions with a small enough group to yield tangible outcomes. The team would like participants experienced in consensus and available to attend both days. We have room for 40-45, which equals roughly 14 per sector (assuming three sectors of government, industry and NGO). This would leave a few spaces open if some participants from Day 1 were keen to join Day 2.

The team discussed various options involving self-selection, general calls for nominations, first come-first serve and waiting lists. **The team agreed** to have each of the three sectors (lumping AWC's two government sectors together) select 14 participants using their own processes. The CASA secretariat can help facilitate these processes. In addition, registrants will be asked to express interest in the second day. They will be placed on a waiting list to fill any outstanding or unused slots.

**Action item 7.13: Jennifer, Terry and Krista will talk about the best way to facilitate the AWC's and CASA sectors.**

**Action item 7.14: George will provide a contact for CEMA to identify any groups who may want to be part of the self-selection process.**

## 5) Marketing

The team identified the following key selling points:

- Paul Emond and Peter Watson
- Case studies and the stakeholder perspectives panel: chance to hear detailed experiences from various perspectives
- (Day 2) Opportunity to participate in enhancing consensus in Alberta, making it more informed, efficient.

**Action item 7.15: Jennifer will work with Jean Moses to develop key messages for marketing.**

Some titles or themes brainstormed included:

- “What would Martha say?” Often the phrase was used to help people get past roadblocks. Martha had the ability to see other’s perspectives, merge them with her own and generate a unique solution people could live with.
- Moving forward
- Perspectives
- Consensus: The other view
- Tough on issues (not on people)
- Agreeing to agree

## 6) Workplan

The team reviewed the workplan. It is a useful, living document so all members of the team know when, and who, is taking care of planning items.

A few issues arose when discussing planning details:

- Charging for the event: With a fee it is more difficult to back out after registering. We don’t want to plan for 150 and have 75 attend. However, it is tough as a non-profit organization to charge given that we have sufficient funds. The team may need some funds for other work, such as a consultant or report writer. As the budget currently looks, we’re spending nearly all our revenue.

**The team agreed** to charge \$75 per person for the event. This is equal to the cost of the venue and catering per person.

**Action item 7.16: Jennifer will work with the financial administrator to determine the best way to administer a fee.**

- Proceedings: The team would prefer to have proceedings available, but can work out the details at a later date.
- Participants should be asked on the registration form for permission to share their name, organization and email address on the attendees list.
- **The team agreed** to host a dinner the evening of Day 1.

## 7) Budget

The following expenses **were approved by consensus**:

1. Paying all speakers travel
2. Speaker gifts
3. Delegate packages including memory sticks (documents: NRTEE reports, CASA, AWC documents) and water bottles or mugs
4. An honoraria of \$500 for non-government speakers who request it, typically people whose employer pays for their time will forgo this.

**The team also agreed** to hire Winterberry Studios as their graphic designer and Kim Sanderson, if she is available, as the workshop report writer.

## **8) Next steps and next meetings**

The next meeting will be a teleconference July 30 9.00 – 10.30. The agenda items will be:

1. Report back from stakeholders regarding the tool
2. Report back from speaker contacts

The next face-to-face meeting will be September 22 10-2 at CAPP.

Meeting was adjourned at 2.21.

Appendix A: Draft program

Time	Session Title / Speaker	Session Objectives
9.00	1. Welcome address <i>Peter Watson</i>	Welcome attendees Overview Day 1 Objectives
9.15	2. Key note address <i>Paul Emond</i>	Overview of consensus decision making Future of consensus decision making
10.00	Break	
10.15	3. Consensus Case Studies AWC CASA <i>Municipal Affairs</i>	Case studies sharing their experiences and insights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successes and challenges</li> <li>• How to overcome obstacles</li> </ul> Each case study will be previously agreed to by each sector.
12.00	Lunch	Tribute to Martha <i>Myles Kitagawa</i> <i>John Squarek</i> <i>Family member</i> <i>Other, non-environmental speaker</i>
1.30	4. Consensus: How is it working? <i>Moderator: Bev Yee</i> <i>Panel members:</i> <i>NGO: Chris Severson-Baker</i> <i>Industry (Mike Kelly, Keith Murray?)</i> <i>Government</i>	Panel conversation with representatives from industry, government, NGOs and project managers
4.00	5. Closing address <i>Paul Emond</i>	Thanking everyone Next steps: Day 2, Proceedings availability, etc Invite delegates to dinner / reception