

Minutes



Odour Management Team, Meeting #1

Date: June 4 & 5, 2013

Place: Red Deer Lodge Hotel & Conference Centre, 4311 – 49 Avenue, Red Deer, Alberta

In attendance:

Name	Stakeholder group
Humphrey Banack	Alberta Federation of Agriculture
Ann Baran	Southern Alberta Group for the Environment
Mandeep Dhaliwal (Day 1 only)	Calgary Regional Airshed Zone
Keith Denman	Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Francisco Echegaray	Natural Resources Conservation Board
Joseph Hnatiuk	Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists
Holly Johnson-Rattlesnake (Day 1 only)	Samson Cree Nation
Sandi Jones (Day 1 only)	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Jim Lapp	Solid Waste Management Association of North America (City of Edmonton)
Nelson Lord	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CNRL)
Ruth Mitchell	Alberta Health
Tanya Moskal-Hébert (Day 2 only)	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Shelly Pruden	Peace Airshed Zone Association
Gary Redmond	Alberta Capital Airshed
Al Schulz (Day 2 only)	Chemistry Industry Association of Canada
Janis Seville	The Lung Association
Tracy Smith	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (Shell)
David Spink (Day 2 only)	Prairie Acid Rain Coalition
Gord Start	Alberta Forestry Products Association (Hinton Pulp)
Merry Turtiak (Day 2 only)	Alberta Health
Angella Vertzaya	Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (City of Edmonton)
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed Management Zone
Celeste Dempster	CASA
Alex Grzybowski	Pacific Resolutions
Robyn Jacobsen	CASA

Regrets:

Name	Stakeholder group
Carolyn Kolebaba	Alberta Association of Municipal Districts & Counties
Norine Saddleback	Samson Cree Nation

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
1.1: Based on the two lists from today's discussion, Celeste will write up a draft list of ground rules for the team's review.	Celeste	Meeting #2

1.2: Keith and Merry will investigate who regulates transloading facilities/rail.	Keith and Merry	Meeting #2
1.3: Each stakeholder group will bring forward the name of their self-selected co-chair.	NGO, industry, government	Prior to meeting #2
1.4: Celeste will prepare a straw dog terms of reference for the three topics (complaints, odour assessment, and health) to be used as a foil for discussion at the next meeting.	Celeste	Distribute with meeting #2 agenda
1.5: Team members will review the three topics (complaints, odour assessment and health) in the project charter and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting as well as what related information is available on each topic from their organization.	All	Meeting #2
1.6: Celeste to poll for dates for three upcoming meetings.	Celeste	ASAP

Day 1: June 4, 2013

Time: 9:00 am to 5:00 pm

1. Introduction

This 1.5 day meeting was the kick-off event for CASA's new Odour Management Team. Day 1 focused on providing the team with an orientation to CASA and the CASA process, developing team ground rules, and preparing tools and solutions to address upcoming team challenges. Having laid a solid foundation for success, Day 2 was directed at discussing the implementation of the project charter, reviewing team membership and the co-chair selection process, and discussing the team's workplan and next steps. The goal of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for relationship building, engage in orientation and training in collaborative processes, apply this training to create tangible products, build buy-in and ownership of the process, and set the stage for the continued success of the Odour Management Team.

The meeting began at 9:05am. Celeste was introduced as the team's project manager with Robyn acting as support from the CASA Secretariat. The team was also joined by Alex Grzybowski, an expert in collaborative consensus processes, who lead the discussion on interest based negotiation. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting.

2. CASA Overview

Celeste provided an overview of CASA and elements of a successful team. CASA is made up of three components:

- Board:
 - 22 members from government, industry and non-government organizations
 - Oversees and provides strategic direction for CASA
 - Meets 4 times annually
- Secretariat:
 - Oversees the day-to-day operations of CASA
 - Responsible to the Board
 - Are the process experts
- Teams:

- Responsible to the Board and to the constituents they represent
- All team members have roles and responsibilities which can be found in CASA's Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes (MCP) (page 19-25).

The team discussed building blocks for success including relationship building, discussion without prejudice, and communication with constituency. CASA's MCP is also a valuable resource for success as it outlines the collaborative consensus process and strategies for overcoming common challenges the team will face. *Each member of the team is responsible for contributing to the success of the project.* Team members should take advantage of the diversity of perspectives at the table to build a robust, creative package of recommendations that meets everyone's interests.

3. What is interest based negotiation?

To introduce the concept of interest based negotiation, the team participated in a short negotiation role play. The exercise was meant to demonstrate the difficulty of finding a win-win situation when people focus solely on their positions (especially when there is no opportunity for compromise, ex. neighbours arguing about whether to cut down a tree). When people focus on interests rather than positions, there are a wider variety of solutions that become available and the likelihood of reaching a win-win agreement increases significantly.

The CASA process uses a collaborative consensus approach in which participants negotiate from an interest based point of view rather than engaging in positional behaviours.

4. Interest Based Negotiation in Action

Alex delivered an interactive presentation on interest based negotiation including having participants review a list of common odour interests and positions.

CASA uses an interest based approach to negotiation. As such, an important part of the process is identifying interests and helping participants to move from positions to interests. A position is often expressed in the form of a pre-formed solution or an opening demand. It is usually only ideal from one party's perspective and cannot be provided for by alternate means. An interest is the needs, hopes, fears, concerns and desires that underlie a position. They provide the currencies for a fruitful discussion and creating a win-win solution. Interests can be substantive (ex. concerns around odour issues), procedural (ex. concerns around timing of implementation), or psychological (ex. the need for respect).

Through this discussion the team developed two tools to help team members focus on interests rather than positions during meetings:

Tool: How to identify an interest?

- Ask the 3 Questions:
 1. What is your concern? (Identifies the issue)
 2. What is your solution? (Often expressed as a position)
 3. How would that solution solve your issue? (Describes underlying interests)

Tool: What if someone is being positional?

- Ask questions! (rather than argue)
- Propose alternatives
- Put your own interests on the table
 - Ask: How does your solution meet my/everyone's interests?

The most important communication tool in an interest based discussion is *listening*. The most effective participants are those who are also active listeners. Part of listening means that the other person feels as though they are being listened to. This means making eye contact when appropriate, making gestures of acknowledgment, putting aside distractions such as cell phones and newspapers, and *asking open ended questions*. Rather than focusing on what you think or want to say, a good listener pays attention and tracks the other person's comments – similar to singing along with the radio. A good listener also picks up on what is not being said. When someone feels as if they are being listened to they are more likely to focus on interests and trust others at the table. It is important to recognize the challenge of listening to someone else when you may disagree with what they are saying. Rather than argue, participants are encouraged to ask questions. You do not necessarily need to agree but it is the responsibility of every team member to try to understand each others' interests.

Following this discussion around listening, the team summarized tips for good participation and developed an associated tool:

Tool: Tips for being a successful participant.

- Demonstrate how you would address others' interests.
- Listen to learn.
- Focus on the problem, not people.
- Don't argue, ask questions!
- Enable others to take risks.
- Take risks!

The team then engaged in a discussion around ground rules. Alex asked the team to list meeting behaviours they had experienced in the past that contributed to a bad meeting:

- Getting yelled at
- Name calling
- Don't achieve meeting objectives
- People don't listen
- People are positional right out of the gate
- Dominating personalities
- Meeting has no structure leading to circular talk and no outcomes
- Long lectures
- Being talked down to
- Accusatory language
- Lack of trust
- Running late/off agenda
- Cutting off good, productive discussion
- Chair who doesn't manage meetings
- Participants are unprepared
- Rambling
- No ground rules or buy-in from group
- No one has/wants responsibility for follow-up

Alex asked the team to list meeting behaviours they had experienced in the past that contributed to a good meeting:

- If you have a concern, speak up!
- Consistent representation

- Punctuality
- Communication with sector so can bring sector's interests forward
- Honour commitments
- No distracting side conversations
- Enable others to take risks
- Take risks!
- The ground rules used by the CASA Odour Management Working Group (detailed in the minutes from meeting #1 of this group)

By reversing the behaviours from the first list and adding the behaviours from the second list, the team created a recipe for how the team will successfully work together going forward. These will form the basis for the team's ground rules.

Action Item 1.1: Based on the two lists from today's discussion, Celeste will write up a draft list of ground rules for the team's review.

Alex continued by leading a discussion around other concepts that describe how the team will work together. These concepts will form part of the term's operational terms of reference (project charter, page 16) and will be discussed and reviewed in greater detail at a future meeting.

- Consensus:
 - Agree with the whole
 - Can live with the package
 - Positive affirmation (explicitly acknowledge agreement)
- What is the procedure if the team reaches impasse?
 - Dialogue, ask questions
 - The parties who can't reach agreement should work together to propose alternate solutions
 - Those at impasse are responsible for documenting perspectives and options to bridge differences
- Media inquiries:
 - Co-chairs deal with media requests with the assistance of the Secretariat around key messages
 - Any communications with the media should reflect CASA's principle of non-attribution (ie. The team discussed... vs This [Specific organization] said this...).
 - Members are encouraged to contact the Secretariat for communications advice before speaking to the media.
 - Further advice can be found in CASA's media relations policy.
- Discussion without prejudice:
 - Creating an environment where the team can talk about possibilities, explore issues, and take risks without fear.
 - Safe zone to share ideas
 - No idea is a bad idea
 - Respect
 - Recognizing sensitive topics, but still enabling that conversation
 - People are allowed to explore and change their mind within a discussion without judgement
- Both confidentiality and non-attribution contribute to a discussion without prejudice

5. Process Planning and Upcoming Challenges

Celeste provided an overview of CASA's MCP and where the team is within the process. The MCP outlines 8 steps that action CASA's collaborative consensus process. Each step lays out associated actions and deliverables as well as strategies for overcoming common challenges. It will be a key resource for this team. By the end of the 1.5 day kick-off event the team will have reached the end of Step 3 (convening the team) and will be entering Step 4 (issues, information, and interest). It should be noted that, while the sequence of steps appears linear, the process is actually iterative. Some members may feel more at home in some steps than others (ex. discussing interests and issue; preparing alternatives); being aware of these tendencies is helpful for members on a personal level in order to participate effectively.

There are certain challenges that the team will likely face in the near future. Alex led the team through an exercise to prepare strategies for four challenges that the team may potentially face. In the future, the team will be able to use the strategies prepared today to help overcome some of these challenges.

Challenge #1: Your project team has elected to use a small subgroup to accomplish a task quickly. The subgroup would be responsible for completing the task and reporting their results to the project team for their consideration and incorporation into the ongoing work of the team. There is a call for volunteers to join the subgroup - 12 people volunteer, but the team was hoping to keep the subgroup at 6-8 people.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:

- The team should establish clear deliverables, objectives, expectations, expertise requirements, timelines, time commitment, and report back requirements for the subgroup (i.e. a terms of reference). This will help potential participants to better understand the membership needs of the subgroup.
- The team should establish guidelines for interim reporting and information flow between the subgroup and the team.
 - The subgroup is responsible to the team; the team provides oversight.
- Use caucuses to nominate representatives.
- Representatives need to be able to commit to the needs identified in the subgroup's terms of reference (including time commitments).
- Membership should be guided by the range of interests that need to be represented rather than hard numbers and should avoid duplication of interests.
- Membership should include representation from the three stakeholder groups (government, industry, NGO).
- The team should keep in mind that, even if they do not sit on the task group, team members will have influence through regular updates and feedback, and the team has the final decision-making authority.

Challenge #2: Several months ago, at considerable expense, your project team contracted a consultant to write a report that the team will use as the foundational background piece for generating recommendations. After receiving the report, several members of the team are adamant that the information in the report is incorrect and can't be trusted. There is no budget to redo the report.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:

- Strategies for dealing with the report:
 - Try to understand why the report is being rejected (ex. don't like the results vs. poor quality of work).
 - In this way, can use the report to help reveal interests and create agreement about where the team needs to go next.
 - Discuss: Did the report meet the terms of reference?
 - Document concerns and attach to the report as a cover letter.
- Prevention Strategies:
 - From the outset, clearly outline the purpose of the report and type of report (ie. Why are you doing this report?).
 - Technical report:
 - How will this information be used? Be sure this is outlined ahead of time.
 - NB: Peer review can help manage uncertainty around technical reports.
 - Asking consultant to provide recommendations:
 - How will this information be used?
 - Develop a clear terms of reference.
 - Use the consensus process to create an RFP.
 - Choose consultant using the consensus process.
 - Create hiring criteria to build team buy-in.
 - Make sure the consultant understands the team's needs.
 - Identify from the outset who has ownership of the final report (ex. Is it the consultant or the team?).
 - Put together a small group to work with consultant on a regular basis.
 - Have consultant relay preliminary results to catch any issues early.
 - Build in progress reports.
 - Build in milestone presentations as opportunities for the team to provide feedback.
 - Have payments associated with milestones.
 - Make sure the team understands their obligation to engage with interim reports and provide feedback when required.
 - Include report revisions in the budget.

Challenge #3: Your team is working to reach agreement on an important recommendation and the group engages in an interest-based discussion to explore how the proposal affects everyone's needs. Various members express concerns with the recommendation and offer up amendments. Rather than join the discussion, one team member simply continues to restate their position, disregarding the concerns of other parties, and referencing their constituency's unwavering support for the original recommendation.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:

- Use questions to try to get more information.
- Use two tools detailed in Section 4:
 - Tool: How to identify an interest.
 - Tool: What if someone is being positional?
- Look for common ground.
- Refer to ground rules.
- Project manager can provide individual coaching.
- Co-chairs can provide individual mentoring.

- Other team members can use their skills and good relationships to help the member move from positions to interests.
- Use co-chairs to help understand if the position is coming from the individual or from the organization.
- Use associated caucus as a resource.
 - Is this person an effective representative?

Challenge #4: Your team has been working diligently for several months to gather information, develop options, and craft recommendations, and you are getting close to completing your final report. At your next meeting, a team member announces that they've heard an announcement from the Minister that significantly changes the context in which several of your recommendations were written. Someone suggests, with exasperation, that the team might as well scrap all the recommendations. Everyone around the table looks defeated.

Strategies for Overcoming Challenge:

- Don't panic!
- Confirm rumours while continuing work in the face of uncertainty.
- As a team evaluate the impact of the announcement.
 - Look for any positive impacts of the announcement.
 - Try to understand why the decision was made.
 - Create a summary which can be brought to the Board for advice.
- Recognize and deal with the emotional impact of the announcement.
- Be flexible.
- Rework recommendations.
- Use an iterative process to regain ground.
- Team members should bring relevant policy initiatives to the team's attention ASAP. Keep internal communications open to avoid surprises and being caught off guard.
 - Don't be discouraged. Remember that even with the best intentions sometimes surprises happen.

The team briefly brainstormed a list of other challenges that the team may face in the future:

- Data challenges:
 - Lack of data
 - Identifying gaps
 - Engaging with experts
 - Data management
 - Managing data expectations
 - Recognizing the subjective nature of odour
 - Recognizing that can't rely solely on data to make decisions
- Understanding the individual impact of odour
- Establishing legitimacy of our work
- Potential outreach activities

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Day 2: June 5, 2013

Time: 8:30 am to 1:00 pm

1. Introduction

The meeting began at 8:30am. Participants introduced themselves and were welcomed to Day 2 of the meeting. Alex provided a summary of Day 1 and Celeste provided an overview of the agenda for Day 2.

2. Implementation of Project Charter

Celeste gave a short presentation to review the highlights of the project charter. The team had the opportunity to ask questions of clarification and discuss the project charter:

- The working group who prepared the project charter (approved by CASA Board in March 2013) did not deal with substantive issues but rather worked to design a process which would allow a larger group of stakeholders (i.e. this team) to engage in a focused discussion about odour management in Alberta.
- The working group considered the broad issue of odour management as well as what could be accomplished by a CASA team in 18-22 months. Given the complexity of the issue, the project charter outlines the need for a ‘phased approach’. The working group developed a vision for odour management in Alberta to guide ongoing and future work as well as a goal for the work of this CASA team. Meaning, that as part of this ‘phased approach’, the team will focus on a specific piece of work recognizing that this work is one piece of the odour puzzle.
 - The team can keep track of and share with the Board areas where future work could be needed.
- Rather than focus on specific odours or odour producing activities, the team will focus on creating strategies, processes, etc. that can be applied to all sectors and odours. The team discussed what this might look like using examples from working group discussions and referencing strategies from other jurisdictions.
 - The team has been directed to remain focused on creating useful, useable products.
- The project charter outlines seven topics of objectives (complaints, odour assessment, health, prevention/mitigation, enforcement/role of regulation, education/communication/awareness, continuous improvement). There is an upfront recognition that the team may be able to delve more deeply into some topics than others, but at no point should ignore the interrelated nature of the seven topics. This is in keeping with the ‘phased approach’ and 18-22 month timeline.
- The team is responsible to the CASA Board for two deliverables: a final report with package of recommendations, and a good practice guide.
 - The good practice guide is intended to be a user-friendly version of the final report and act as a communication tool to help share and apply the work of the team. The design and content of the good practice guide will depend on the results of the team’s work. The team may choose to engage a communications/design specialist to help with the design of the good practice guide.
- To meet the 18-22 month timeline, the team will use small task groups. A task group is responsible for completing a piece of work that will subsequently be reviewed by the team and incorporated into the overall work of the team. This will help to the team to complete their work in a timely manner by making efficient use of resources. A task group reports to and coordinates with the team on a regular basis. The team provides oversight for all task groups. The team holds the final-decision making authority over the work of the task group.

The team confirmed their commitment to the project charter.

The team continued with a discussion around the practical implementation of the project charter:

- Meeting quorum will be at least one member (or alternate) from each of the three stakeholder groups (industry, government, NGO)
 - There was a general discussion that interested parties around the table are committed to attending meetings and actively participating on the team.
- If a team member is unable to attend a meeting, they may choose to send an alternate. Alternates should not be attending meetings on a regular basis, but should be kept informed of team discussions and progress on a regular basis so that they are able to fully participate at meetings when required.
- Given the geographical distribution of team members, the team decided that the meeting location will alternate with two meetings in Edmonton, followed by one meeting in Calgary. This will be revisited in the future as required.
- To avoid duplication and surprises, the team discussed the importance of keeping abreast of developments in the world of odour management. There will be a standing agenda item added to each meeting where members can share updates. Team members are also encouraged to contact Celeste with updates between meetings.
- The team will need to build a common understanding around odour.
- The team will need to discuss funding (slated for discussion later today).
- The team will need to remain conscious of the human resource requirements of the team's work and engage people effectively so as not overwhelm participants' capacity. This was also identified in the project charter as a risk (page 14).
- The team will need to provide regular updates to the Board.

3. Membership

The team reviewed current membership - the goal of this exercise being to check that interested parties are being engaged at the right level and in the most efficient manner, and to fill any gaps that might be identified. Membership is an iterative process and the team will review it periodically. Highlights of the discussion are as follows:

- ERCB – Celeste contacted the ERCB to discuss the project charter and if/how the ERCB would like to be engaged. The ERCB reviewed the project charter and felt that their interests aligned with specific categories of work and asked to be engaged through the task groups and included as a corresponding member.
- Alberta Food Processors Association – Celeste contacted the President who felt that they would be interested in participating on the project team. He will bring the request before their Board on June 27.

Action Item 1.2: Keith and Merry will investigate who regulates transloading facilities/rail.

Celeste reviewed the co-chair selection process with the team. Each CASA team has three co-chairs, one from each of the three stakeholders groups (government, industry, NGO).

Action Item 1.3: Each stakeholder group will bring forward the name of their self-selected co-chair.

4. Sequencing and Workplan

The CASA Board approved the odour management project charter in March 2013. The team reviewed the additional advice from the Board provided at this time, with the highlights as follows (complete record available from Board minutes):

- The project team should check in regularly with the board to help keep work on scope and pace.
- The project team should take advantage of existing research as much as possible and consider its application in the Alberta context, rather than conduct original research.
- Recognizing the integrated nature of the seven topics, the Board has suggested that the team prioritize the first 3-4 topics – create a workplan, begin work, report back to the Board on progress, then continue with work on the remaining topics. This will help the team to remain on scope and on track to meet timelines.

With this advice in mind, the team discussed the logical sequencing of the work and the team’s workplan.

Based on the advice from the Board, the team agreed to begin work on the first three topics (complaints, odour assessment, and health).

The team discussed that the first three topics fit well together as a group and this initial focus will help the team to begin work more quickly. The team will need to build a common understanding of odour, which will include technical aspects as well as an understanding of the emotion that is often associated with odour issues. There needs to be clear terms of reference to guide work under the three topics including the questions that need to be answered and the information that needs to be gathered. The team will need to do an initial scoping, and possibly exploratory information gathering, to outline the terms of reference.

The next meeting (meeting #2) will focus on an in-depth discussion of the three topics and associated terms of reference.

Action Item 1.4: Celeste will prepare a straw dog terms of reference for the three topics (complaints, odour assessment, and health) to be used as a foil for discussion at the next meeting.

Action Item 1.5: Team members will review the three topics (complaints, odour assessment and health) in the project charter and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting as well as what related information is available on each topic from their organization.

The team discussed funding. At CASA, there are two types of funding:

- Internal funding:
 - These funds are provided by CASA. They cover meetings expenses (ex. catering) and stakeholder honouraria. These funds have already been allocated through the CASA budget.
- External funding:
 - If a team chooses to undertake work requiring funds (ex. hiring a consultant), these funds must be raised externally. In the past CASA has acquired external funding through grants, but funds are usually raised through team membership.

The project charter identifies areas where funds may be required and it should be noted that the funding for the team is front-loaded. The team discussed that in order to attach a number to the funding question a more detailed discussion of the work is needed. By the end of meeting #2, the team hopes to have a better understanding of external funding requirements so that the team can provision the required resources.

5. Next Meeting

In order to maintain momentum and meet work deadlines, the team decided to set dates for three meetings: one around the end of June, one over the summer, and one in September.

Action Item 1.6: Celeste to poll for dates for three upcoming meetings.

The team was notified that the Cumulative Environmental Management Association (CEMA) out of Wood Buffalo will be holding an odour workshop in September 2013 and will be extending an invitation to the CASA Odour Management Team to attend. The team will keep abreast of workshop details as they become available.

The meeting adjourned at 12:07pm for lunch and participants departed at 1:00pm.