

**Weyerhaeuser/Tolko  
Okanagan-Shuswap and Boundary Regional  
Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

**Meeting Summary  
SFM Advisory Group Meeting, November 21, 2004**

**Meeting Attendance**

√	Amanda Bridge	√	Mike Watkins
	Bernie Kaplun	√	Morrie Thomas
	Berthold Hettrich	√	Pat Salm
√	Cam Leadbeater	√	Paul Ross
√	Darcie Annesley		Peter Wise
	David Allingham		Real Rousseau
√	Earl Overland		Renee Clark
√	Ed Sims		Ron Racine
	Grant Furness	√	Scott Smith
√	Jim Bryan	√	Ted Allingham
	Joe McGinnis		Terry Kineshanko
√	Juergen Hansen		Tom Chapman
√	Larry Broadfoot	√	Les Laithwaite
√	Michelle Mercer		

**Meeting Agenda Follows**

**Weyerhaeuser/Tolko  
Okanagan-Shuswap and Boundary Regional  
Sustainable Forest Management Plan**

## **DRAFT AGENDA**

### SFM Advisory Group Meeting

**Date: Thursday, October 21, 2004**

**Time: 12:00 to 4:00 PM (lunch provided)**

**Place: Accent Inns, 1140 Harvey Ave (Hwy 97), Kelowna**

---

#### **Meeting Objectives:**

- Review the 2004 Audit Results
- Address Action Items from April 29/04 Meeting Summary
- Initiate updating of the SFMP

#### **Agenda Topics:**

- |    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1  | Introduction and Agenda Review  | 12:15 to 12:30 p.m. |
| 1a | Advisory Group Background (added to agenda at meeting)  |                     |
| 1b | Process (added to agenda at meeting)  |                     |
| 2  | 2004 Audit Update (Weyerhaeuser/Tolko)  | 12:30 to 12:50 p.m. |
| 3  | Action Items from April 29/04 Meeting Summary   | 12:50 to 1:00 p.m.  |
|    | • Update on Canadian Forest Service work in regard to BC's carbon balance: <b>will be addressed during Indicator review as part of SFMP updating at Nov 4 meeting – Scott Smith</b> |                     |
|    | • Add definition for “pest” to glossary: <b>Pat Salm</b>  |                     |
|    | • Report on trends for certain Indicators as part of Annual Monitoring Report: <b>will be included in 2004 report – Weyerhaeuser/Tolko</b>  |                     |
| 4  | Updating of the SFMP: Process   | 1:00 to 1:15 p.m.   |
| 5  | Updating of the SFMP – Overview of proposed SFMP changes to meet CSA Z809-02 Standard   | 1:15 to 2:00 p.m.   |
| 6  | Updating of the SFMP – Working session  | 2:15 to 3:45 p.m.   |
| 7  | Summary and Wrap-up   | 3:45 to 4:00 p.m.   |

## 1) Introduction and Agenda Review

Table members introduced themselves.

Meeting objectives and draft agenda topics were reviewed. Pat Salm requested an additional agenda item "Advisory Group Background". Juergen Hansen requested that "process" be added as an agenda item.

### 1a) Advisory Group Background

The original Advisory group was based on TFL 15 and predated the SFM Plan process. In 2000 the area addressed by the group was expanded to include all of Weyerhaeuser's operating area in the Okanagan TSA with the goal of developing an SFM Plan to support registration to the CSA Standard. The majority of the Advisory Group's focus was on SFM Plan Values, Objectives (formerly Goals), Indicators and Targets (formerly Objectives). The Group also reviewed, commented on and provided ideas for other parts of the plan.

In 2001 Weyerhaeuser was registered to the CSA Standard. For the next couple of years the Group's emphasis was plan maintenance and improvement together with monitoring and reporting. These functions supported continuation of the improvement cycle.

In 2003 Tolko expressed an interest in joining the SFM Plan. The concept was discussed with the Advisory Group and the Group agreed to the addition. Tolko's operating area is in the northern Okanagan. The need for additional public representatives from this area was identified with the result of several new members joining the group. The SFMP and portions of the Terms of Reference (TOR - distributed at meeting) have been updated to reflect the inclusion of Tolko.

**Question:** has the SFM Plan and process made a difference? Are the original objectives being met?

Yes, the Group is seeing trends. Movement by Weyerhaeuser observed.

Better operational awareness within the companies and improved communication with the PAG. Contractors have called company staff and said they have shut themselves down because operating in the wet conditions would be environmentally detrimental.

Better licensee understanding of public's wishes and priorities.

Change has been slow but it is moving, potentially with increasing momentum.

Clearly supports the licensees' effort to meet legal requirements.

**Action: Pat Salm** to identify any additional TOR changes required to reflect Tolko participation and/or changes to the CSA Z809-02 Standard (terms & definitions).

**Complete:** proposed TOR revisions (see email attachment) are to be reviewed by PAG at Nov 25 meeting

### 1b) Advisory Group Process

Attitudes have changed tremendously in the last 10 years. The belief in cooperation versus confrontation has grown substantially. LRMPs, and their consensus approach, were a major step forward in creating this atmosphere.

The consensus approach promotes working together versus fighting with each other. It provides an opportunity to sort out differences.

**Proposal:** try a neutral facilitator process and look at all options versus just accepting suggestions as provided by licensees.

#### **Discussion:**

Group members generally favored provision of ideas versus starting with a blank page. Providing ideas is not intended to shortcut discussion.

Suggestions are helpful but let's pause and consider options. Unless all possible ideas are explored you may not get the best approach.

Terms of Reference:

Aim for consensus

Agree to disagree documented

SFM Plan is not a negotiation, it is advisory.

No history of companies refusing to consider ideas provided. A consensus based process has been the goal throughout. Some members of the Advisory Group feel that we have not always had consensus, and it is not necessary as long as there is a "suitable" resolution. All have had to bend and sway as we go along.

The Group, as well as the plan, is moving forward and continually improving. Do not ever think of the Advisory Group as a rubber stamp. Ensure "any" member's concern is respected and addressed.

**Action:** Juergen Hansen will forward a description of the consensus process to the facilitator for distribution with the minutes.

**Complete:** a description of the consensus process is appended to the minutes

## 2) 2004 Audit Update (Weyerhaeuser/Tolko)

Tolko provided a summary with highlights (appended to minutes). Tolko extended an invitation for a couple Advisory Group members to attend and observe future audits.

Tolko's review led to a general discussion regarding lack of First Nations participation. Previous efforts were reviewed.

Weyerhaeuser's 2004 audit summary is not yet complete.

**Action:** Pat Salm will provide a summary report covering the Weyerhaeuser ISO 14001, CSA Z809 and the CSA Chain of Custody (COC) audits for the BC operations within a month.

**Complete:** the summary is posted at

<http://www.weyerhaeuser.com/environment/practsustainforest/bcinterior/plan/ExternalAuditSummary.pdf>. Copies will be provided at the Nov 4 meeting for those wanting them.

**Question:** who does the auditing?

Currently QMI (Quality Management Institute) completes the external audits for both Weyerhaeuser and Tolko. QMI is contracted by the licensees to complete these audits. Each company also conducts their own internal audits.

QMI is accredited by CSA to complete annual external audits. A sampling of QMI audits are audited by CSA to confirm that standards for both the auditing, and Z809, are being maintained.

## 3) Action Items from April 29/04 Meeting Summary

Definition for "Pest" to be included in glossary

The following ideas are provided for discussion at the November 25'th meeting.

- **"pest"** means an injurious, noxious or troublesome living organism but does not include a virus, bacteria, fungus or internal parasite that exists on humans or animals (Pesticide Control Act)
- **"pest"**: a person or thing that causes trouble, annoyance, discomfort, etc.; nuisance; specifically any destructive or troublesome insect, small animal, weed, etc. (Webster's)

#### 4) Updating of the SFMP: Process

“Proposed Process For Updating The SFMP” (appended to the minutes) was distributed and discussed.

**Please Note Scheduling agreed to**

November 4<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> meeting dates confirmed

Meetings will start at 10:00 a.m. and run to 4:00 p.m. to ensure completion of the updating in 3 meetings

November meetings will be held at the Eldorado Hotel (map attached)

Facilitator will be available one hour early to update those that missed the Oct 21<sup>st</sup> Mtg or who miss the Nov 4<sup>th</sup> mtg.

Balance of “process” agreed to as presented.

#### 5) Updating of the SFMP –

##### **Overview of proposed SFMP changes to meet CSA Z809-02 Standard**

Reviewed pages 1 and 2 of “Overview of Change” document that was included with the meeting notice and draft agenda.

A note of interest; CSA is initiating work this year on review of the Z809 Standard so that it will be available for use in 2007 (5 year improvement cycle)

#### 6) Updating of the SFMP – Working session

Reviewed an updated page 3 from the “Overview of Change” document that was originally included with the meeting notice and draft agenda (updated page appended to the minutes).

Agreed to the suggested wording provided for the new plan section “3.3 Strategy Guiding the SFM Plan” on page 11 of binder Tab 1.

Introduced the “Criterion Element and Prescriptor Changes” document in Tab 2 of the binder. As Element 1.4 is new to the CSA Standard, the Group’s Values and Objectives for this Element were discussed. The suggestions provided in Tab 1 (page 14) were agreed to.

**Action: Advisory Group members** will review the balance of the “Criterion Element and Prescriptor Changes” document in Tab 2 of the binder. The members will look to see if there are significant changes to Elements or Prescriptors that have not been identified. Values and Objectives will be reviewed for all Elements where their has been significant change. Values and Objectives for Elements not having significant change will not be reviewed during the updating process.

#### 7) Summary and Next Steps

The next advisory group meeting will be November 4<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. – Eldorado Hotel Kelowna

As per the agreed process, all pages to and including page 12 of Tab 1 can be moved to Tab 5 as complete. Replacement pages 11 and 12 incorporating the agreed to changes to the plan are attached to the email (“10 21 04 PAG Mtg Updates to the SFMP”) for insertion in tab 5.

Replacement page vi is also included with Tolko’s web site added.

**CSA Z809-96 Registration Audit  
Tolko, Lavington Division  
June 14-16, 2004**

**AUDIT SUMMARY**

---

All of the requirements as designated in the audit plan of the CAN/CSA Z809:1996 standard were audited and considered to be adequately implemented.

**Nonconformances :**

No nonconformances were levied during this audit.

**Positive Aspects of the Sustainable Forest Management System**

- 1) The Responsibility Matrix Guideline is an excellent tool.
- 2) Several good examples seen on field day of stand level wildlife habitat retention as well as coarse woody debris.
- 3) Excellent effort made by Tolko staff in the integration process with Weyerhaeuser to produce a joint SFMP.

**Public Advisory Group Audit Participation / MOF Interview:**

The audit team conducted a series of interviews (both in person and via telephone) with the PAG on June 14, 2004 to solicit comments with regards to the SFM process. PAG interviews were conducted concurrently for both Tolko Lavington Woodlands and Weyerhaeuser Okanagan Falls Forestlands.

Comments solicited were based on individual and group statements and are based on the sample of members spoken with. The following comments were noted by the audit team:

- 1) It's easy to get the necessary information from Tolko and Weyerhaeuser.
- 2) Information is presented in a timely and understandable manner by both licensees.
- 3) More First Nations involvement is needed in the process.
- 4) Good to have a process in place that bridges landscape and watershed management.
- 5) There are too many indicators which are actually legal requirements.
- 6) The facilitator is good and chairs meetings well.
- 7) Overall concerns with beetle salvage and all its side effects.

## **CSA Z809-96 Registration Audit, Tolko, Lavington Division Con't**

General differences between the 1996 and 2002 versions of the Z809 standard were also discussed with the group to aid in the eventual transition of the new standard.

In addition to meeting with PAG members, the audit team leader also conducted a phone interview with a representative of the Ministry of Forests from the Okanagan Shuswap Forest District on June 4, 2004. The purpose of this meeting was to review Lavington Woodlands compliance and enforcement record. Todd Graziadei (Enforcement Officer) with the Ministry of Forests participated in the phone interview. From this interview it was determined that Tolko Industries Ltd. Lavington Woodlands is not viewed as a high risk operator in the district based on past performance.

### **Opportunities for Improvement\***

#### **Consideration should be given to:**

- continuing attempts to recruit First Nations members.
- inviting PAG members to participate in future audits.
- tracking & logging all instances where Tolko offers something of material benefit to any First Nations whose traditional territory falls within the DFA (eg. Employment, MOUs, information exchanges etc.). Also consider logging all correspondence with First Nations (including printed email and telephone conversation logs) to show due diligence.
- approaching the MOF for clarification regarding "Take or Pay" policy and its impact on stand level retention structures and then determine how such retention structures can be addressed within the Forest Stewardship Plan framework.
- attempting to acquire information from the MOF from small scale salvage operations on the DFA for applicable indicators related to forest conditions.

\*NOTE: Although "Opportunities for Improvement" do not have to be accepted by the company, they will be reviewed by the auditors as part of the preparation for the next audit to ensure that they were given consideration.

# Proposed Process for Updating the SFMP

## Approach for Updating the SFMP

During development of suggestions to address the new standard, the intent was to minimize the degree of change to the current plan, This approach minimizes the workload for Advisory Group and maximizes retention of achievements and efforts to date. To meet this objective the following steps were taken:

- SFMP change limited to that necessary to meet the new standard
- Additional required information sourced from within, or as close to the SFMP as possible.
- Nothing dropped from the plan. Proposed deletions to the plan are noted.

## Proposed Scheduling

This meeting - agree to process, review high level overview of changes, begin work

Nov 4 meeting – a full working meeting, agree to most of plan changes

Nov 25 (final) meeting – wrap up uncompleted work and summarize accomplishments.

## Strategy For Updating the SFMP to the CSA Z809 – 02 Standard

It is proposed that review of significant CSA mandated changes, and development and evaluation of alternatives follow the order of the SFM Plan.

## Adoption of Change

Proposal: meeting discussion and agreement will be recorded but not concluded until the next meeting. This will provide an opportunity for additional consideration. The first step at the next meeting is to address any after thoughts from the previous weeks work, then confirm it as complete.

The meeting minutes will include updated versions of those portions of the plan discussed and agreed to. They can be retained in tab 5 of the binder. . At the conclusion of updating, tab 5 will include the entire updated SFM Plan.

## Missed Meetings

In the event of missed meetings, Les will be available for an hour before the second and third meetings to update those that missed the previous meeting. The updating will facilitate active involvement in the meeting while not slowing down progress of the group.

## Plan Presentation

Binders include:

Tab 1: SFMP with proposed changes

Tab 2: CSA Z809-96 vs 02 Criterion and Element comparison and assessment

Tab 3: CSA Z809-02 Standard

Tab 4: Supporting Indicator information

## Color Coding For Significant Changes

Existing text proposed for deletion is ~~crossed out~~.

Required text mandated by the CSA Z809 Standard is in **bold black and highlighted in grey**.

Proposed changes to existing Element Indicator relationships are shown in **bold black with yellow highlighting**.

Proposed new text is in **bold red and highlighted in yellow**.

## Changes not highlighted are

Information/documentation sourced within existing plan

Technical or housekeeping

Critical element – element

Operational plan(s)—licensee plan(s)

TSR every 5 years – periodic TSR

Can/CSA Z809 – 96 -- Can/CSA Z809 – 02

Miscellaneous changes that the Licensees do not feel are significant. Intent is to streamline and prioritize PAG effort on key items and reduce time demand for the public members.



**SFMP Sec 3.3: SFMP Strategy**

The CSA standard requires identification and elaboration of strategies that will need to be implemented to achieve each of the targets. As the OSBR SFMP does not contain written strategies, potential strategies are suggested.

**SFMP Sec 4 & Appendix 4:  
CSA Criteria and Elements (formerly Critical Elements)  
SFMP Values and Objectives (formerly Goals)**

Criteria, Elements and their Prescriptors are CSA mandated SFMP content. The following summarizes changes, additions or deletions to Criterion Prescriptors, Elements and Element Prescriptors.

There are no changes to Criteria and only one significant change to a Criterion Prescriptor. Criterion 3 focus is now solely on soil and water. Reference to the physical environment has been dropped from the Prescriptor.

Several Elements have been dropped from the CSA Standard, some have been added, and two have been significantly revised. The following table highlights the significant changes to the CSA Elements.

<b>Changes to CSA Elements</b>		
<b>Discontinued</b>	<b>Added</b>	<b>Changed Significantly</b>
2a) Forest health	1.4 Protected Areas and Sites of Special Biological Significance	4.1 Carbon Uptake and Storage (formerly 4.a. Element Recycling)
3.a) Physical Environments		
4.b) Utilization and Rejuvenation	5.2 Communities and Sustainability	6.4 Information for Decision-Making (formerly 6.f. Collective Understanding of Forest Ecosystems)
5.a) Long-term Productive Capacity		
6.a) Social Values	6.3 Public Participation	
6.d) Decision Making Process		

There are numerous wording changes for many of the remaining Elements and Element Prescriptors. Most of these changes are minor in nature.

Updating of the SFM Plan will include confirmation, revision or development of Values and Objectives (formerly Goals) for new or revised Elements and Prescriptors.

# **COLLABORATIVE PLANNING THROUGH FACILITATED DYNAMIC ROUND TABLE DIALOGUES**

By Juergen and Marilyn Hansen

## **BACKGROUND**

During the last ten years, there has been a major discussion in Canada and the USA about alternate ways of resolving environmental conflicts and designing better environmental policies.

In the past, mediated round tables have been used to resolve such conflicts between resource industries and environmentalists. The two best-known large-scale round tables have been the Trees, Fish and Wildlife (TFW) process in Oregon (1985) and the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) in British Columbia (2000 to the present).

The success of the informal TFW table was a result of the tremendous goodwill of the participants and the dedication of some volunteer lawyers. The table did not bother to establish a clear format or dialogue sequence. The LRMPs, on the other hand, used the overall structure and process suggested by the Harvard Project on Negotiation. Most LRMPs were reasonably successful, even though they tended to bias the negotiations in favour of corporate commercial wishes rather than sustainability and the common interest.

Some disappointed members of the Okanagan Similkameen LRMP modified the methodology in order to make the whole negotiation process faster, more adaptable and more considerate of grassroots' and local participation. This led to four major changes:

- 1) A negotiation format and table structure that will be fair to the three major sectors (economy; environment; social equity) that contribute to sustainability policies, and to the participants who represent these values and sectors.
- 2) An independent dialogue process that gives the power for decision-making and recording to the participants who represent the economic/financial, social and environmental interests and values.
- 3) Neutral third-party assistance for the dialogue from a facilitator who guides the dialogue but - unlike a mediator - does not take part in it. And
- 4) A structured and facilitated consensus-seeking dialogue process that gives the participants a chance for an in-depth discussion of their vision, agenda and range of possible options before they go on to design and accept an ideal option that everybody can support and that's in the public interest.

These four changes formed the basis for our new "dynamic round table" concept. The consensus-seeking dialogue provides an ideal method for fast and environmentally sensitive decision-making by the participants. It helps (and forces) the participants to:

- a) look at the negotiations as a collaborative planning effort rather than conflict resolution, and
- b) go through an individual transition process from supporting pre-conceived bargaining goals to collaborating toward the common goal, and

- c) use their creativity to develop and evaluate the whole range of possible options for reaching the common goal, and
- d) select a final public policy option that best protects the individual values as well as the public interest, and
- e) write a clear consensus-based policy recommendation or action plan for the convenor who is responsible for implementation.

These five changes were needed to resolve the ongoing conflicts between industrial development and environmental protection.

The changes (especially a. and b.) are brought about gradually during the stepwise dialogue. In its new form, the process will make it possible to evaluate the economic cost of environmentally-sound pro-active management and to estimate the environmental cost of uncontrolled development. Balancing these costs with the social aspects of a new public policy leads to sustainability, which can be defined as the integration of environmental, social and economic/corporate priorities.

At the same time, these changes represent a move from one-on-one mediated conflict resolution to collaborative sustainability planning in groups. Based on our field experience, we expect that the new round table format will allow round table participants to balance the economic, social and environmental needs and values against each other and to come up with a final recommendation that is in the common interest, that reinforces sustainability and that is supported by all participants (and their support groups).

We feel that the dynamic process will be especially useful to plan and implement sound management plans wherever conflicts between environment and economic priorities occur. Local and provincial forestry, agriculture, fisheries, recycling and pollution management provide typical examples of such situations. Oregon's voluntary TFW (Tree, Fish and Wildlife) process (1985) showed how this integration can be achieved in spite of a long history of bitter confrontations between the stakeholders.

## **THE PROCESS**

The combination of the five changes mentioned above did indeed lead to a new **dynamic round table dialogue format** that has been tried with inexperienced groups of participants in the Okanagan and has been found to be fast, peaceful and very successful.

The need for a **structured dialogue** did not sit too well with many alternate dispute resolution specialists. Their main counter-argument was based on their experience with unstructured mediated one-on-one conflict resolution between two (or, at the most, three) parties. Such processes proceed in a tit-for-tat fashion, do not rely on any specific dialogue structure and are strongly influenced by the mediator who, for the sake of convenience, tends to favour certain "key players". Others feared that a structured dialogue would restrict the freedom of speech, would inhibit the individual transition from pre-conceived bargaining position to common interest and would prevent creative thinking. Yet others realised, to their horror, that a structured

dialogue would require some self-control from all participants so that the discussion could stay focussed on results and solutions and would not trail off into the blue yonder.

We designed the new "**dynamic**" round table format in response to these fears. Its major features are **neutral facilitation** and a **six-step dialogue structure** (including creative brainstorming) that prevents the facilitator from taking part in the dialogue but allows all participants to get rid of their emotional ballast, to trust the process and work together.

## SETTING UP A TABLE

Setting up a collaborative consensus-seeking dynamic win-win round table is no more complicated than creating a committee that decides by majority vote (win-lose).

It usually starts with a great deal of confusion and behind-the-scenes backroom discussions. Once the dust settles and cooler minds take over, the convenor appoints a group of about 12 volunteer stakeholder/representatives. Ideally, there should be equal numbers of economic, social and environmental table members who will need frequent reminders that they should represent their own values and those of their informal sector, not their political home institution or organization.

With large tables, the convenor may want to appoint a round table chair who looks after the nuts and bolts and tea-and-crumpets arrangements of long-lasting tables.

In dynamic round tables, the majority-vote is replaced by a requirement for consensus-based decision-making. "Consensus" is not only a goal of the whole dialogue process but also a mechanism to allow the participants to move step by step through the dialogue, to forget about their past squabbles and to look for common ground.

## THE SIX STEPS AND THE TRANSITION

As a result of our LRMP experience and field work in the Okanagan, we have found that this search for common ground can be supported most effectively by a stepwise negotiation process in which consensus has to be reached before the dialogue can go on to the next step. The process helps the participants go through the following steps:

- 1) (**Vision**) to define the common vision of what they want to accomplish;
- 2) (**Analysis**) to analyze the means and data available, and the outer limit of the common task;
- 3) (**Agenda**) to design a common agenda, which should deal with the overarching principles first before getting down to the less relevant details. In unstructured negotiations and LRMPs, these details often create a lot of time-consuming heat; in the dynamic round table process, they are easily resolved once the overall principles are clarified;
- 4) (**Options development**) to practice creative brainstorming and to put together planning options that will consider each participant's interests and, at the same time, serve the common interest. This step regularly brings a major surprise: there are a lot more potential options than anybody suspects at the beginning!

(3)

- 5) (**Options Evaluation**) to evaluate the impact on the individual and common interest

which each of the options would have if it were implemented, and  
6) **(Decision)** to select the best option or action plan and recommend it to the convenor.

We have found during local field work that this six-step dialogue process has several advantages: it allows the participants to discuss their issues in greater depth (analysis step), with more creativity (options' stages) yet much faster (thanks to the sharp dialogue focus on results) than in any LRMP or other similar mediated process.

The predictable structure of the facilitated process prevents "blocking" of the dialogue. The facilitator simply asks potential nay-sayers to redefine their reason for the blocking in the form of an additional option (in step 4) which is then evaluated in parallel to the main option. The dialogue also creates mutual trust and a new interpersonal dynamic between the participants which lets them discover their commonality of purpose. In fact, it allows them to go through a transition from defending rigid pre-conceived group positions toward contributing to options that allow environmentalists and developers to agree on common solutions that serve both and that are in the public interest.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION**

Participants who have never taken part in a round table process often wonder and worry about "how they are supposed to act in such a dialogue and negotiation process". The answer is simple: the neutral facilitator guides everybody through the six steps by asking specific questions and by initiating and guiding dialogues between the members. All a participant has to do is respond honestly to the questions and to join the dialogues. As everybody goes through the transition from pre-conceived positions to focus on the common good, the stakeholders contribute their specific values and interests and learn how to integrate them with the values and ideas of others.

**This is the point where adversarial conflicts turn into opportunities to develop options that serve each participant (and his or her support group) as well as the common interest.**

Neutrality and patience are the key words to remember for facilitators, especially if the controversial issue at stake threatens to become a crisis. In fact, a crisis can be defined as an issue that has become overly emotional. Environmentalists and social advocates are thoroughly familiar with this crisis phenomenon. Many of them have taken part in public protests against policies that they see as inhumane and environmentally or socially destructive.

The reason for this crisis attitude stems from the fact that environmental and social movements derive their political and public power from strong emotional appeals to the human capacity for caring and responsibility for all aspects of life and for the community as a whole. Many politicians appeal to these sentiments before elections but find it hard to implement their promises once they are elected. This is why many NGOs (non-government volunteer organizations) concentrate their efforts on protests against official policies, "individual rights" movements and commercial developments that seem to be in conflict with the environmental or social values they hold.

The economic sector, on the other hand, has an easier row to hoe. Its political appeal stems from catering to the personal interests of voters and from loudly proclaimed adherence to (or at least the promise of) sound economic policies and balanced budgets. The dynamic round table process allows the economic stakeholders to incorporate environmental and social concerns into their planning. We have tried to redesign the original LRMP process in such a way that all participants can join dynamic round tables without fear of having to give up or compromise their environmental, social or economic value systems. If this is done early enough, it can be done without major economic costs and without the need for expensive retrofitting. The facilitated round table process gives environmentalists a chance to make active contributions to better policies and to collaborate with corporate interests without getting outgunned or sideswiped.

We expect that the dynamic round table process described here will be especially useful:

- 1) for resolving or preventing conflicts** between the general public and government agencies (creating coherent "public input").
- 2) as a planning method** for sustainability projects such as pollution control, land use and parks' management, recycling, water management, biodiversity preservation, wildlife and fish habitat protection and restoration and research projects in ecology and biological sciences.
- 3) as a management tool** to be used by boards, cooperatives and coordinating committees for the collaborative management of their daily sustainability tasks.
- 4) as an operating system** for workshops, neighbourhood and professional associations, advisory committees, peace groups, caucuses, NGOs, think tanks, etc. that actually want to reach clear conclusions or make recommendations at the end of their discussions.

Round tables are also being used as part of court-ordered or voluntary arbitration proceedings and out-of-court settlements (P.C.I.). However, this field will remain in a state of flux and the actual use of the process is highly dependent upon state and provincial legislation.

Theoretically, round tables could be an ideal tool for conducting treaty negotiations between governments and aboriginal groups, and for making temporary arrangements for resource use and extraction from lands claimed under aboriginal title. However, the required mutual trust is at low ebb after 200 years of adversarial negotiations and broken promises. In the USA, moreover, the concept of "aboriginal lands" is poorly defined. In Canada, the concept has been confirmed and refined by the Supreme Court (Delgamuukw) but both the federal government and the provinces have been reluctant to acknowledge and implement the Supreme Court decisions and suggestions for action.

In our experience, dynamic round tables can make their sustainability decisions (which, technically, become advisory suggestions or action plans for the convenor) in a more focussed way and therefore faster than any other institution or process.

(5)

Upon request, we'll be happy to explain how the round table dialogue process can be applied to address your particular public policy planning or management task.

Juergen and Marilyn Hansen, The Green Group, RR 4, 7611 Oak Ave., Summerland, B.C. V0H 1Z9. Telephone (250) 494-9265. Fax (250) 494-9267. E-mail [Commonsproject@vip.net](mailto:Commonsproject@vip.net).  
October 27, 2004