

WRI CCS Community Engagement Guidelines:

First Working Group Call Summary

May 28, 2009, 11:00 AM EDT

Discussion topic: CCS Community Engagement Guidelines Audience/Scope

Discussion questions:

1. Review definition of community engagement and purpose of the Guidelines
2. Review proposed audiences. Are these the key decision-makers?
3. Discuss how each audience segment will use the Guidelines
4. Discuss international scope of the Guidelines and vision of what that entails
5. Open discussion for lingering comments on the draft outline

Meeting Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Jason Anderson	World Wildlife Fund Europe
Sarah Forbes	World Resources Institute
Lori Gauvreau	Schlumberger Carbon Services
Sallie Greenberg	Illinois State Geological Survey
Josh Habib	Cadmus Group
Gretchen Hund	Battelle
Sean McCoy	Carnegie Mellon University
George Minter	Hydrogen Energy
Karen Obenshain	Edison Electric Institute
Darlene Radcliffe	Duke Energy
Dan Reidinger	Edison Electric Institute
Gary Spitznogle	American Electric Power
Amanda Stevens	New York State Energy Research and Development Authority
Lindsey Tollefson	Big Sky Regional Partnership
Preeti Verma	World Resources Institute
Sarah Wade	AJW Group

Key outcomes of discussion:

- Reached agreement within the group regarding definition of community engagement as well as the proposed audience and purpose.
- Identified the need to include definitions for other key terms, such as effective engagement, transparency, engagement.
- Identified and discussed how each audience segment may use the guidelines with particular attention to local communities and how they may best use the report.
- Follow-up discussions on the merits of establishing a password-protected discussion forum to supplement discussions had during the conference calls vs. using the existing e-mail group list.

1a. Review definition of community engagement: *A process in which a project proponent (IMPLEMENTER) builds and maintains constructive relationships with communities by engaging them in a timely and transparent manner over the life of a project. This is part of a broader stakeholder engagement strategy, which also encompasses governments, civil society, project developers and others with an interest in the project.*

- Discussed importance of thinking about people outside communities -- at the regional- and state-level --who are interested and impacted by the project. This includes regulators, public utility commissions, and state-level decision-makers
- The link between community and project proponents is fluid. Broader stakeholder engagement strategy at a national-level is something separate and perhaps somewhat outside the scope of this document.
- Is proponent the right word to be used here? Project Sponsor, Implementer, and Operator may be better words. Consider changing project proponent to project implementer in the definition.
- Need to define certain terms which can have different meanings depending on the stakeholder's organizational perspective, such as effective engagement, constructive relationships, and decision-makers. WRI has proposed definitions below:

Effective engagement: A dialogue that includes but is not limited to an information exchange between communities (those affected by a project) and project implementers.

Constructive relationship: A mutually beneficial relationship between project implementers and communities which is fostered through effective communication and engagement.

1b. Review and accept proposed purpose: *WRI has convened stakeholders to develop recommendations on how to effectively engage communities in CCS project planning and operations. These Community Engagement Guidelines for CCS will serve as a benchmark for the audience identified below.*

- There was some discussion about changing “benchmark” to “resource” in this context.

2. Review proposed audience: *The key audience identified for the CCS community engagement guidelines are decision-makers: communities affected by CCS projects (community leaders, landowners and other citizens), regulators identifying requirements for community engagement, and project developers implementing community engagement around a planned project.*

- Discussed the tension between the communities as a recipient of information and engagement based on these Guidelines and their dual role as an audience that can use the Guidelines to gauge whether or not best practices are being implemented.
- Discussed the definition of community and referred to “those affected by a project”, acknowledging that they may not live in the immediate project area. Drawing this distinction is challenging.
- Group acknowledged that the definition of community engagement proposed reflects that the guidelines are meant for communities, impacted by a project.

3. How different audiences will use these guidelines:

- Project implementers will use the guidelines while making decisions about projects.
- Regulators can use these guidelines as they think about engaging communities in the regulatory development process and in setting regulatory requirements for transparent community engagement. An example from the EU Environmental Impact Assessment was given as a case where community engagement is required but not well-defined.
- Communities will use these guidelines to understand what types of questions to ask from project implementers and regulators.
- One stakeholder recommended that this group should not make recommendations that are not necessary. The purpose should be on defining the process of how to inform and engage communities better instead of prescribing how it should be done in each and every situation.

4. Scope: International vs. National:

- WRI acknowledged that participants feel strongly about both a national and international scope. During the discussion on the call, both views were presented and discussed.
- One way to balance this tension may be to develop two separate sections, one section international and the other United States, or develop international guidelines with a section focused on United States.
- WRI will also continue to seek international stakeholders who are interested and willing to participate in this effort and will move forward with a global scope.

Stakeholder communication:

Is email exchange the right vehicle or would a password-protected space be better for stakeholder communication and group discussion? Stakeholders leaned on both sides and WRI offered to discuss the issue individually with stakeholders and if there was sufficient interest to host an online discussion forum.