

LNG Environmental Stewardship Initiative Breakout Session #2

DECISION-MAKING

What specific level/suite of decisions will be made at the Governance Working Group level?

1. Establish criteria
2. Cross regional opportunities
3. Interpreting outcome paths
4. Funding – allocation across all 4 regions (criteria and governance structure – develop a model for ratification within the regions)
5. Communications (continuous) – milestones
6. Decide on criteria for projects to meet to set ESI
7. Making recommendations based on outcomes for discussion at policy level and regulation (not management response)
8. Broad funding criteria setting
9. Funding partners to be responsible of GWG and ITWG but GWG ensures good communication across regions

In the immediate term, participants are seeking clarity on how decisions on demonstration projects (work plans and funding) will be made. What do you think is an appropriate interim decision making format for demonstration projects?

1. Prioritize desired outcomes
2. Low hanging fruit
3. Assumptions: province is the banker, right now
4. Demonstrated support (75%) for project workplan implementation – proposal – on process on an interim bases for making it so
5. Which projects to recommend to governance WG
6. Which communities participate
7. Who (which scientists) would do work – technical issues
8. In interest of time (assume decision needs to be made in a month or so), suggestion is for the first \$10M - \$2M Monitoring Program (common interests); \$2M @ ITWG demo project – regionally determined

What specific level/suite of decisions will be made at the regional level?

1. How, what, when, where, who
2. In absence of an agreement – NE. come back to technical level or leadership for certainty
3. MOU could be platform to support concerns in decision-making

4. Recognizing each party brings something to the table to support common issues – identify common issues
5. Develop potential workplans (including project budget)
6. Decision on how to spend regional share of \$30M, but based on GWG general spending parameters (e.g. priority for contracts local/community based)

We will aim for consensus in decision-making. How do you think we can reach agreement?

1. Dispute resolution; mediation
2. Keep in mind, general common objectives

What will happen if we are not able to reach agreement?

1. Define criteria
2. Super majority?
3. How can the GWG 'push'
4. Have effective dispute resolution mechanisms in places

FUNDING

Decisions on budget needs for the next three years have yet to be made – those decisions will become informed when budget needs are established for the demonstration projects being contemplated in 2015/16. In the meantime, the provincial ESI team is considering a number of scenarios to inform planning. Those scenarios include:

- 1) Additional investment from partners generating a longer term program; (vote tally: 1)
- 2) No further investment spend the full \$30M and limit ESI to a 3 year program; and
- 3) No further investment, spending a portion of the \$30M and putting the remainder in Trust to spend over a longer period of time. (Vote tally: 2)
- 4) New scenario: Aim to spend \$30M in 3 years to increase impacts and seek investment based on results

Which of these options, or combination of, do you feel would be most effective to achieving the goals of the ESI and why?

1. It will take more than 3 years to spend \$30M
2. Clearly map out financial spending plan
3. Depends on socio economic sequences – Assessment – Monitoring – Restoration
4. No. 2 above = too limited to see results of monitoring
5. No. 1 above = challenge because of different mandate/objectives of partners
6. (1) and (3) above: could do and allow for partners to provide funding based on interest in specific projects and allow for longer term funding of stewardship projects thru growth in trust fund
7. Block of funding moved to a trust

8. Some of \$30M to be spend, but remainder should be used as leverage of potential funding partners
9. Options preferred (1 and 3 above)

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

How are we going to assess our performance?

1. GWG to emphasize need and direction to spend
2. Balance between demo/long term regional strategy for ESI
3. Develop performance measurement based on work plan of GWG
4. Everybody with proposal should be eligible for funding, and not be left behind
5. More research needed before consensus
6. Set cap on \$2M from ESI \$30 M in interim, each region ITWG get a portion and remainder to be used later for leverage on BC government funding partners

What will we consider success to look like or what will the success indicators be?

1. Principle - \$ will be held by independent entity

Is there anything we have missed?
