

Stress 3 paper

How to decide?

Engagement, Information and Capacity

Louis Simard, School of Political Studies, University of Ottawa

Energy Positive Project

Ottawa, October 4th

The Energy System is not broken but...

- Problems and recurrent questions
- Public decision : complexity and compromises
- Information and knowledge:
 - diversity, integration and independency
- Informed reform: understanding and challenges
- Engagement, information and capacity

Choices and objectives

- A third paper: upstream and downstream of the decision making process
- A long term perspective at the 2 extremities of the system: Policy development and project implementation
- Objectives: proposing principles, processes and tools to pave the way for greater public confidence and better decision-making processes in the Canadian energy sector.
 1. Co-construction and engagement
 2. Collaborative policy and Strategic environmental assessment (SEA)
 3. Co-management and different tools
- A balanced perspective : (a) market based energy system, competitiveness and economic imperatives (timeliness and predictability) (b) environmental, social, local and Indigenous imperatives, and (c) security, reliability and affordability imperatives

1. Co-construction and engagement (1/2)

- Deliberative turn/imperative: since 20 years, proliferation of participation tools and practices
- Co-construction: a general attitude or a culture change
 - “When a plurality of actors are implicated in the production of a policy, a project, a technical or knowledge dispositive (...) the believe in a relative continuity in the expertise and role of implicated actors to articulate the different dimensions of projects and to specify the possibilities It implies types of engagement sensibly stronger that those associated to concertation or consultation” (Akrich, 2013).

1. Co-construction and engagement (2/2)

A. To operationalize co-construction in a decision process, height (8) principles for public engagement:

1) Upstream; 2) Inclusiveness; 3) Information, transparency and clarity of rules; 4) Resources and access; 5) Traceability and continuity; 6) Influence, modification of the decision and the “no option”; 7) Negotiation and compensation and; 8) Efficiency.

B. The potential risks of engagement:

1) Strategical use; 2) Popular tyranny; 3) Inanity and power relations;
4) Polarisation, fatigue and cooptation

2. Upstream, collaborative policy and SEA (1/2)

- Clear political orientations and policy objectives are necessary to protect the independency of regulators and prevent conflicts in their roles
- An integrated approach, based on collaboration and openness could be a key for better acceptance of results and a stronger coordinated system of policy-making decisions.
- Collaborative policy-making is a process whereby one or more public agencies craft a solution to a policy issue using consensus-driven dialogue with diverse parties who will be affected by the solution or who can help implement it.

2. Upstream, policy collaboration and SEA (2/2)

- Collaborative policy in different phases: 1) Assessment, 2) Convening, 3) Deliberation and Negotiation and, 4) Decision
 - The Quebec's experience: the energy policies cycle
- Information = Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA): a tool for collaborative policy
 - "A systematic process for evaluating the environmental consequences of proposed policy, plan or programme initiatives in order to ensure they are fully included and appropriately addressed at the earliest appropriate stage of decision making on par with economic and social considerations" (Sadler and Verheem, 1996: 27).

3. Downstream, co-management and tools

- Co-management :

“a situation in which two or more social actors negotiate, define and guarantee amongst themselves a fair sharing of the management functions, entitlements and responsibilities for a given territory, area or set of natural resources” (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2000: 1).

- | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A power sharing process• A bridge between different kinds of stakeholders• Integration of different kinds of knowledge• Ongoing problem solving process through a complex structure• Evolving process (negotiation and learning)• Formulation of agreements | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Time and resource consuming, longer to reach consensus• Certain disequilibrium of resources between parties• Proper communication means• Third party “regulation”• Historical relations• Public confidence |
|--|---|

3. Downstream, co-management and tools

- Different avenues for co-management (tools)
 - A. General and long term relation type
 1. Long term general agreement
 2. Multi-level governance capacity
 3. Permanent relationships by organizational design
 - B. Project oriented
 4. Impact and Benefit Agreements (IBAs) and compensation
 5. Partnership and ownership
 6. Joint follow-up committees

Conclusion

- Explore and develop some avenues to improve the general energy decision-making process and public confidence (upstream – downstream)
- Engagement, information and capacity in light of co-construction and co-management principles
 - Long term and cultural change perspective by reinforcing the formalization of the policy-development process, in a collaborative way, based on the principles of the SEA
 - Develop co-management tools by sharing not only the benefits of projects but also all the gathered information, in short, the interests and the values of stakeholders of the energy system.

- Engagement, Information and Capacity: a Co-Construction Approach

