

SUMMARY REPORT  
of the  
Calgary Public Workshop  
on the  
Draft Government Directive on Regulating  
Held November 25, 2005

Prepared by:

**Hajo Versteeg, B.A., LL.B., M. Jur.**  
*Environmental Law and Policy Advisor*  
5365 Hilltop Dr  
Manotick, Ont, Canada K4M 1G4  
☎ (613) 692-4837  
✉ [hajo@sympatico.ca](mailto:hajo@sympatico.ca)

And:



**Stratos Inc.**  
1404-1 Nicholas Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1N 7B7  
[www.stratos-sts.com](http://www.stratos-sts.com)

## 1. Background and Context: The Draft Government Directive on Regulating and the Public Workshops

As part of the Government of Canada's Smart Regulation Initiative, the Privy Council Office (PCO) has been tasked with developing a proposed *Government Directive on Regulating* to strengthen the current federal process for designing, implementing, evaluating and reviewing regulations. Once approved by the government, the *Government Directive on Regulating* will replace the current Government of Canada Regulatory Policy. It will apply to all federal departments and agencies responsible for regulating.

The PCO has committed to working with a broad cross-section of Canadians interested in developing the draft *Government Directive on Regulating* (the draft Directive). To this end, an independent consultant was hired to work with interested parties including environmental, health, consumer, industry, business and labour groups, and Aboriginal organizations to prepare a Consultation and Engagement Strategy. The Strategy recommended several mechanisms for Canadians to express their views on the draft Directive. The PCO adopted all of the recommendations including the sponsoring of eight public workshops across Canada to solicit input on the draft Directive.

The **purpose of the public workshops** was to:

- provide participants with an opportunity to present their views and to hear the views of others on the draft Directive; and,
- work with others in a multi-stakeholder setting to develop practical advice to government on improving the draft Directive.

Workshops were held as follows:

- Moncton, November 14, 2005
- Montreal, November 16, 2005
- Toronto, November 18, 2005
- Winnipeg, November 21, 2005
- Saskatoon, November 23, 2005
- Calgary, November 25, 2005
- Yellowknife, November 28, 2005
- Vancouver, November 30, 2005

The public workshops were one of several initiatives aimed at soliciting stakeholder input into the draft Directive. The other initiatives include an invitation to make submissions (written or electronic) on the draft Directive, by December 23, 2005. Extensive information is posted on the following website: ([www.regulation.gc.ca](http://www.regulation.gc.ca) and follow the Smart Regulation Initiative link). Information on this site includes the draft Directive, information on the Smart Regulation

Initiative, the Consultation and Engagement Strategy for developing the draft Directive, the current Government of Canada Regulatory Policy, the agenda and the PCO slide show presentation used at the Public Workshops, and opportunities to comment on the draft Directive. PCO will continue to routinely contact its comprehensive email list of interested parties to notify them of updates that are posted on the website.

Over 900 organizations, associations, networks, groups and individuals with an interest in the draft Directive were directly contacted by the PCO about the public engagement opportunities and were given specific information on how to get involved. In addition, the Canadian Environmental Network was contracted by the PCO to notify individuals and organizations associated with their Network about the public workshops and to ensure that a core group of individuals (five to eight per workshop) affiliated with environmental, consumer, public health and labour groups were in attendance at all of the workshops except Yellowknife. Separate interactions were held between the PCO and five aboriginal organizations aimed at encouraging attendance, particularly at the Yellowknife workshop. In total, approximately 250 individuals attended the eight workshops. These individuals were affiliated with a broad cross-section of interests including: all levels of government, aboriginal groups, industry, business, the natural resource sectors (e.g., farming, fisheries and forestry), environmental non-government organizations, labour, public health and consumer groups and individual members of the Canadian public.

## **2. Structure of the Public Workshops**

Consultants were engaged to assist in the design and to facilitate the workshops. In addition, the consultants were responsible for preparing separate venue Summary Reports highlighting the key issues, options and messages that were heard during each workshop, as well as a final Report summarizing what was heard across the country.

## **3. The Calgary Workshop (November 25, 2005)**

### *3.1. Attendance at the Calgary Workshop*

In total, 26 individuals attended the Calgary workshop. These individuals were affiliated with research institutes, universities, industry and business, the natural resource sectors (e.g., farming, food producing and processing interests), government agencies, aboriginal organizations and public advocacy groups, including but not limited to environmental non-government organizations, public health, labour and consumer groups. For a complete list of participants, see Appendix 1.

### *3.2. Modification of the Calgary Workshop agenda*

The Calgary workshop agenda was modified at the request of participants. Instead of breaking into smaller groups, the workshop stayed in plenary throughout the day. As well, the order in which the three themes were addressed was modified to deal with the “Commitment to Canadians” before the other two themes. For the Regulatory Analysis and Implementation themes, discussions in plenary focused on a subsection at a time.

### *3.3. Structure and content of this Workshop Report*

Section 4 of this Report provides a summary of what was heard at the Calgary Workshop held on November 25, 2005. Generally this section follows the structure of the revised workshop agenda along the three main themes corresponding to specific sections in the draft Directive: 1) Commitment to Canadians; 2) Regulatory Analysis; and, 3) Implementation. In many instances, participants provided very useful comments that related to the workshop process, to the regulatory policy/process in general, to the draft Directive as a whole, and to the Smart Regulation Initiative itself. While the draft Directive was the primary focus of the workshops, the more general issues raised by participants have also been captured in Section 4.

This Report strives to ensure that all of the issues that were heard in each of the sessions are presented fairly. However, “the details” that often accompanied a specific view, and examples used to illustrate these views are not presented in this Summary Report. As noted at each workshop, the views detailed in this Report are not attributed to any particular individual. In some cases this Report does attribute a particular perspective to a specific stakeholder interest where this is appropriate and helpful. Readers who participated in the workshops are cautioned that the issues they raised are not reported verbatim in this Summary Report. However, workshop participants should be able to recognize the general intent and thrust of the comments/advice that they raised in the sessions. Participants were informed that the Summary Reports for each workshop would be posted on the website [www.regulation.gc.ca](http://www.regulation.gc.ca) within three to four weeks of each session. Individuals who feel that comments they expressed at the workshop were not fairly captured in this Summary Report, or who want to add additional comments were strongly encouraged by PCO personnel and the facilitator to post their views on the website, preferably by December 23, 2005. All posting on the website are available for public viewing.

The facilitator stressed that the purpose of the sessions was to solicit the views of participants, and not necessarily to strive towards consensus with respect to any particular view. As a result, a particular perspective on the draft Directive that was proposed by one individual at one session is as legitimate and as important in helping the PCO prepare the Directive as a perspective that was shared by many participants across sectors in all sessions.

## 4. Summary of what was heard at the Calgary Workshop

### 4.1. General comments relating to the Workshop process and the Smart Regulation Initiative

- One participant felt that the PCO should provide participants with hardcopies of the workshop materials by mail, rather than require them to print out emailed documents.
- Some participants assumed that this would be a 'wordsmithing' exercise and that the draft Directive was essentially complete.
- The suggestion was made that the website could use more clarity to facilitate providing comments.

### 4.2. General comments relating to the draft Directive

- Many participants, primarily from the industry and government sectors, felt that the draft Directive is a move in the right direction for a variety of reasons including:
  - A strengthened analysis through the use of risk and impact assessment.
  - An emphasis on aboriginal consultation.
  - An emphasis on cooperation between jurisdictions:
    - A few participants felt that further regulatory harmonization and collaboration between the federal government and the provinces were needed.
  - An application of a life-cycle approach to managing regulations.
- However, these participants also identified areas for improvement, including:
  - A need for stronger accountability mechanisms.
  - Several participants wanted to see more clarity in the draft Directive, particularly through the provision of definitions for certain terms and expressions including *risk*, *risk assessment*, "*do the most good*", and *regulation* (in terms of which instruments are and are not regulations).
  - Improved transparency regarding the enabling legislation under which regulations will be developed.
  - One participant also suggested applying a life cycle approach to the Directive itself (i.e. requirement for review after a set time period).

- Many other participants, primarily from the public advocacy sector, believed that the draft Directive was a move in the wrong direction. Three main themes of criticism arose from the discussion:
  - *These participants felt that the draft Directive's emphasis on risk analysis/management and on cost-benefit analysis represents a significant and inappropriate shift away from the Precautionary Principle:*
    - One participant felt that this shift conflicts with the mandates of certain government departments, such as Health Canada and Environment Canada.
    - A few participants also felt that the draft Directive represents a movement away from the principles of *do no harm* and *reverse onus*.
    - Participants pointed to U.S. regulations for mercury and the U.S. drug approval process as examples of how the use of evidence-based approaches has led to undesirable outcomes.
  - *In the view of these participants, the draft Directive is being driven by international trade considerations and North American integration:*
    - One participant felt that this shift threatens accountability to Canadian citizens.
    - Another participant suspected that the draft Directive is following the direction of U.S. regulatory approaches, including regulatory analysis based on net benefit instead of justice.
  - *These participants felt that the draft Directive encourages federal departments and agencies to step away from their regulatory roles and to use non-regulatory approaches:*
    - One participant stated that the draft Directive suggests harmonization, self-regulation and self-monitoring, which is a cause for concern from a citizen's point of view.
    - One participant stated that while other initiatives in the Canadian Government are focused on good governance, the draft Directive encourages departments to step away from their roles and responsibilities, such as the federal government's environmental jurisdiction as supported by the Old Man River court case.
    - A few participants felt that government departments should assert their jurisdiction through the use of regulations.
    - Because of the level of analysis required by the draft Directive, several participants believed that department and agencies with limited capacity will be discouraged from making regulations. This has the effect of promoting the use of voluntary non-regulatory approaches.

- Some of the participants who were opposed to the draft Directive did acknowledge that the current policy on regulating has major weaknesses. However, one participant questioned the rationale for the new directive and felt that the old policy was being presented as a “straw dog”.
- Some participants also questioned the appropriateness of a “one size fits all” document for regulation-making. They felt that regulations concerning human health and the environment should be treated differently than regulations concerning financial or economic matters.
- In response to concerns about risk assessment and the lack of Precautionary Principle, another participant defended the use of risk-based approaches by stating that the Precautionary Principle is applied in risk assessment depending on the level of uncertainty identified in the assessment.

4.3. *Specific comments related to the “Commitment to Canadians” section in the draft Directive (lines 39 to 71 in English version/ lines 39 to 75 in French version)*

- Many participants were generally supportive of the list of commitments to Canadians. These participants were in favour of commitments to science-based approaches and to federal-provincial cooperation. They also felt that the commitments demonstrated the need for balancing a wide range of concerns. However, some of these participants qualified their support with the following comments:
  - There needs to be a stronger commitment to reducing duplication especially between the federal government and the provinces and territories; on this point one participant suggested using stronger language in the last bullet of the commitment by stating that the government should be committed to facilitating “collaboration” with other governments in Canada.
  - The commitments are laudable but the extent to which they will be upheld depends on the details of the draft Directive (i.e. the devil is in the details) and how it is implemented.
  - Instead of committing to doing “the most good”, there should be an emphasis on preventing potential or additional harm.
  - A couple of participants stated that while federal-provincial-territorial cooperation is important, it should not discourage the federal government from asserting its jurisdiction where it exists.
  - Several participants suggested that the commitments be explicit about the avoidance of duplication. One participant suggested that this could be added to the bullet on facilitating “timeliness, efficiency and policy coherence”.

- One participant wanted to see a commitment to “value for money” for taxpayers, as well a statement concerning minimizing unintended consequences.
- One participant requested definitions or further qualification of terms such as “public interest” and “policy coherence” that are used in the commitment statements.
- One participant wanted to see the life-cycle approach to regulating as well as the use of risk management reflected explicitly in the commitments.
- Many other participants, while generally in favour of the opening paragraph and the first two commitments (first two bullets), expressed the following concerns about the other commitments:
  - Since many of the commitments are economic, how does one reconcile disparate interests? For example, it may be difficult to demonstrate the benefits to the economy of protecting human health and environment.
  - Several participants felt that the commitments on human health, the environment, good governance and protecting future generations should be primary commitments, whereas economic commitments should be secondary.
  - However, one participant also suggested that the priority of these commitments may vary depending on the type of regulation.
  - Several participants were not supportive of the commitment to “promote effectiveness”. They felt that it was in direct conflict of other commitments and that *effectiveness* was too vague a statement. Another participant felt that the commitment on *effectiveness* should capture the risks associated with not regulating.
  - A few participants were uncomfortable with the emphasis on evidence-based approaches and, instead, suggested that the wording Precautionary Principle be included in the commitments.
  - One participant supported the first and second commitments but requested that wording be added to make it clear that the lowest common denominator is not the driver for harmonization. This participant also felt that: the third commitment be removed, because the private sector did not require explicit recognition in the commitments; the fourth commitment be deleted; and a statement concerning the Precautionary Principle be added. With respect to effectiveness, the participant requested that the wording be changed to express a commitment to strengthening the effectiveness of regulation in protecting the environment and human health.
  - One participant suggested adding a commitment to protecting whistle-blowers who speak out in the public interest.



- A couple of participant also challenged the notion of duplication and wanted industry to provide concrete examples of duplication. On this point, another participant stated one should not only look for areas of overlap (duplication) but also regulatory gaps.

*4.4 Specific comments related to “Regulatory Analysis” in the draft Directive (lines 72 to 506 in English version/ lines 81 to 565 in French version)*

The structure of the plenary discussion of this section of the draft Directive generally followed that of the draft Directive. Comments have been reported back along that structure, by subsection, below.

*General comments related to the Regulatory Analysis section as a whole*

- A couple of participants raised concerns about the scope of application of the draft Directive. One participant stated that there needs to be the same standard of accountability for non-regulatory measures and that, where regulatory gaps exist, a legislative framework should be established, so that agencies use tools that have the sanction of Parliament. Another participant asked whether the draft Directive would apply to certain “regulation-like instruments” such as those under the Railway Safety Act.
- One participant expressed the need for timeliness in the development of regulations (in light of the extensive analysis required by the draft Directive) by identifying appropriate timelines. Departments or agencies need to develop a regulatory strategy to which they will be held accountable. Furthermore, this participant believed that agencies/departments need to declare this regulatory strategy at an early stage when the enabling legislation is enacted.

*A. Consulting Canadians (lines 138 to 175, or lines 157 to 200 in the French version)*

- One participant stated on numerous occasions during the workshop that the federal government’s current practices for consulting other levels of government and citizens groups are inadequate. Specifically, this participant felt that the process of posting notices in the *Canada Gazette* followed by a public comment period was not sufficiently interactive given the electronic/internet tools available today. This participant and another were particularly concerned with the lack of interactive consultation with the provinces.
- Another participant felt that a double standard was being applied by setting different comment periods for regulations regarding trade obligations (75 days) and all other regulations (30 days).

- One participant stated that government officials need to be provided with tools and mechanisms to fulfill the consultation requirements in a consistent way.
- One participant expressed support for the bullet in lines 164 to 165 (lines 186 to 188 in the French version) regarding the expectation of providing timely feedback on the outcome of consultations.
- One participant stated that consultation needs to have full transparency including a declaration of what value system is being used to assess the nature and implications of the public policy issue (lines 159 to 160, or lines 179 to 181 in the French version).

*B. Identifying and Assessing Public Policy Issues (lines 177 to 211, or lines 202 to 241 in the French version)*

- Some participants stated that departments and agencies also need to develop mechanisms for measuring unintended consequences in addition to setting performance indicators (lines 209 to 211, or lines 238 to 241 in the French version) for measuring intended results. Another participant wondered whether there should be agency and department-specific requirements for performance indicators.
- Some participants expressed support for the risk approach described in this section and felt that the Precautionary Principle was also addressed here. This participant also requested stronger language concerning the review of assessments and analyses from other jurisdictions (lines 199 to 200, or lines 228 to 230 in the French version) by removing the words “wherever possible”. Another participant responded that there is a lack of understanding of what the Precautionary Principle is and that it is often subsumed into Risk Management, including in the draft Directive. He referred to a document entitled *Implementing Precaution* by the Canadian Environmental Law Association (CELA) as a much better focus for the Directive.
- Several participants wanted to see a stronger commitment to the Precautionary Principle in this section. They identified the drug Vioxx, the cod fishery, and BSE as recent examples of where the Precautionary Principle was not applied to the detriment of Canadians.
- Two other participants expressed how complex and multi-dimensional risk assessment can be and stated that risk mitigation for one group can lead to impacts for other groups.
- Another participant expressed concern that current risk assessment approaches externalize the social impacts of new technologies, and felt

that the draft Directive should provide more details on the limitations of using a risk-based approach.

- In the assessment of public policy issues, one participant thought it important that departments and agencies report why certain concerns were not addressed. With respect to the bullet in lines 203 to 204 (lines 233 to 234 in the French version), this participant also requested that the word “perceptions” be changed to “concerns”, since “perceptions” suggest a lower-priority consideration.
- One participant expressed concern and requested clarification about reviewing assessments and analyses from major “international partners”. Does this refer to scientific analyses or policy analyses, and does it include state (U.S.)-level jurisdictions? Other participants supported the idea of taking advantage of international expertise. Alternatives to the word partners were suggested including “jurisdictions” and “bodies”.
- One participant asked whether departments and agencies would need to “re-rationalize” regulations driven by obligations under international protocols, for which extensive analyses and assessments have been completed.
- One participant stated that traditional knowledge and independent science need consideration in the draft Directive.

*C. Selecting, Designing and Assessing Regulatory Responses (lines 213 to 368, or lines 243 to 411 in the French version)*

- Some participants felt that this subsection dealing with selecting the appropriate mix of government instruments for action (lines 215 to 242 to lines 245 to 273 in the French version) was biased in favour of trade considerations.
- One participant expressed support for the use of ‘voluntary consensus-based standards’ (lines 241 to 242, or lines 271 to 273 in the French version).
- Some participants thought that the bullet in lines 232 to 233 (lines 262 to 263 in the French version) seemed self-serving and that regulation should rather be designed from the beneficiary’s point of view.
- Two participants stated that the triggers for Aboriginal consultation should be expanded to include all situations where Aboriginal peoples are potentially affected and not just under legal obligations (lines 244 to 257, or lines 277 to 280 in the French version).

- One participant stated that lines 285 to 305 (lines 319 to 343 in the French version) appeared to be excerpts from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). He questioned whether this was appropriate given that there are mechanisms under NAFTA (complaints review process, trilateral commission) under which these elements can be challenged. He requested that a statement be added to say that regulations would still be evaluated and modified based on monitoring.
- One participant stated that there are many more legal obligations in addition to NAFTA that departments and agencies must be aware of during regulatory activities (lines 259 to 305, or lines 291 to 343 in the French version).
- One participant asked for stronger language for line 321 (line 360 in the French version) by using “collaborating” instead of “cooperating”.
- One participant asked for stronger language so that harmonization does not lead to the lowest common denominator; language on cooperation that raises the bar (lines 307 to 368, or lines 345 to 411 in the French version).
- One participant challenged the concept of “national standards” in the bullet on lines 332 to 333 (lines 371 to 372 in the French version) and stated that it was inaccurate and not respectful of provincial jurisdiction in certain areas.
- Some participants stated that cooperation with municipal governments should also be included in the subsection on cooperation (lines 307 to 368, or lines 345 to 411 in the French version)
- One participant felt that the subsection on international cooperation of lines 349 to 368 (or lines 389 to 411 in the French version) should also include working towards influencing international regulatory practices.

*D. Analyzing Impacts and Ensuring Benefits Justify Costs (lines 370 to 467, or lines 413 to 526 in the French version)*

- One participant expressed concern about the impact analysis of non-regulatory approaches, as compared to the extensive requirements for impact analysis for regulations as set out in the draft Directive.
- Some participants did not believe that benefits and costs can be quantified, as suggested in the section on analyzing costs and benefits (lines 446 to 467, or lines 501 to 526 in the French version). Another participant added that there is currently no standard on social impact analysis in Canada—no standard on the value of life.

- With respect to lines 381 and 382 (lines 424 to 425 in the French version), the option of doing nothing should also be acknowledged as a choice.
- The section needs to emphasize departmental expertise in conducting the different types of analyses.
- One participant noted there is uncertainty in whether certain economic indicators such as GDP are actually indicators of progress.

*E. Planning for Implementation and Compliance (lines 469 to 505, or lines 528 to 564 in the French version)*

- Some participants noted that this section needs more emphasis on the development of tools for compliance; i.e., what is needed to measure performance indicators.
- A few participants emphasized the importance of communication between headquarters and regional offices to ensure national consistency in the implementation of regulations.
- The last bullet in this section should include language on ensuring *funding*, in addition to skills and abilities.
- The statement on “facilitating compliance” (lines 475 to 477, or lines 534 to 536 in the French version) must also reflect the intention of serving the public good. Other participants also questioned the meaning and intent of this statement.
- In discussing this section and others, several participants expressed concern that federal departments do not have the capacity to meet the expectation of the draft Directive in terms of regulatory analysis, implementation, and monitoring. Some of these participants also believed that this would have the effect of discouraging departments from developing regulations.

*F. Measuring, Evaluating and Reviewing Regulation (lines 507 to 546, lines 566 to 610 in the French version)*

- One participant requested that the bullet in lines 544 to 546 (lines 608 to 610 in the French version) be removed, as this requirement is not necessarily be consistent with supporting the public interest.
- One participant stated that Alberta regulations have expiry dates that force a review of the regulation within a set time period. She would support a similar requirement for federal regulations.

*4.4. Specific comments related to the “Implementation” section of the draft Directive (lines 507 to end in English version/ lines 566 to end in French version)*

Discussions pertaining to this section of the draft Directive were much shorter than the other themes.

*IV. Responsibilities for Planning and Reporting to Canadians (lines 548 to 563, or lines 612 to 629 in the French version)*

- One participant asked whether a department or agency’s annual Report on Plans and Priorities would include a declaration that it is not intending to regulate because of an existing provincial regulation or national standard.

*V. Key Departments and Agencies Involved in the Regulatory Process (lines 565 to 639, or lines 631 to 714 in the French version)*

- It was suggested that clarification is required on how PCO and Justice relate to each other in terms of ensuring that regulatory proposals are consistent with the Directive.
- One participant asked whether there were channels for recourse, say through PCO, if a responsible agency or department was consulting adequately or not following other aspects of the Directive.

*VII. Implementing the Government Directive on Regulating (lines 654 to 670, or lines 730 to 750 in the French version)*

- Concerning lines 660 to 663 (lines 738 to 742 in the French version), one participant requested that language be added to the second sentence that requires departments and agencies to indicate what action will be taken if they do not meet their commitments developing and maintaining appropriate systems for managing the regulatory process.
- One participant requested that the 5-year review of the draft Directive include an analysis of its impact on how long it takes to develop and implement a regulation. This participant also asked whether the triage approach that PCO described in the workshop, and which it said it would apply to implement the draft Directive in an efficient way, could be described in the draft Directive.
- One participant asked whether the term security, as used in the draft Directive, includes food security.

## **5. Next steps and closing remarks**

Following the plenary discussions, PCO personnel detailed next steps in the development of the draft Directive. They encouraged interested parties to provide written comments on the draft Directive by December 23, 2005 (see: [www.regulation.gc.ca](http://www.regulation.gc.ca) and follow the Smart Regulation Initiative link). All submissions will be posted to the website and available for public viewing. In this regard, every effort will be made to share the summaries of each workshop (eight in total) prior to December 23. Individuals who feel that the summary for the venue they attended does not fairly capture the views/advice they raised can post his/her views on the website. All submissions received after December 23, 2005 will be posted for public viewing and, wherever possible (given timing considerations), will be taken under advisement by the PCO in developing the Directive. All individuals who attended any of the workshops and provided an email address at registration, along with all other individuals and organizations on the PCO mailing list (over 900) will be notified of changes and additions to the website, including the posting of each workshop Summary Report.

In Winter 2006, PCO will prepare another draft Directive taking into consideration the comments heard at the workshops plus any additional submissions posted on the website or otherwise received by PCO. This revision will be posted for public comment for approximately two weeks and will be discussed by the Reference Group on Regulating. (The Reference Group is composed of sixteen representatives from a broad cross-section of parties interested in the development of the Directive, including industry and public advocacy groups. The Group has provided advice on the Directive as it has evolved. Detailed information on the Reference Group is available from the website.) The PCO will then prepare the proposed Directive for consideration by the federal cabinet.

## **Appendix 1—Participants at the Calgary Workshop, Nov. 25, 2005**

- Karen Blank, National Energy Board, Calgary, AB
- Robert B. Cash, ADM Agri-Industries Company/Canadian Oilseed Processors Association, Halton Hills, ON
- Kelsey Chomistek, Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Calgary, AB
- Jo-An Christiansen, Alberta Agriculture Food and Rural Development, Edmonton, AB
- Karen Craik, United Nurses of Alberta, Calgary, AB
- Evan W. Dixon, Rae and Company, Calgary, AB
- Linda Duncan, Lake Wabamun Enhancement & Protection Association, Edmonton, AB
- Katherine Germaine, Gartner Lee Limited, Calgary, AB
- Rowan Hemsing, Measurement Canada, Edmonton, AB,
- Jacob Irwing, Devon Canada, Calgary, AB
- Jodi Lea Jenkins, National Energy Board, Calgary, AB
- Jim Kienzler, Canadian Pacific Railway, Calgary AB
- Timothy Lambert, Canadian Public Health Association, Calgary, AB
- Dan McFadyen, Canadian Energy Pipeline Association, Calgary, AB
- Mike Peters, Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Calgary, AB
- John E Phillips, Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, Ottawa, ON
- Jacinta Reid, Nexen Inc., Calgary, AB
- Dr. Mary Richardson, Friends of Athabasca Environmental Society (disbanded)
- Al Schulz, Canadian Chemical Producers Association, Sherwood Park, AB
- Harvey Scott, Crooked Creek Conservancy, Athabasca, AB
- Robert Smith, Canadian Pacific Railway, Calgary AB
- Joan Tegtmeyer, Council of Canadians, Calgary Chapter, Calgary, AB
- Mel Tegtmeyer, Council of Canadians, Calgary Chapter, Calgary, AB
- Jason Unger, Environmental Law Centre, Edmonton, AB
- Debora Walsh, Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Calgary, AB
- Gary A. Webster, Newalta Corporation, Calgary, AB
- Dr. Dale Armstrong, Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Calgary, AB



PCO staff in attendance:

- Samir Chhabra, Policy Analyst
- Ben Turcotte, Senior Policy Analyst
- Daniel Wolfish, Policy Analyst