

SUMMARY REPORT

**of the
Public Workshops
on the**

Draft Government Directive on Regulating

February 21, 2006

Prepared by:

Hajo Versteeg, Facilitator
Wylie Thomas, Rapporteur

In collaboration with:



Stratos Inc.
1404-1 Nicholas Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
tel: 613 241 1001
fax: 613 241 4758
www.stratos-sts.com



OUR VISION

A world where decision makers at all levels integrate sustainability into their actions to improve ecological and human well-being.

OUR MISSION

To provide business, governments and organizations with expert advice, information, and tools that will assist the development and implementation of more sustainable policies and practices.



We encourage you to print on recycled paper.
Stratos uses 100% post-consumer content recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT: THE DRAFT GOVERNMENT DIRECTIVE ON REGULATING AND THE PUBLIC WORKSHOPS 1

2 STRUCTURE OF THE PUBLIC WORKSHOPS..... 2

 2.1 MODIFICATION OF THE WORKSHOP AGENDA..... 2

3 STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THIS SUMMARY REPORT 3

4 SUMMARY OF WHAT WAS HEARD AT THE WORKSHOPS 3

5 NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING REMARKS 9

APPENDIX 1—PARTICIPANTS LIST NOVEMBER 23, 2005 10

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 included 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 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 the detailed reports from each of the eight cross-Canada public

workshops. 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 contacted 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 participation in the consultation, including through attendance at the workshops.

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 this final Report summarizing what was heard across the country.

In total, 205 individuals attended the eight workshops across the country. There was roughly even participation from business/industry groups and public advocacy (environmental non-government organizations, public health and consumer) groups. Together these two groups represented more than 70% of all participants. This mix varied from city to city, with the highest proportion of advocacy groups at the Moncton, Montreal and Vancouver workshops, while the Calgary and Toronto workshops were attended by the highest proportion of business/industry participants. Another 5% of participants were from Aboriginal groups, with the highest proportion at the Yellowknife workshop. The remaining 25% of participants were from other groups including governmental organizations, academics and individual members of the Canadian public. For a complete list of participants, see Appendix 1.

2.1 Modification of the Workshop Agenda

In most cities, the original draft workshop agenda was modified at the request of participants. In most cases, the change involved staying in plenary throughout the day (as opposed to breaking into smaller groups). 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.

3 Structure and Content of this Summary Report

The eight public workshops attracted a very broad cross-section of individuals and organizations. As anticipated, many of these participants expressed differing perspectives relating to the Smart Regulation initiative in general and the draft Directive in particular. Section 4 of this Report provides an overview of what was heard at the eight workshops. It distils a very broad range of views into a few pages of cross-cutting messages where it seemed apparent that many participants shared a particular view. Of course, participants provided extensive detailed and specific comments relating to virtually every section of the draft Directive. These are not repeated here as they have been captured in the individual workshop reports. The individual reports have been circulated to workshop participants and the PCO, and are available on the website at: www.regulation.gc.ca.

This Report strives to ensure that all of the “cross-cutting” issues and advice/perspectives that were heard across the sessions are presented fairly. As with the individual city reports, the views detailed in this Summary 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.

At several of the workshops, participants from public advocacy groups asked that comments be attributed to either individuals or organizations in the workshop reports. At one workshop, the suggestion was made that all of the eight workshop proceedings be taped in their entirety, transcribed and made available to anyone with an interest in them. However, as was stressed by the facilitator, the purpose of the sessions was to share ideas, encourage open-ended discussions, and solicit the views of participants without the concerns and potential inhibiting influence associated with attribution of comments. None of the workshops were tape recorded. Extensive workshop summaries were prepared and distributed to participants. These summaries are also posted on the website: www.regulation.gc.ca . Participants at several of the workshops recommended that the PCO account for how it uses the views expressed at the consultations in redrafting the Directive.

4 Summary of what was heard at the workshops

Generally, there was broad support across most sectors for the **life cycle approach** to designing, implementing and reviewing regulations proposed in the draft Directive. For those familiar with the current Regulatory Policy, there was recognition that this approach detailed in the draft Directive was very useful as it would drive continuous

improvement and allow the regulatory system to learn. At several workshops, participants proposed that the application of the draft Directive be extended to include the existing body of regulations [not just new ones]. Some wondered whether, for reasons of finite resources, the life cycle approach should apply to all regulations, or be limited to more significant regulatory frameworks. Many suggested that the Directive itself should be subjected to the same requirements as regulations in general (i.e., be reviewed after x number of years).

Participants from business, and to a lesser extent from public advocacy groups, recommended that the draft Directive specify **clear timelines and triggers for review**, such as sunset clauses. Generally speaking, business participants felt that the current regulatory system was slow, and therefore strongly supported benchmarks for timeliness so that the regulatory system can remain nimble and responsive to the needs of a rapidly changing world. Participants from the public advocacy groups insisted that expediency can not be promoted at the expense of health and safety of Canadians and the quality of the environment.

At most of the workshops, participants from most sectors agreed with the importance of **performance indicators** for evaluating and reviewing regulations against their stated policy objectives. Some participants called for a strengthened role for the PCO in working with departments and agencies in designing performance measures and evaluation strategies (lines 669 to 670). It was suggested that the draft Directive should also specify indicators that would apply to all regulations and which would measure performance against the commitments to Canadians outlined in the draft Directive (lines 39 to 70). Others proposed that the departments and agencies involve the public in designing the needed indicators.

The importance of **transparency** throughout the regulatory lifecycle starting at an early stage was highlighted by participants at all of the workshops. While the draft Directive's commitment to greater inclusiveness, transparency and public scrutiny (for example, in lines 61 to 62) was acknowledged, many participants felt that it needed to be significantly strengthened by outlining its practical aspects, since "transparency" has taken on different meanings through overuse. In this respect, participants provided detailed recommendations for improving the draft Directive's commitment to transparency and public consultations, including making all reports and information generated and used throughout the regulatory lifecycle available to Canadians. A fairly common suggestion was that the 30-day comment period for regulatory proposals published in the *Canada Gazette* was insufficient, and at the least, should be the same for all regulations, whether they are deemed to have trade implications or not.

Generally, participants felt that the draft Directive should specify **benchmarks for consultation**, since departments vary in their understanding of what constitutes consultation. Many participants recognized that there is an inherent tension between depth, breadth and timeliness of consultations. Participants from public advocacy groups

generally felt that transparency should drive the process, and that sufficient time and resources should be allotted to allow Canadians to “get up to speed” and participate effectively. It was also suggested that there be a clear distinction between consultations with the public (to determine what the public interest is) and consultations with the regulated communities (to work out the details). Several participants suggested that there was value in the consultative process itself, which went beyond transparency and the quality of decision making. While many participants from business agreed with the importance of consultations, they expressed a desire for reasonable time limits so that transparency is not used to bog down the process.

Participants at most of the workshops suggested that the government still had work to do to encourage broader participation from the public in these types of consultations. It was suggested that the government should make better use of multiple channels, including traditional media, the internet and electronic technologies.

Some participants felt that the technical **language** of the Directive and regulatory proposals themselves presented a significant barrier to fuller public participation. Suggestions were made that the government engage professional communicators/writers to translate the language of its regulations, specifically the Directive, into “plain language” that is intelligible to a wider audience. Many participants suggested that several terms and phrases (e.g., “greatest overall benefit to Canadians” and “fair and competitive markets”) in the draft Directive were open to interpretation and needed to be defined explicitly, perhaps through a glossary or definitions section. However, some others felt that flexibility in the language was needed to apply the Directive to regulatory activities in all sectors. Some participants felt that the approach being proposed and the language was **reactive** rather than proactive, citing for example language in the Directive which speaks about “mitigating” problems rather than preventing them.

With respect to **aboriginal consultations**, participants noted the importance of providing time and funds to translate consultation materials into the language of the receiver and to develop the capacity of communities to participate meaningfully. Participants generally approved of the inclusion in the draft Directive of the explicit requirements to consult aboriginal groups but suggested that the triggers for consultation should be clarified and expanded to include all situations where aboriginal peoples are potentially affected; not just those where legal obligations are deemed to exist. It was pointed out that aboriginal peoples were diverse and that a stronger requirement for regional aboriginal consultation be included. In this regard, it was noted that in many cases designated contact points for regional representation already exist through the various co-management boards set up under land claim agreements.

Participants from all sectors raised the need for ensuring that the necessary human and financial **resources** are allocated for implementing the draft Directive. In this regard, they called for a stronger commitment to **enforcement** both in regulations and in the draft Directive itself. Participants from the public advocacy sector generally felt that poor

enforcement provisions and weak sanctions undermined the ability of the regulatory system to protect health, safety and the environment, and advocated for strengthening the penalties for non-compliance. It was pointed out by business participants that a lack of consistent enforcement favours those who break the rules and is unfair to honest businesses. Several participants suggested adding a requirement that departments and agencies develop enforcement plans in addition to compliance plans (lines 155, and lines 109 to 115).

Many participants from most sectors suggested that the draft Directive specify **accountabilities** and explicitly require departments and agencies to abide by its provisions. Participants at most of the workshops identified the need for much stronger action-oriented language throughout the Directive; to use words such as “must”, “shall” and “will” instead of “should,” “may” and “are expected to.” In this regard, it was suggested that the oversight function of the PCO be strengthened to ensure compliance by departments and agencies and to maintain consistency in the quality of regulatory analyses. Some participants suggested that the regulatory system would be improved by holding individuals within the civil service fully accountable for their decisions, and removing any immunities. Others recommended a more involved role for Parliament in the oversight of regulations, including their development, implementation and review. Several participants proposed the creation of some sort of ombudsman function to oversee the implementation of the draft Directive, the smooth and expedient functioning of the regulatory system and to provide a single point of contact for complaints. This should include a mechanism that would allow members of the public to trigger a review of regulations. The suggestion was made that departments and agencies needed to be more service-oriented in order to promote effective public participation, for example, by developing a one-stop website for accessing information across government departments.

Generally speaking, participants from the public advocacy sector felt strongly that the draft Directive subscribed to a business/**economy**-first paradigm and therefore did not break with approaches in the past. They expressed disappointment that the draft Directive did not emphasize and prioritize respect and protection for the environment, human health and safety over economic concerns. They pointed out that this bias was reflected in the sections of the draft Directive that require: regulatory initiatives to comply with international trade obligations (such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement and the North American Free Trade Agreement); departments to conduct economic impact analyses of regulatory proposals, especially the reference to measuring costs and benefits; and, requirements to analyze and manage risks. In particular, they felt there was an excessive emphasis in the draft Directive on fulfilling international obligations (lines 259 to 305; lines 291 to 343 in the French version), particularly those with a trade component. Suggestions were made for removing these references or at least rewriting the section to convey the idea that the need for protection of health, safety and environment supersede economic factors, including Canada’s international trade commitments.

Views on the place of **economic analysis** in regulatory development varied among participants from public advocacy groups. Several argued that economic objectives had no place whatsoever in regulatory initiatives, whose primary if not sole purpose should be to protect the health, safety and the environment of Canadians. They suggested that the existing and the proposed regulatory regime in Canada afforded inadequate protection to the environment, human health and safety, which had rendered it untrustworthy and ineffective. In this regard, several participants referred to recommendations of the Krever Commission and successive reports of the Office of the Auditor General whose findings, they said, had been largely ignored. Others suggested that their concerns could be addressed by prioritizing health, safety and environmental protection over economic concerns. Several participants identified a need for an overarching goal or vision, such as a sustainable future, to guide decision making. In this regard, many participants noted the absence of the words “sustainable” or “ecological” in the draft Directive. At all the workshops, detailed suggestions for addressing these concerns were provided by participants particularly with respect to the draft Directive’s Commitment to Canadians. These suggestions are described in detail in the individual workshop reports.

Participants from public advocacy groups worried that the Smart Regulation Initiative, and by implication the draft Directive, was being driven by international trade considerations and North American integration, which they saw as a move toward deregulation and the lowest common denominator in protection for the environment, health and safety of Canadians. A very clear and consistent message from participants from the public advocacy sector was that the **Precautionary Principle** was not, but must be made, the focal point of the draft Directive and all regulatory activity in Canada. They felt for example that the Directive’s reliance on “best available evidence and knowledge”, risk assessment and cost benefit analyses to determine whether regulatory action is required and whether regulation should be part of the mix of instruments could and would be used to weaken or eliminate the use of precaution in decision making. They suggested that these, taken together with the call for the use of “a mix of instruments”, opened the regulatory-making process to the influence of special interests, particularly of industry and business.

Many participants, primarily from the industry, business and natural resource sectors, expressed strong support for the overall approach of the draft Directive. From their perspective, **risk assessment / risk management**, performance measurement, and **cost-benefit analysis** are important tools which, when used with environmental and social impact analyses, will produce more sustainable (triple-bottom line thinking) and efficient regulations. They pointed out the significant benefits and efficiencies of the requirement in the draft Directive that federal, provincial and territorial regulators cooperate and consult with each other when designing and assessing regulatory responses to manage public policy issues. Some participants from business expressed no

concern to the use of the Precautionary Principle as long as rules governing its use were clearly defined.

While many participants supported the idea of **a mix of instruments** to achieve public policy objectives, they differed in what they considered to be the inherent biases in the draft Directive relating to that mix. In general, the view that the language of the Directive was biased toward regulations over other policy tools (such as voluntary standards) was expressed by business participants. On the other hand, participants from the public advocacy groups felt that references in the draft Directive to instrument choice, minimizing unnecessary burdens and ensuring that benefits outweigh costs promoted a bias toward voluntary measures over regulations which are assumed to be inherently burdensome and inefficient. They argued that the draft Directive appears to place the onus on regulators to prove that regulation is necessary. Generally, participants from the public advocacy sector were of the view that voluntary measures should never be a part of the mix of public policy instruments. Detailed suggestions were provided by all sides and are described in the individual workshop reports.

Participants from business praised the draft Directive's requirement for regulators to **coordinate** their activities and cooperate with other jurisdictions, including municipalities. They viewed this as a constructive and efficient move toward reducing red tape and duplication in the regulatory system of Canada. Others, primarily from public sector groups, were wary of any language in the draft Directive that suggested regulators coordinate and cooperate with international jurisdictions, particularly with the USA, as this, they strongly believed, would lead to an inevitable weakening of Canadian sovereignty and the country's ability to protect the health, safety and environment of Canadians. Participants from business said they did not object to effective regulations as long as these were efficient regulations that did not add unnecessarily to the costs of doing business, which can be quite onerous for small and medium-sized enterprises. It was suggested by several that if the draft Directive references international commitments, it should also reference internal commitments such as those affecting inter-provincial/territorial trade. Other participants noted the value of coordination with international initiatives to avoid reinventing the wheel, as long as this did not lead to a lowering of standards. Several participants suggested that, given the importance of coordination and cooperation to the development of efficient and consistent regulations, the draft Directive needs some form of interdepartmental communications strategy.

A key point raised quite regularly in the workshops, primarily by public advocacy members, was that regulators should heed the advice of the Krever Commission and that the Directive should be very clear that departments and agencies **regulate in the public interest** and not in the interest of those who are being regulated. In this regard, there were two lines in the consultation draft of the Directive that sparked significant concern because they seemed to suggest that regulations were to be designed for the benefit of those who must comply. PCO agreed that this language in the text was not clear and would be re-drafted in the revision to require departments and agencies to

design regulation in consultation with affected parties to encourage compliance and facilitate implementation while effectively protecting the public interest, and to develop compliance and enforcements plans in consultation with affected parties, including those who must administer and comply with the regulation.

5 Next steps and closing remarks

Following the plenary roundtable, 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 and follow the Government Directive on Regulating link). They noted that all submissions to the website would be posted and available for public viewing prior to December 23. They invited individuals who felt that the summary for the venue they attended did not fairly capture the views/advice to post his/her views on the website www.regulation.gc.ca. 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 updates 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 List November 23, 2005

Moncton Workshop, November 14, 2005 (38 participants):

- Jeanne Arnold, Falls Brook Centre, Knowslesville, NB
- Louisa Barton-Duguay, SOS Eau Water Sankwan, Moncton, NB
- Wendy Betts, Eco-PNB, Fredericton, NB
- Mary Boyd, PEI Health Coalition/McKillop Centre for Social Justice, Charlottetown, PEI
- Jean-Paul Bourque, Sierra Club Canada Atlantic, Moncton, NB
- Georges Brun, Rabbit Brook Committee, Moncton, NB
- Richard Butland, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Dieppe, NB
- David Chown, Canadian Association of Chain Drug Stores, Windsor Junction, NS
- Stephanie Coburn, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Head of Millstream, NB
- Mary Ann Coleman, NB Environmental Network, Waterford, NB
- Kathleen Connors, Canadian Health Coalition, Pouchcove, NL
- David Coon, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB
- Sean Cooper, APCC, Moncton, NB
- John Crompton, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Moncton, NB
- Sharon Flatt, Canadian Unitarians for Social Justice, Douglas, NB
- Melissa Friedman, CBC Radio, Moncton
- Neil Gardner, Sierra Club Atlantic, Sainte Marie de Kent, NB
- Anna Girouard, Podieur, Ste Marie, NB
- Anna Goguen, Alliance Fonction publique du Canada, Moncton, NB
- Jean-Louis Guérette, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Moncton, NB
- Jim Harris, Green Party of Canada
- Hilary Howes, Construction Association of NB, Fredericton, NB
- Brigitte Julien, NBEN, Waterford, NB
- Gabrielle Kretzschmar, NB Partners in Agriculture, Upper Hamstead, NB
- Sharon Labchuk, Green Party of Canada, PEI
- Daniel LeBlanc, Sentinelles Peticodiac Riverkeeper, Moncton, NB
- André Martin, Symbiose, Université de Moncton, Dieppe, NB
- Beth McLaughlin, Au Coeur/Occur Sustainable Communities, Moncton, NB
- Heather McTiernan, Graduate Student, Fredericton, NB
- Inka Milewski, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Miramichi, NB
- Bronwyn Pavey, Petitcodiac Watershed Monitoring Group, Moncton, NB
- Huberte Richard, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Moncton, NB

- Simonne Richard, Conservation Council of New Brunswick, Moncton, NB
- Don Ridely, PEI Bioalliance, Cornwall, PEI
- Stéphane Robichaud, Canadian Federation of Independent Business, Moncton, NB
- Andy Secord, St Thomas University, Fredericton, NB
- Nancy Stacey, NS Department of Environment and Labour, Halifax, NS
- Lise Thibodeau, AFPC,PSAC, Moncton, NB

Montreal Workshop, November 16, 2005 (11 participants):

- Maychai Brown, Action Cancer du sein de Montréal, Montréal, QC
- John Burcombe, Mouvement Au Courant, Montréal, QC
- Marilyn Crawford, Bedford Mining Alert, Godfrey, ON
- Bohdan Czarnocki, Canadian Unitarians for Social Justice, Lachine, QC
- Eric Darier, Greenpeace, Montréal, QC
- Marie Hélène Bacon, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal, QC
- Roger Leclerc, MEDEC, Toronto, ON
- Jules Lizotte, Association canadienne de l'industrie de la peinture et du revêtement, St-Laurent, QC
- Jacques St-Amant, Option consommateurs, Montréal, QC
- Sasithorn Tajchakavit, A Lassonde Inc, Rougement, QC
- Beverley Thorpe, Clean Production Action, Montréal, QC

Toronto Workshop, November 18, 2005 (49 participants):

- David Adams, Association of International Automobile Manufacturers of Canada, Toronto, Ontario
- Peter Allsop, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Mississauga, Ontario
- Glenn H. Archinoff, Atomic Energy of Canada, Mississauga, Ontario
- Hugh Benevides, Canadian Environmental Law Association, Toronto, Ontario
- Tyler Bjornson, Canola Council of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario
- Mauricio Bobadilla, Sobeys Inc, Mississauga, Ontario
- Karen Burke, Canada's Research-Based Pharmaceutical Companies, Dundas, Ontario
- Carl Carter, Canadian Cosmetic, Toiletry & Fragrance Association, Mississauga, Ontario
- Maureen Carter-Whitney, Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy, Toronto, Ontario
- Christina De Toni, Cement Association of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario
- Brian Finch, Canadian Treatment Action Coalition/Best Medicines Coalition, Toronto, Ontario
- Tracey Firth, Canadian Animal Health Institute, Guelph, Ontario

- Peter Forristal, Imperial Oil, Calgary, Alberta
- Michi Furuya Chang, Kraft Canada, Toronto, Ontario
- Dave Good, Smucker Foods of Canada Co., Toronto, Ontario
- Paulette Gougeon, Nestlé Canada, North York, Ontario
- Dennis Graham, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Toronto, Ontario
- Heather Holland, Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ontario
- Bob Ingratta, Monsanto Canada Inc, Ottawa, Ontario
- John Jackson, Great Lakes United, Kitchener, Ontario
- David Johnston, ADM Agri-Industries Company, Halton Hills, Ontario
- Donald Johnston, Canadian Home Builders' Association, Toronto, Ontario
- Leesa Klich, GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Health, Oakville, Ontario
- Louise Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Toronto, Ontario
- Garry Larouche, Public Service Alliance of Canada, Azilda, Ontario
- Anne Ledger Wilkie, Canadian Health Food Association, Markham, Ontario
- Karen Levins, Cantox Health Sciences International, Mississauga, Ontario
- Michael McBane, Canadian Health Coalition, Ottawa, Ontario
- Robert Moklon, Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) Local 00258, Toronto, Ontario
- Rowena Moyes, Canadian Home Builders' Association, Toronto, Ontario
- Paul Muldoon, Canadian Environmental Law Association, Toronto, Ontario
- John Newell, Durham Directive, Pickering, Ontario
- Philip Petsinis, General Motors of Canada, Oshawa, Ontario
- John E. Phillips, Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, Ottawa, Ontario
- Randy Preater, Canadian Seed Growers Association, Ottawa, Ontario
- Bruce Rebel, Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association, Ottawa, Ontario
- Robert J Redhead, Robert J. Redhead Limited, Burlington, Ontario
- Anne Rochon Ford, Women and Health Protection, Toronto, Ontario
- Blake Smith, Ford of Canada, Oakville, Ontario
- David Sparling, Institute of Agri-Food Policy Innovation, Guelph, Ontario
- Anna Tilman, Storm Coalition
- Josie A. Tolentino, SGS Canada Inc, Mississauga, Ontario
- BoAnne Tran, Pollution Probe, Toronto, Ontario
- Allan Webster, Ontario Power Generation, Pickering, Ontario
- Robert White, Non-Prescription Drug Manufacturers Association of Canada (NDMAC), Ottawa, Ontario
- Kathy Wilson, Dare Foods Limited, Kitchener, Ontario

- Mark Winfield, Pembina Institute, Toronto, Ontario
- Min Wong, Ontario Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, Toronto, Ontario
- Terence H. Young, Drug Safety Canada, Oakville, Ontario

Winnipeg Workshop, November 21, 2005 (11 participants):

- Madeline Boscoe, Canadian Women's Health Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba
- Shirley Conibear, Manitoba Cattle Producers Association, Baldur, Manitoba
- Liz Dykman, Manitoba Eco-Network, Winnipeg, Manitoba
- Gerry Fitzsimmons, Internal Trade Secretariat, Winnipeg, Manitoba
- Eric Fridfinnson, Flax Council of Canada, Manitoba
- Ronald Humble, Manitoba Energy, Science and Technology, Winnipeg, Manitoba
- Anne Lindsey, Manitoba Eco-Network, Winnipeg, Manitoba
- Rory McAlpine, Maple Leaf Foods, Toronto, Ontario
- Randall McQuaker, Resource Conservation Manitoba
- Darryl Melnyk, Health Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba
- Nevin Shaw, Manitoba Industry, Trade and Mines, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Saskatoon Workshop, November 23, 2005 (26 participants):

- Leo Baribeau, Star Produce Limited, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Bryan Dilling, Saskatchewan Industry and Resources, Regina, Saskatchewan
- Sandra Finley
- Randy Fleming, Interchurch Uranium Committee Ed Coop, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Marianne Greer, Phenomenome Discoveries Inc., Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Yvonne Hansen, Saskatchewan Eco-Network
- Royal Hinthier, National Research Council. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Joseph M. Hnatiuk, Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists, Regina, Saskatchewan
- Larry Holbrook, Prairie Plant Systems, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Rick Holm, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Elaine Hughes, Stop the Hogs (Beyond Factory Farming), Saskatchewan
- Ron Kehrig, Ag-West Bio Inc., Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Jeanette Krayetski, Saskatchewan Environment, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan
- Sharon Mascher, Saskatchewan Environmental Society
- John J. McConnell, Farm to Live Consulting, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Liam Mory, Cameco Corporation, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Ashley O'Sullivan, Ag-West Bio Inc, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Paul Orde, POS Pilot Plant Corporation, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

- George Patterson, Saskatchewan Industry and Resources, Regina, Saskatchewan
- Leigh Pickford, Star Produce, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Terry Pugh, National Farmers Union
- Brendan Reding, Saskatchewan Industry and Resources, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Erika Ritchie, Cameco Corporation, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Kent Smith-Windsor, Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Janice Tranberg, Ag-West Bio Inc., Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- Bob Wiens, Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food, Regina, Saskatchewan

Calgary Workshop, November 25, 2005 (26 participants):

- Dr. Dale Armstrong, Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Edmonton, AB
- 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
- Joan Teghtmeyer, Council of Canadians, Calgary Chapter, Calgary, AB
- Mel Teghtmeyer, 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 Robert Smith, Canadian Pacific Railway, Calgary AB

Yellowknife Workshop, November 28, 2005 (17 participants):

- Rhian Christie, INAC – Nunavut Region
- Brian Davidson, Sahtu Secretariat Inc., Deline, NT
- Jessie Dawson, Kwalin Dun First Nation, Whitehorse
- Norma Dean, NWT Federal Council
- Jennifer Dickson, Pauktuutit Inuit Women's Association, Ottawa, On
- Linda Ecklund, Industry Tourism and Investment (ITI), NT
- Sheryl Grieve, North Slave Metis Alliance, Yellowknife, NT
- Chris Heron, Northwest Territory Metis Nation, Fort Smith, NT
- Adam Houston, Industry Tourism and Investment, GNWT, Yellowknife, NT
- Terry Lancaster, Industry Tourism and Investment (ITI), Northwest Territories
- Gabrielle Mackenzie-Scott, Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board, Yellowknife, NT
- Janet Marshall, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Gatineau, QC
- Lesley McDiarmid, Kwalin Dun First Nation, Whitehorse
- Valerie Meeres, North Slave Metis Alliance, Yellowknife, NT
- Norm Snow, Inuvialuit Joint Secretariat, Inuvik NT
- Mary Tapsell, Mackenzie Valley Environmental Review Board, Yellowknife NT
- Bob Wooley, Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board, Yellowknife NT

Vancouver Workshop, November 30, 2005 (27 participants):

- Rick Aikens, Measurement Canada, Penticton, BC
- Peter Bamford, British Columbia Maritime Employers Association, Vancouver, BC
- Gail Barnaby, Council of Yukon First Nations, Whitehorse, Yukon
- Jim Bird, Univar Canada Ltd., Richmond, BC
- Maria Castro, Beyond Factory Farming Coalition
- John Champion, Government of British Columbia, Victoria, BC
- Allan Combres, National Component, Penticton, BC
- Lawrende Chiu, Grimm's Fine Foods, Richmond, BC
- Berni Claus, Vancouver BC
- Angela Griffiths, Friends of the Earth, Vancouver, BC

- Graham Kissack, Catalyst Paper, Crofton, BC
- Arthur Kube, Senior on Guard for Medicine
- Harold Larson, Natural Noodles, Penticton BC
- Albert Le Monnier, International Longshore and Warehouse Union – Canada, Vancouver, BC
- Brian Lockhart, Canadian Chemical Producers Association, North Vancouver, BC
- Sylvia MacLeay, Council of Senior Citizens' Organization of BC
- Barbara Mintzes, DES Action Canada/Women and Health Protection, Vancouver, BC
- Mary Ann Moffat-Meder, Vancouver, BC
- Sharon Mok, Environment Canada, Vancouver, BC
- Andrew Morgan, Government of British Columbia, Victoria, BC
- Ellen Reynolds, DES Action Canada
- Jack Robertson, Underwriters Laboratories of Canada, Victoria, BC
- Jorgen Rohweder, BC Food Processors Association, Vancouver BC,
- Ann Rowan, David Suzuki Foundation, Vancouver, BC
- Kristina Stevens, Province of British Columbia, Victoria, BC
- Pieter Vanderpol, BC Food Processor Association, Abbotsford, BC
- Duncan Wilson, Vancouver Port Authority, Vancouver, BC