

SUMMARY REPORT
of the
Saskatoon Public Workshop
on the
Draft Government Directive on Regulating
Held November 23, 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

And:



Stratos Inc.
1404-1 Nicholas Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
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 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 Saskatoon Workshop (November 23, 2005)

3.1. Attendance at the Saskatoon Workshop

In total, 26 individuals attended the Saskatoon workshop. These individuals were primarily affiliated with industry and businesses, government agencies and public advocacy groups, including environmental non-government organizations, public health and consumer groups. For a complete list of participants, see Appendix 1.

3.2. Modification of the Saskatoon Workshop Agenda

The Saskatoon workshop agenda was modified at the request of participants. Instead of breaking into smaller groups, the workshop stayed in plenary

throughout the day. However, time was provided for participants to work together in smaller groups before plenary discussions. 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.

3.3. Structure and Content of this Workshop Report

Section 4 of this Report provides a summary of what was heard at the Saskatoon Workshop held on November 23, 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 or broader 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 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 Saskatoon Workshop

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

- Several participants described a lack of confidence in the government and decision-making processes, which must be addressed if government is to engage Canadians effectively.
- Several participants expressed frustration that recommendations from the Office of the Auditor General had been repeatedly ignored.
- One participant said that the government needs to move away from using “stakeholders” and to refer to “citizens” instead.

4.2. *General comments relating to the draft Directive*

- Many participants, primarily from the public advocacy sector, expressed a strong desire to see the Precautionary Principle emphasized over other considerations in the design and implementation of regulations.
- One participant said that as the government designs regulations it will need to develop an overriding statement of context, which should include a description of a state of the environment, the state of the food supply, the state of health, etc.
- Participants from public advocacy groups expressed concern that “harmonization” was a move toward deregulation and the lowest common denominator in protection for the environment, health and safety of Canadians. For these individuals, harmonization must not come at the expense of effectiveness. Business participants agreed that harmonization should not lead to a lowering of standards, but that harmonization was warranted when it led to increased efficiency and fairness in trade. One participant pointed out that harmonization of regulations across the country is necessary because harmonization is occurring globally.
- One participant felt that the draft Directive did not adequately capture the idea that regulations must not hurt the competitiveness of Canadian business.
- One participant recommended removing the word “natural” from references to the “natural environment” in order to capture its broader meaning.
- Some participants felt that the technical language of the Directive itself presented a barrier to fuller participation. A suggestion was made that the government engage professional communicators/writers to translate the

language of its regulations and the Directive into language that is intelligible to a wider audience.

- Several participants identified the need for stronger action-oriented language throughout the Directive; to use words such as “must”, “shall” and “will” instead of “should,” “may” and “expected to”. Several participants suggested that the draft Directive must explicitly require all departments and agencies to comply with its requirements.

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

- Generally, participants from the industry and business were comfortable with the statement of commitment to Canadians, although they provided detailed comments for improving them (see below). One participant said that he particularly appreciated the commitment to policy coherence, which is an important issue for business. Another felt that timeliness in the regulatory system was critical to expedite time to market, because some products can save people’s lives.
- Several participants, primarily from the public advocacy sector, stated that the statement on commitments must be clear that the prime purpose of regulations is to protect and preserve health, safety and environment. [Some felt that references to supporting businesses, trade and the economy were inappropriate, and even fundamentally at odds with environmental protection, and should be removed from the commitments. One participant said the commitment should commit to “ensuring the long-term welfare of the public while reducing the overlap of regulation”. Others felt that this could be addressed by changing the relative importance with which these issues are treated in the commitments. Some suggestions were:
 - Remove the reference to “businesses”, “trade”, etc. from the commitments, because the notion of business interests is captured in the word “Canadians.” If Canadians are concerned about businesses, then businesses will make their way into regulations.
 - Economy is secondary to health, safety and environment, and therefore should be dealt with in a separate bullet from these issues (lines 47 to 49, or lines 48 to 50 in the French version). Without a healthy population and environment, you cannot have a healthy economy.
 - Several participants noted that key words or phrases were missing from the commitments, including:
 - Social justice;
 - Full-cost accounting (possibly added as its own commitment);

- Ecosystem-based approach / management;
 - Sustainable development and sustainability;
 - Best practice; and,
 - Traditional knowledge, which should be understood to mean more than the knowledge of Canada's Aboriginal peoples and include the community-based knowledge.
- Many participants provided suggestions for adding commitments, including:
 - There needs to be a commitment to clarity in regulations, so that regulations cannot be creatively interpreted to serve special interests and so that Canadians are able to understand regulations and participate more effectively in decision making. Clarity of regulations also provides predictability and levels the playing field for business.
 - Full cost accounting needs to be added as a separate commitment or somehow incorporated into an existing one, such as the fifth commitment on lines 61 to 62 (lines 64 to 65 in the French version).
 - The draft Directive should commit to the independence of government scientists and guarantee their protection when they speak out in the public interest. There should be a reference to professional ethics and responsibilities in the commitments.
 - A commitment to communicate changes to regulations needs to be made so that people understand how the draft Directive impacts the work at different levels of government.
 - The Directive should commit to consistency in the interpretation and enforcement of regulations across the country (in all sectors).
 - Generally, participants from business felt that references to supporting the economy were warranted. Several individuals noted that economic prosperity, social well-being and a healthy environment were interconnected and that supporting a fair and competitive economy was key to achieving other policy objectives such as social and environmental well-being.
 - Several participants referred to the commitment as “motherhood statements” with which it was difficult to disagree. They pointed out that the “devil is in the details” and recommended that definitions be supplied for some of the more nebulous terms, possibly as a glossary in an appendix. The Directive should avoid loosely defined terms. One participant felt that arriving at agreed-upon definitions would be difficult, if not impossible, but that the process of defining terms could be as important as the definitions themselves. Some of the terms that were identified as needing definition were:

- “Public interest”—it should be made clear that this includes health, culture, wellness, etc.;
- “Best available knowledge”;
- “Quality of environment”—this should be defined to include the notion of ecosystem health;
- “Instil”, “best” and “responsive;”
- “Timeliness.”
- Other participants said that the lack of specificity or definitions in the commitments was a good thing as it provided the flexibility needed to apply the Directive to regulatory activities in all sectors. One participant felt that spending time on definitions would be a waste of time.
- Many participants, particularly from the public advocacy sector, expressed a strong desire to see a commitment to the Precautionary Principle. For these participants, the requirement to base decisions on evidence was problematic, as it did not address how departments regulate when there is conflicting evidence or when evidence is missing altogether. Several participants felt that there was an inherent incompatibility between protecting the public interest and evidence-based decisions. Several suggestions were made:
 - Replace the fourth commitment (lines 58 to 59, or lines 60 to 62 in the French version) with a requirement to apply the Precautionary Principle.
 - Remove “evidence and” from the fourth commitment (lines 58 to 59, or lines 60 to 62 in the French version) and add to the end of the bullet “.....and, in the face of scientific uncertainty, where there is risk of harm to the environment, that the Precautionary Principle be invoked.”
- Others felt that, while the Precautionary Principle was missing, the section on Commitment to Canadians was perhaps not the place to address it. One participant said that the Precautionary Principle, if added, must be narrowly defined to ensure predictability in the regulatory system. Another participant wondered whether, by including the Precautionary Principle in the draft Directive, Canada would in fact be aligning itself with some trading partners (e.g., the European Union) over others (e.g., the USA).
- Many participants agreed with the life cycle approach taken in the draft Directive and the requirement that regulations be reviewed. Some felt that a commitment to conduct regular reviews of regulations should be integrated into the fifth commitment (lines 61 to 62, or lines 64 to 65 in the French version). The suggestion was made that the draft Directive commit to a review of the existing body of regulations, not just new ones.

- The importance of transparency in all aspects of the regulatory process was highlighted by many participants, a number of whom suggested that the commitment to transparency (lines 61 to 62; lines 64 to 65 in the French version) needed strengthening. One participant suggested that to ensure transparency, the government must commit to consult early in the life cycle of regulations.
- Several participants felt that the government needs to instill trust and confidence among Canadians (lines 51 to 52, or lines 52 to 54 in the French version). It may be difficult to do so when the government has the dual role of protecting the environment and promoting business. One way of instilling trust would be for the government to commit to using independent studies to inform its decisions. One participant felt that the commitment to “instill trust and confidence,” was putting the “cart before the horse” and could be misconstrued.
- Participants provided specific suggestions for changing or refining the wording in the commitments:
 - Add the word “protect” to the first commitment (lines 47 to 49, or lines 48 to 50 in the French version) so that it says “serve, advance and protect the public interest...”
 - Drop “public interest as expressed by parliament” in the first commitment (lines 47 to 49, or lines 48 to 50 in the French version) because the public interest is defined in other places as well (e.g., at the municipal level).
- Several participants from business expressed support for the sixth (lines 64 to 66, or lines 67 to 69 in the French version) and seventh commitments (lines 68 to 70, or lines 72 to 75 in the French version), particularly the commitment to “focusing resources where they can do the most good.” One participant proposed expanding the seventh commitment to include holding regulatory bodies accountable (i.e., there need to be mechanisms whereby decisions can be appealed).

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

II Scope of Application (lines 99 to 134, or lines 113 to 153 in the French version)

- Several participants from business felt that some of the language in the section, such as the paragraph on lines 118 to 119 (lines 136 to 138 in the French version) was biased towards regulation. The paragraph should be rewritten to acknowledge that regulatory proposals can lessen the regulatory burden (i.e., that the regulatory process should not necessarily lead to more regulations).

- One participant said that he hoped that the provision for expedited processes to deal with emergencies in lines 131 to 134 (lines 150 to 153 in the French version) would not be used to exempt those regulatory proposals from the requirements of the Directive.

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

- Participants generally supported the section dealing with consulting Canadians, agreeing that it was an important ingredient in maintaining transparency of the regulatory system.
- Several participants stressed the importance of keeping consultations short and limited so that the regulatory system can remain responsive to the needs of a rapidly changing world.
- Several participants felt that the section on consulting Canadians should provide more details on what constitutes effective and meaningful consultations. The following observations were made:
 - The draft Directive's reference to "meaningful" and "effective" consultations may end up committing the government to labour- and resource-intensive processes, depending on how these terms are defined. It was pointed out that the University of Calgary had developed an effective model of consultations where individuals, chosen at random from the public, were provided with intensive briefings before being brought together for the consultation. It is therefore important that the Directive define the parameters around "effective" and "meaningful".
 - Effective and meaningful consultations require the involvement of stakeholders throughout the regulatory lifecycle starting at an early stage.
 - "Balanced consultations" in lines 144 to 146 (lines 163 to 166 in the French version) can be interpreted widely and should be defined.
 - In the case of consultations with Aboriginal groups, materials need to be translated into the language of the receivers.
 - The government must work through multiple channels, including the media, in order to inform and engage a wider audience in its public consultations. The public needs to be better informed on social, environmental and economic issues in order for it to participate in decision making.
 - Several participants said that the standard 30-day comment period for regulatory proposals published in the *Canada Gazette* does not constitute sufficient consultation.

- Several participants, citing examples where the advice of the public had been ignored in the past, said that work was needed on rebuilding the public's trust in the processes. Consultations are a two-way process.
- The draft Directive should describe the opportunities provided to Canadians (lines 144 to 148, or lines 163 to 167 in the French version). Efforts by government to increase public participation can lead to conflicts of interest, when for example the government pays for participation.
- The consultative process should identify stakeholders indirectly affected by a regulatory initiative as well as those directly affected, and then inform them of the consultations.
- 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.
- One participant suggested that the bullet on lines 164 to 165 (lines 186 to 188 in the French version) should include a commitment to informing Canadians on how their views are being addressed in regulatory proposals.
- It was suggested that the limits of knowledge and uncertainty must be acknowledged explicitly in the bullet on lines 159 to 160 (lines 179 to 181 in the French version).
- It was proposed that the bullet on line 155 (line 175 in the French version) include the development of enforcement plans, as compliance plans are too weak.

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

- Several participants, primarily from business, felt that the language in this subsection implied that more regulations were better than fewer regulations. They supported changing the language to suggest exploring other measures before resorting to regulations.
- Several participants felt that the paragraph dealing with risk analysis on lines 184 to 193 (lines 210 to 221 in the French version) precluded the use of precaution in decision making and suggested either removing it or rewording it to indicate that precaution should inform risk assessment. Others felt that the reference to risk assessment was critical, but offered that the paragraph should provided specifics on how risk assessments are

to be carried out. One participant felt that the paragraph should address risks in relation to benefits.

- It was noted by one participant that the section does not specify performance standards for departments with respect to making information public or requirements that they be transparent about any delays in the regulatory process.
- One participant suggested that the subsection on lines 195 to 204 (lines 223 to 234 in the French version) should explicitly require a multi-disciplinary approach to assessing public policy issues. The same participant noted that he approved of the bullet on lines 196 and 198 (lines 224 to 227 in the French version), particularly the reference to “immediate and long-term impacts on health, safety and security, the quality of the environment and social well-being of Canadians.”

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

- The suggestion was made to replace “assessing” public policy issues in the paragraph on lines 206 to 211 (lines 236 to 241 in the French version) with “analyzing” public policy issues.
- It was suggested by one participant that lines 223 and 224 (lines 253 to 254 in the French version) should require that a high level of detail accompany regulatory proposals, including the objectives and an explanation of why a particular mix of instruments has been chosen.
- Several participants objected to the language on lines 232 to 233 (lines 262 to 263 in the French version) because it appears to imply that regulations are being designed to please the regulated, and not with human safety and the environment in mind. The bullet should be rewritten to better express the idea that regulations are designed to facilitate compliance (rather than encourage people to break the rules).
- One participant said he felt that the section from lines 222 to 233 needed a stronger emphasis on protecting the public good and enforcing regulations. If regulations are not properly enforced, the good actors get lumped in with the bad actors.
- Several participants urged against considering voluntary measures as part of the regulatory response (lines 235 to 242, or lines 265 to 273 in the French version).
- Several participants wondered whether the high level of detail in the subsection on lines 285 to 305 (lines 319 to 343 in the French version) relative to other sections was appropriate.

- One participant said that she worried that the bullet on lines 290 to 292 (lines 325 to 328 in the French version) would lead Canada to adopt lower standards and guidelines, developed in countries where corporations may have more influence than they do in Canada. Another participant said it was not clear to him how the various groups involved would decide which of the various instruments will be chosen (guidelines, standards, etc).
- Several participants felt that harmonization, coordination and cooperation (lines 307 to 333, or lines 345 to 372 in the French version) between regulatory jurisdictions were a key aspect of the draft Directive which would lead to improvements in the efficiency of the regulatory system. At least one participant suggested that the language in the subsection should be made more prescriptive.
- A suggestion was made to add a bullet/requirement at line 327 (line 366 in the French version), which says “determine in areas currently regulated by provinces and territories, if federal regulations are required.”
- It was suggested by several participants that the draft Directive should commit to looking at best practice internationally in order to avoid reinventing the wheel. At least one participant felt that this idea had been well captured in the section on lines 349 to 365 (389 to 411 in the French version).

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

- Participants made several specific comments for improving this subsection of the draft Directive:
 - The section on assessing environmental impacts on line 400 to 423 (lines 446 to 468 in the French version) is open to interpretation. At least one participant objected to the notion of positive environment impacts referenced in the section.
 - There is an inherent contradiction between economic growth and environmental well-being reflected in lines 428 to 431 (lines 478 to 482 in the French version).
 - The bullet in lines 440 to 441 (495 to 495 in the French version) should be rewritten to say something along the lines that regulations will work towards maximizing restrictions on oligopolies (instead of promoting competition).
 - The bullet in lines 442 to 444 (lines 496 to 499) could be rewritten to emphasize maximizing the economic benefits of regulations, in recognition of the fact that some regulations are beneficial. It was suggested that this bullet could be rewritten in clearer language to address the concern of some participants that it provides a loophole for

corporations to conceal data and information under the pretext of trade secret.

- One participant said that it was not clear from the Directive who had responsibility for conducting environmental impact assessments on behalf of departments. He suggested strongly that a competent body be identified for providing this part of the analysis. The Directive must also commit to providing the resources need for conducting the various impact assessments it calls for.
- Several participants objected to the reliance on cost-benefits analyses as outlined in the section (lines 370 to 467, or 413 to 526 in the French version), as this approach focuses on costs that can be measured in monetary terms. The suggestion was made that the notion of costs should be defined more broadly to include the full costs associated with harm to the health, safety and environment.
- At least one participant expressed support for the subsection on lines 436 to 444 (446 to 467), with the caveat that these activities must protect the environment and people.

E. Planning for Implementation and Compliance (lines 469 to 505, or lines 528 to 564 in the French version) and F. Measuring, Evaluating and Reviewing Regulation (lines 507 to 546, lines 566 to 610 in the French version)

- 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.
- Several participants felt that the section did not deal adequately with enforcement and should be clear on sanctions for those who fail to comply with regulations.
- Several participants expressed strong support for the bullet on lines 504 and 505 (lines 563 to 564 in the French version).

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

- One participant stressed the importance of requiring departments and agencies to do their due diligence in exploring multiple channels of communication to engage the public more effectively in decision making.

4.5. *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)*

- At least one participant felt that the role of PCO in regulatory processes should be strengthened so that it is able to reject regulatory proposals on the basis of failure to comply with the draft Directive and to inform departments and agencies when their regulations overlap with those of others.
- Several participants advised that the reports of the Auditor General be made a mandatory component of the planning and reporting section.
- One participant said she found it difficult to conceive of risk and the Precautionary Principle in the same framework (lines 651 and 652, or lines 728 to 729 in the French version). The Precautionary Principle should drive the regulatory process.

4.6. *Final Roundtable from participants*

Before adjourning for the day, the facilitator asked each person in the room to provide any additional suggestions or comments that were not already raised during the workshop. Participants were asked to consider whether the draft Directive was moving in the right direction. The following details comments made during the roundtable discussion that were not explicitly captured elsewhere in this summary.

- A majority of participants said that, overall, they felt that the draft Directive was moving in the right direction and that it was a better framework than the current Regulatory Policy. Many qualified their support, saying that the Directive should move away from the risk assessment paradigm and place the Precautionary Principle at its center. For others, accountabilities needed to be strengthened.

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 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 www.regulation.gc.ca. All submissions received after December 23, 2005 will be posted for public viewing and, wherever possible

Summary Report: Saskatoon Workshop (November 23, 2005)

(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 at the Saskatoon Workshop, November 23, 2005

(Total number of participants = 26)

- 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 Hinther, 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

Summary Report: Saskatoon Workshop (November 23, 2005)

- 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

PCO staff in attendance:

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