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ABSTRACT

Following the release of *Our Common Future* (1987), a National Task Force created by the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers (CCREM), recommended the establishment of National and Provincial Round Tables. Shortly thereafter, local round tables emerged across Canada as an important community response to the promotion of sustainable development. Local round tables are typically multi-stakeholder groups that operate by consensus and work towards a sustainability goal. Many of these local organizations were formed in a rather ad hoc manner with very little attention focussed on relevant organizational theories, and to this date are still struggling to come to grips with their establishment and operations. Thus there is an urgent need to understand how these community processes work and to discover how they can operate most effectively. The goal of this thesis is to test the use of the stage model of collaboration theory in guiding the establishment and operations of local round tables and for assessing their strengths and weaknesses in these phases. The *Howe Sound Round Table* (HSRT) was chosen as suitable case study.

Collaboration theory has been well researched by McCann (1983), Gray (1989), Waddock (1989) and others. It also offers an effective strategy for defining the issues, building partnerships, and solving problems with other groups in a manner that enables them to work constructively towards common goals. Thus, its application to local round table processes is very appropriate. Nevertheless, current collaboration models cannot be applied in their existing form, but must first be adapted to the needs of local round tables. A five stage collaboration framework is proposed. These stages are as follows: environmental context/issue crystallization, problem setting, direction setting, relationship building and monitoring. This proposed framework is then used to guide both the data collection and the analysis.
The results include a comprehensive analysis of the establishment and operational phases of the HSRT and a detailed list of recommendations for this group. These recommendations may be grouped into six major categories or objectives that may be beneficial to the HSRT as well as to other community groups. Based on the validity of the results and recommendations, it is concluded that collaboration theory can be used as a suitable guide. Further, since local round tables (such as the HSRT) are just one type of consensus-based, multi-stakeholder process it follows that collaboration theory may also successfully be applied to a wide variety of other such processes. Nevertheless, while collaboration is proven to be an effective tool, it does have some limitations. In addition, it should not be used as a replacement, but rather as a supplement to the more practical round table and community stewardship guides that are currently available.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE THESIS

1.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Round tables form one of Canada's most distinctive institutional responses to the challenges of sustainable development. Not only has Canada been described as a "world leader in their use," but this nation has been credited with "inventing round tables" (Doering, 1995). It has also been said that

"As a result of the round table movement, Canada has probably... become the world's most remarkable experimental laboratory on the machinery of sustainable development." (Gordon, 1994).

Further, this movement has earned respect as a new and constructive way of approaching interdependent planning problems and dealing with complex environmental, social and economic issues (Gordon, 1994). Several reasons may be offered for the emergence of the round table movement.

First, severe global environmental crises are becoming ever more common and more threatening. Degradation of rain forests, species extinction, ozone layer depletion, soil erosion, and global warming are just a few of the global crises we face today. In addition, extensive suburban sprawl has increased dependence on the automobile, increased land values, and led to the loss of valuable agricultural lands. Rapid population growth continues to exacerbate competition and conflicts over scarce resources. In 1987, the World Commission on the Environment (WCED) produced a very influential document --Our Common Future-- which highlighted these global impacts and called for a massive campaign towards sustainable development. (Refer to Section 2.3 for a more detailed, chronological history of round tables).

Second, traditional government mechanisms and institutions for dealing with land and resource management in Canada have been criticized for their segmented and narrowly-focussed approach (Lacombe et al., 1994). Current knowledge recognizes that resource systems are
interconnected in a complex manner that requires integrated resource management. The three-tiered, multi-jurisdictional system of federal, provincial and local government is cumbersome and inefficient, often resulting in duplication of efforts and lack of co-ordination. The division of regions based on their political/jurisdictional borders tends to ignore watershed boundaries and hinders a more holistic, bioregional approach.

Third, the challenges for government are rising steadily. The growing fiscal deficit has necessitated huge budget cuts and staff reductions (Seasons, 1995). Governments at all levels are feeling the pinch. In order to make do with smaller numbers of employees, and to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts, government is currently undergoing extensive restructuring with some senior government agencies downloading some of their responsibilities.

Fourth, decision-making processes in Canada have been undergoing some noticeable changes. Citizens have become frustrated with

"hierarchical structures that are insensitive to the needs of citizens and (that) focus the attention of public servants upwards towards the source of authority and accountability, rather than towards the individuals directly affected by the discretionary and sometimes arbitrary decisions of the bureaucracy..." (Owen, 1993).

They are no longer prepared to blindly accept government actions and to be excluded from government decision-making. They now demand better access to decision-makers and effective forums for public participation. Public groups have also grown dissatisfied with government’s "traditional practice of reaching compromise agreement on its proposals through separate discussions with different, often mutually suspicious, sectors.” (Gordon, 1994). Simultaneously, there has been an increasing interest in consensus-based, multi-stakeholder processes.

Fifth, in response to the above pressures, public members themselves have begun to realize that they have an important role to play in the management of natural resources (FBMP et al., 1995). The media, other communication sources, as well as environmental non-
governmental groups (such as Greenpeace), have successfully raised public awareness and focussed attention on the myriad of ills for which we, as humans, are responsible. There has been a growing realization that a community has an “extra-regional” ecological footprint of aggregate consumption and that human activity and growth in one region can have severe impacts on another (Rees and Wackernagel, 1992). Communities now recognize that they need to take on more and early responsibility for their activities. Further, both communities and government are starting to realize the benefits of community involvement in government processes. Not only do local communities feel the direct impact of government decisions, but local citizens

“...also tend to be intimately familiar with the full range of land and resource values in the areas surrounding their community and...therefore (should be) regarded as valuable sources of information by government decision-makers.” (CORE, 1995.)

Finally, government’s largely reactive and regulatory responses to environmental management (Bregha et al., 1990) are slowly being replaced by more proactive approaches that incorporate resource management and conservation guidelines at the regional and local levels.

“The adoption of an environmental agenda, at least in name, by virtually all government and the private sector has resulted in a shift in emphasis from problems to solutions. Those groups that have successfully raised awareness of environmental problems are now expected to contribute to their resolution through, for example, consultative and advisory process, which are proliferating.” (Griss, 1993).

All these and other factors have contributed to the rise of round tables (as well as other mechanisms) for dealing with sustainability. These consensus-based, multi-stakeholder processes offer an integrated approach to sectoralized decision-making, present a forum for the expression of diverse interests, traverse jurisdictional boundaries (at least at the local level), build awareness and actively engage the public in seeking sustainability solutions.
It is important to note that round tables have been met with varying degrees of acceptance from both the public and government. Some local governments have wholly embraced the idea and have sought to initiate these processes within their own local communities. Others have steered away from them or tried to put barriers in their paths to discourage them. For example, in 1994, the provincial government withdrew its funding for the B.C. Round Table resulting in the demise of this important group. Nevertheless, these vehicles for promoting sustainability continue to proliferate and persevere. In 1994, Canadian round tables existed at the national level (National Round Table on the Environment and Economy), in almost all 12 provinces and territories (Provincial Round Tables), and in many local municipal areas thereby amounting to a total number of close to 200 round tables (Gordon, 1994). Despite their growing numbers, round tables, and especially local round tables are a relatively new concept in Canada. This thesis will concentrate on the establishment and operations of local round tables. A more detailed definition of these groups will be provided in chapter two, but for the time being local round tables may be described as multi-stakeholder groups that reflect the full diversity of interests within a community. In addition, they have a mandate to address sustainability (within their community) and typically play an advisory role. They also operate by consensus and are ongoing processes.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The initial fervor and enthusiasm for round tables following the release of *Our Common Future* (1987) and the findings of the *Task Force* created by the *Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers* (CCREM) (see Section 2.3 for more details), led to the rather hasty establishment of a vast number of round tables. Many of these organizations sprung up in a rather ad hoc manner, with very little attention focussed on relevant organizational theories. Of
the 40 or so local round tables that have emerged in this province, some have died and some have made constructive progress. The majority of these groups, however, are still struggling to come to grips with their establishment and operations. Thus there is an urgent need to understand how these community processes work and to discover how they can operate most effectively within their different ecological and social environments.

Existing guidelines and recommendations for the development of community organizations are still very new and experimental. By contrast, there are various established theories for examining group processes, such as organizational behaviour and functional theory (Cunningham, 1978). However, these theories relate more to hierarchical, corporate/market-oriented entities and offer limited advice for bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, consensus-based groups. Further, Gray and Wood (1991) claim that organizational theories “tend to ignore or grossly underplay” the interdependency of organizations as well as “exaggerate the extent of discretion that can be exercised by any single organization.” An alternative approach, collaboration theory (Gray, 1989), while it emerged fairly recently, has a much broader application that can be applied to consensus-based grassroots groups. Gray and Wood (1991) identify six major theoretical perspectives that appear to have significant possibilities for explaining collaboration and collaborative alliances:

- resource dependence theory
- corporate social performance theory/institutional economics theory
- strategic management theory/social ecology theory
- microeconomics theory
- institutional theory/negotiated order theory
- political theory

Collaboration theory has been used by public interest groups, government and business alike. It encourages balanced representation and equal participation and is well-suited to situations that involve diverse and opposing interests. Yet another characteristic points in favour
of using collaboration theory as a tool for examining local structures. While local round tables are important, they are by no means the only mechanisms for promoting sustainability. The emergence of local round tables (mostly between the late 1980s and early 1990s) has been accompanied by a resurgence of other local environmental non-governmental groups (ENGOs) as well. (See Section 2.2 for more details.) As more and more community groups become established and compete for limited resources and for government support, partnerships will need to be formed and alliances made not only among the groups themselves, but also between these groups and various levels of government. Collaboration theory offers effective strategies for defining the issues, building partnerships and solving problems with other groups in a manner that enables them to work constructively towards common goals.

Pasquero (1991) observed that the stage model of collaboration could provide a useful checklist for the development of such community organizations as well as to predict the stages at which round tables would be weak or fail. This author experimented with collaboration theory as a framework for analyzing the work of the National Round Table. Similarly, Griggs and Kofinas (Unpublished, 1994) examined the progress of the B.C. Round Table within the context of collaboration. As yet, no study has analyzed the use of collaboration theory as a measure for guiding the establishment and operations of local round tables. Local round tables are more numerous than other (national and provincial) round tables. Further, local round tables play a crucial role in addressing sustainability at the local level where the immediate problems are felt. Thus, the use of collaboration theory to examine the establishment and operations of local round tables would be of great benefit to these significant groups.

Some restrictions may apply. Pasquero (1991) pointed out that while theories of collaboration deal with the inter-relationships between one or two organizations, such theories
for addressing broader, multi-layered societal associations deserve more attention. This author observed that such societal or multi-organizational partnerships (of which round tables are an excellent example) can offer useful insight and help to refine existing collaborative models. From this it follows that it would also be a useful exercise to examine what local round table processes can offer to collaboration.

1.3 PRINCIPAL GOAL AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the interactions that go on within and between the many different types of community groups. However, a case study of a local round table as one example of a consensus-based, multi-stakeholder group may provide useful insight for other such processes.

*The principal goal of this thesis is:*

- to test the use of the stage model of collaboration theory in guiding the establishment and operations of local round tables as well as for assessing their strengths and weaknesses in these phases.

A number of research questions arise from this central goal:

1. Can a suitable framework, adapted from collaboration theory, be developed for use as an effective strategy for examining the establishment and operations of the Howe Sound Round Table? (If so, what are the features of this proposed framework?)

2. Can this proposed collaboration framework be applied to other local round tables and consensus-based, multi-stakeholder community groups in general?
Thus, the underlying *objectives* of this thesis are:

- to describe the historical origins of round tables.
- to describe the general purpose of local round tables, their form and potential; and then to focus in particular on one case study --the Howe Sound Round Table.
- to examine the current models of collaboration theory and to propose a framework with which to guide the establishment and operations of local round tables.
- to test the merits of this framework by applying it to the data collection and analysis of the case study in order to produce a series of recommendations for the HSRT.
- to explore the wider application of the collaboration framework as a guide for other multiple interest, consensus-based community processes.
- to outline any contributions from the case study that may be used to refine collaboration theory.

The *Howe Sound Round Table* (hereafter referred to as the HSRT) was chosen as a suitable case study for the following reasons. The HSRT is presently in a transition stage where it is starting to move out of its establishment and into its operational phase. Secondly, its area of focus --the Howe Sound watershed-- covers several jurisdictional boundaries and exhibits a rich and diverse ecosystem. Since the pressures of urban expansion grow continuously stronger (as does the competition for limited resources), the region is faced with many critical sustainability issues and choices. The accessibility of the group, was the third deciding factor in choosing the HSRT as a case study. Moreover, it is a group with whom I am quite well acquainted having been a member of the HSRT Steering Committee. It is hoped that the results and recommendations derived by this thesis will be of particular benefit to Howe Sound Round Table.
1.4 METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH METHODS

The research includes both a literature review and a series of interviews. The literature review consists of examining journal articles, books, conference proceedings, meeting minutes and other relevant documents. This review is used to ascertain the following information:

- historical origins of round tables.
- purpose of local round tables, their form, and potential.
- details of the establishment, structure and operations of the Howe Sound Round Table.
- stage model theories of collaboration.

A number of interviews were also be performed using a set of carefully constructed questions. Two groups were interviewed: 16 Howe Sound Round Table (HSRT) members and 5 members of government. HSRT members were be asked to express their personal views on the establishment and operations of the group, as well as their interactions with members of the broader community and government. A detailed list of the questions is provided in the Appendix. Note that each HSRT member was asked the same set of questions. Government representatives were asked to describe their interactions with local round tables. An attempt was made to gather opinions from all three levels of government.

The procedures followed in deriving the interview questions should be noted. Following a review of collaboration theory, a collaborative framework for examining local round tables was developed. This framework and its associated criteria were then used to guide the development of the interview questions. Following the advice given by Yin (1989), care was also taken to ensure that the questions were open-ended, clearly worded and free of ambiguity. Initially, while the number of questions seemed a bit unwieldy, it was found that respondents frequently answered two or sometimes three questions in an answer, thereby reducing the actual number of questions asked.
Information gathered from the literature and the interviews was principally qualitative. Wolcott (1994) suggests that there are three major ways of presenting qualitative data. All three will be used in this thesis. A description of the data, or an account that is close to the data originally recorded, will be provided in the form of quotations from interviews. Note, however, that in order to maintain privacy and to encourage individuals to speak openly, all quotations will be confidential. An analysis will then expand on this descriptive account and attempt to identify themes and relationships. Finally, an interpretation or explanation of these themes and relationships will be offered. Wolcott (1994) outlines several ways in which to organize data. In this thesis, the systematic and comprehensive approach of the proposed collaborative framework will be used to organize the data.

Miles and Huberman (1994) explain the importance of maintaining objectivity, internal and external validity in qualitative analysis. Due to my involvement with the HSRT Steering Committee and arms length involvement with the HSRT itself (I have attended several functions and meetings), I was constantly aware of the potential for inserting my own personal assumptions, values and biases into the design of the questions and the data analysis. Nevertheless, having the collaborative framework as a tool for guiding both the data collection and the analysis proved very instrumental in steering me away from this potential problem. In addition, efforts were made to ensure that my views were kept separate from those of the interviewees. Internal validity was tested by using triangulation or the cross-examination of data from various sources (interviews and literature reviews) to see if they produce converging conclusions. Finally, external validity was examined to see if the conclusions are transferable and more widely applicable to other situations.
1.5 THESIS ORGANIZATION

The thesis is presented in five chapters, followed by a list of references and an appendix.

In brief, the key information that each chapter presents is as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction
Background information on the formation and importance of round tables is presented. Following this material the problem statement, principal goal and objectives of the thesis, as well as the methodology and research methods are outlined.

Chapter 2: Movements Towards Increased Public Participation, Sustainability & Collaboration
First government and then community initiatives towards sustainability, increased public participation, and collaboration are outlined. Then the history, form, function and potential of local round tables will be discussed. Finally, the stage model of collaboration theory will be explored.

Chapter 3: Case Study of the Howe Sound Round Table
This chapter discusses the origin and impetus for the establishment of the Howe Sound Round Table. The terms of reference, membership, reporting relationships, internal decision-making, and other operations of the HSRT are then outlined.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis I: Establishment Phases
Here an analysis of the issue crystallization, problem setting and direction setting stages is presented.

Chapter 5: Data Analysis II: Operational Phases
This second part of the analysis examines the relationship building, and implementation stages.

Chapter 6: Recommendations and Conclusions
This final chapter summarizes the recommendations derived in the analysis. Then the broader application of collaboration theory, contributions of the case study to collaboration theory and directions for further research are explored.
CHAPTER 2: CHANGES EMERGING IN PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

2.1 GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES TOWARDS INCREASED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND COLLABORATION

Several recent trends appear to be changing the shape of Canadian government planning and decision-making and are overcoming some of the challenges and inadequacies of traditional modes of governance. In Overcoming Dysfunction in Public Policy Steven Owen (1993) identifies two such trends:

"First, as a matter of process, the public is demanding a more participatory role in the development of public policy. Despite the initial expense and complexity of participatory processes, any attempt to continue or return to command decision-making by government will be politically unacceptable... Second, substantive policy decisions must be demonstrably sustainable, whether they relate to resource and environmental management, to fiscal policy, or to health, education and other areas of social policy. This public responsibility to future generations and global interests... will serve as a touchstone for sound public policy in the future."

Governments are increasingly under pressure to engage the public in decision-making. The nature of governance has been changing in response to this pressure. According to the British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (hereafter referred to as the BCRT), the

"model of representative democracy --wherein elected officials make decisions based on the views of their respective electorate-- is taking on a more participatory format wherein the electorate takes a more active role in advising their elected representatives" (BCRT, 1994i).

Nevertheless, the conditions for effective public involvement have yet to be determined. The BCRT (1994i) outlined a number of models for public involvement ranging from information exchange to consultation. Each model differs in appropriateness depending on the circumstances and policies at hand. Responsibilities and expectations on the part of both government and the public are also different. Other documents produced by the Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE, 1995e) as well as by the Society Promoting Environmental Conservation
(SPEC, 1995) have made considerable strides towards the establishment of guidelines for public involvement in government decision-making.

Sustainability is now given consideration in many government policies. In simple terms, sustainability has to do with the balancing of present economic, ecological, social and political needs so as not to compromise those needs of future generations (W.C.E.D., 1987). Ever since the release of the *Our Common Future* (1987), Canada has been in the forefront of those countries attempting to promote sustainability. In British Columbia alone, a considerable number of government initiatives reflecting the principles in *Our Common Future* have emerged (See Table 2.1).

**Table 2.1: Major Government Initiatives Established to Promote Sustainability in B.C.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>DATE FORMED</th>
<th>MANDATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir I</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>identified need for comprehensive land use and water management strategy for B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Resources Commission</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>provided advice to Ministry of Forests on the management of provincial forest lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Round Table on Environment &amp; Economy</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>established to encourage and to seek consensus on a sustainable development strategy for B.C..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Wilderness For the 1990s</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>process established by the MoF and Parks to solicit public advice on the creation of new parks &amp; wilderness areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Growth Strategy</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>provided a framework for managing old-growth forests for a variety of values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmuir II</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>provided broad recommendations needed to develop a provincial land use strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Resources &amp; Environment</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>established as a permanent statutory commission to develop a provincial land use strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Basin Management Program</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>joint initiative between federal, provincial and local governments to promote sustainability in the Fraser River Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Basin Initiative</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>task given to the BCRT to provide advice on the state of the Georgia Basin and to develop growth management proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite these efforts, there is a danger that sustainability can be weakened in the face of short-term trends. To ensure continuity and commitment to sustainability requires "...a long-term social commitment and an institutional framework that spans economic and political..."
cycles" (CORE, 1995). Also, while strong commitment and action is necessary to achieve sustainability, it is thought that: "...these actions will only be effective if sustainable environmental and land use planning becomes a requirement at the regional district level and if the provincial government is prepared to allocate appropriate statutory responsibilities to the community level." (BCRT, 1991d). The recently proposed *Sustainability Act*¹ and growth strategies legislation are attempting to address these needs.

Besides these movements towards increased public participation and sustainability, yet another trend may be identified. Movements towards collaboration are beginning to emerge in all levels of planning and decision-making. The *Draft Growth Strategies Act* (Ministry of Municipal Affairs, 1994) illustrates this point clearly:

> "Where the present planning system is weakest is in the lack of coordination on strategic issues between bordering municipalities, among municipalities in a region and adjacent regions. It also... lacks sufficient links with provincial ministries and agencies that make important decisions about jobs, infrastructure, resource management and major facilities..."

The new planning system proposed by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs is "interactive, inclusive and flexible." It is a system in which municipalities and regional districts would be "responsible for identifying mutual issues, [and] working together on resolution of these issues..." (Ministry of Municipal Affairs, 1994) "Ministries, Crown and other provincial agencies would enter into 'partnership agreements' with local government for matters where provincial actions would help to implement growth strategies." (Ministry of Municipal Affairs, 1994). These suggestions to form partnerships and work together to solve common issues give every indication that government is thinking seriously about collaboration.

---

¹ The *Sustainability Act* aims to place in statutory language the province's vision of environmental, social and economic sustainability and its commitment to participatory decision-making. Briefly, the Act will require that strategic land use plans be prepared for all areas of the province, and that all local resource and operational plans be consistent with these strategic land use plans. Further, it will state the general right of members of the public to participate meaningfully in land use and related resource and environmental decision-making (CORE, 1994c).
2.2 COMMUNITY INITIATIVES TOWARDS INCREASED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND COLLABORATION

While their mandates vary, many community groups (including local round tables) tend to be multi-stakeholder, consensus-based, volunteer organizations that strive for more meaningful and active public involvement and awareness, as well as the promotion of sustainability and stewardship. While the implementation of sustainability necessarily requires the support of senior government agencies, the importance of ensuring that the public is integrally involved cannot be stressed enough. Rees (1988) asserts that:

“global environmental deterioration is the cumulative result of many... top-down decisions made by central bodies far removed from the direct (and local) ecological consequences of their actions... Sustainability favours increased community control over development decisions affecting local ecosystems...”

Community groups can be excellent tools for creating awareness and mobilizing action at the local level where the real problems are manifested. Active community involvement may also help to do the following: increase the 'buy-in' or acceptance of public policy, generate new ideas and visions for the future of the community, increase community awareness and willingness to take responsibility, as well as bring government closer to community needs. Nevertheless, despite their important role, these groups continue to face harsh challenges, lack of community empowerment and exclusion.

“Communities have become increasingly involved socially, economically and environmentally in the global sphere, yet their powers to cope with this involvement have decreased. Policies on international trade, unemployment, environmental degradation resource depletion are dealt with at the provincial or federal level with little or no local input despite the fact that the immediate effects are felt at the local level.” (Rees, 1988).

As multi-stakeholder groups assembling different interests and perspectives to work together towards a common end (such as the promotion of sustainability), community groups (whether they realize it or not) are actively involved in collaboration. Many have also explored collaboration further by forming innovative partnerships with government, business and other
community groups for the purposes of sharing and exchanging information and other resources. As will become apparent later (Section 5.1.4) collaboration amongst community groups and ENGOs is in fact becoming a necessary way of the future to ensure survival in tough economic times.

Aside from local round tables, many community organizations now exist. Table 2.2 outlines a number of such community initiatives. Note that there is no single model since each community has different priorities, resources, and people as well as different political, environmental and economic climates. It should also be remembered that while this list is provided to draw attention to the myriad of community organizations that have evolved, this research will focus primarily on local round tables.

Table 2.2: Outline of Major Multi-Stakeholder, Consensus-Based Community Organizations and Their Respective Roles. (Adapted from BCRT document Local Round Tables: Realizing Their Full Potential, 1994.)

| **Land and Resource Management Planning (LRMP) processes:** |  
| -led jointly by the B.C. Ministry of Forests, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks. |  
| -engaged in integrated planning for resource management of Crown Land at the sub-regional level. |  
| -e.g. Kamloops LRMP. |  
| **Local Resource Use Plans (LRUP's):** |  
| -deal with coordinated development, resource management and watershed protection etc. |  
| -agency or inter-agency team consults with or actively involves public and resource users. |  
| -e.g. North Columbia Resource Council. |  
| **Local Government Advisory Committees:** |  
| -tool used to advise the Mayor and Council on local planning issues. |  
| -e.g. Richmond Environmental Advisory Committee proposes recommendations for local habitat protection by suggesting Environmentally Sensitive Areas or environmental protection bylaws. |  
| **Local Round Tables** |  
| -multi-stakeholder groups including full diversity of interests in the community. |  
| -address sustainability, ongoing processes, operate by consensus, advisory role. |  
| -e.g. Howe Sound Round Table. |  
| **Watershed Management Partnerships:** |  
| -multi-stakeholder group including: local government, community, first nations, and industry |  
| -co-ordinate planning and management activities within a drainage basin. |  
| -e.g. Williams Lake River Valley Project. |  
| **Community Stewardship Initiatives:** |  
| -recreational and/or environmental groups working towards habitat protection, restoration, and resource management. |  
| -e.g. Squamish Estuary Society. |
Table 2.2 Continued: Outline of Major Multi-Stakeholder, Consensus-Based Community Organizations and Their Respective Roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Resource Boards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- represent a full range of resource interests and values in a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- develop advice and recommendations on land use and resource management issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g. Bulkley Valley Community Resource Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy Communities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- originally initiated by Office of Health Promotion, Ministry of Health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- seek to involve full range of community interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- address community development, social well-being also environmental and economic issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 EVENTS LEADING TO THE FORMATION OF LOCAL ROUND TABLES

The formation of local or community round tables has been integrally linked to the establishment of the National Round Table and the various provincial round tables and resource management processes. In this province the B.C. Round Table, C.O.R.E. and other agencies, have produced an abundance of documents that are an invaluable resource for both governments and communities wishing to initiate local round tables.

The history of round tables is an interesting one that had its roots in the 1970s. Highlights of this course of events, beginning at the international level and ending at the local level, are presented below in chronological order. Much of this information was adopted from the BCRT document *Towards Sustainability: Learning for Change* (1993).

1960s  Growing awareness that environmental as well as social and economic stresses had become global ills.

1972  At a *United Nations Conference on the Human Environment* held in Stockholm, the concept of "sustainable development" emerged as an attempt to achieve responsible development. The *United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)* was created to promote environmentally-sound development.

1980  UNEP developed the *World Conservation Strategy*.

1983  *World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED)* was formed. Chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, Prime Minister of Norway. This group traveled worldwide to put on public meetings and to learn about global environmental, social and economic problems. The Commission later released its findings in a report entitled *Our Common Future*. Their recommendations called for a massive campaign and public participation to set the world in motion towards sustainable development.
1986 *World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED)* visited Canada. The *Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers (CCREM)* established a *National Task Force* to foster and promote environmentally sound economic development. This organization was also to examine how Canada could implement the recommendations outlined in the *World Conservation Strategy* and *Our Common Future*.

1987 The National Task Force recommended that: (1) provincial Round Tables should be established to encourage cooperation on environment/economic integration and (2) there should be increased public participation and education in sustainable economic development.

1988 The Canadian *National Round Table on the Environment and Economy* was formed by the federal government. Its mandate was to provide leadership and foster new ways of thinking and acting to address economic and environmental issues.

1988 Under the direction of the *National Task Force*, the government of B.C. set up a the *British Columbia Task Force on Environment and Economy*—also known as the *Strangway Commission*—after its chair David Strangway. Their mandate was to review *Our Common Future* and the principles of the *National Task Force* and to make recommendations to the provincial government as to how these could be implemented in B.C.. The B.C. Task Force recommended (amongst other things) that a B.C. Round Table should be established to lead the development of BC's Sustainable Development Strategy.

1988 A workshop put on by the *Forum for Planning Action (FPA)* in Vancouver, suggested a suitable process for sustainable community planning.

1990 As proposed by the Strangway Commission, the *B.C. Round Table on the Environment and Economy* was established as an advisory body to government by an order-in-council on January 16, 1990. It had a broad-based membership and was to operate by consensus. Its mandate was to: (1)-develop for Cabinet review a sustainable development strategy for B.C., (2)-recommend processes and mechanisms for the resolution of land and other environment/economic conflicts and (3)-heighten the public's understanding and knowledge of sustainable development.

1991 The B.C. Round Table adopted some of the principles of the FPA process and presented them in a document entitled *Sustainable Communities*. Another document also came out around this time. *Choosing the Right Path* was a collaborative effort between the Local Round Table Task Force of the B.C. Round Table, the Union of B.C. Municipalities, the Ministry of Development Trade and Tourism and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Recreation and Culture. The document emphasized that sustainability strategies are best implemented at the local level and encouraged the establishment of visions for the creation of "sustainable communities."

At this point a number of multi-stakeholder groups in B.C. had already formed and the *B.C. Round Table* was able to draw on them as examples: the *Capital Regional District Round Table on the Environment, Burnaby Waste Management Committee*, and *Matsqui Environmental Task Force*. In addition a number of communities (Richmond, Campbell River, Kelowna and SaltSpring Island) had already expressed considerable interest in forming local round tables.

The B.C. Round Table subsequently published a number of documents that provided specific information regarding the formation and operating procedures of local round tables. *Reaching Agreement: Consensus Processes in British Columbia (Volumes 1 and 2)* published in May and Sept 1991, detailed the meaning and processes involved in reaching decisions by consensus. Then a *Guide to Establishing a Local Round Table* was released in December 1991.

1992 The *B.C. Energy Council* was created to advise the Minister of Energy, Mines and Petroleum resources on energy issues and to create a sustainable energy strategy for B.C. in consultation with the public. The *Commissioner on Resources and Environment Act* was passed and C.O.R.E. was established to, amongst other things, develop a provincial land use strategy and to facilitate the development of community based participatory processes. Also in this year the *Fraser Basin Management Program* and the *Georgia Basin Initiative* were launched.
1994 In May of this year the B.C. Round Table, Fraser Basin Management Board and C.O.R.E. co-hosted a Local Round Table Conference in Vancouver. Representatives from Local Round Tables, Community Resource Boards and other multi-stakeholder groups throughout the Province were invited to a two day workshop to discuss the success and challenges their groups had faced in formation and operations. Recommendations derived from these workshops were compiled into a document *Local Round Tables: Realizing their Full Potential (1994)*, one of the final reports produced by the B.C. Round Table.

In the 1994 budget, the government announced an end to funding for the B.C. Round Table and the dissolution of the B.C. Energy Council. Later this year, a team of people from the Whistler Centre for Business and Arts, the B.C. Round Table, and the Energy Council set out to develop a terms of reference for a new *Council for Sustainability*.

1995 Ministry of Municipal Affairs sponsored a Georgia Basin Initiative Workshop in Vancouver. CORE released two volumes on the *Sustainability Act* as well as *Planning for Sustainability* and *Public Participation*. The FBMP issued a report card on the state of the Fraser Basin and the Council for Sustainability was launched.

Reviewing this history a number of issues become apparent. National and Provincial bodies (NRTEE, BCRT, BC Energy Council and CORE) performed much of the initial spadework in promoting the concept of sustainability and developing a framework within which to implement it. They also played an important role in encouraging the formation of local round tables and other participatory processes. In fact, the BCRT was looked upon by many smaller round tables as an umbrella organization that served to provide an important communication network or link with other local groups. Naturally, many community groups were dismayed to learn about the demise of this provincial body when its funding was cut in 1994.

**2.4 LOCAL ROUND TABLES: THEIR FORM, FUNCTION AND POTENTIAL**

The *B.C. Round Table on the Environment and the Economy* adopted the following five criteria for the round table model: (1) multi-stakeholder membership (2) operate by consensus (3) address sustainability (4) continuing bodies and (5) play an advisory role. Each of these criteria will be discussed in turn.
2.4.1 Criteria for Local Round Tables

(i) Multi-Stakeholder Membership

A multi-stakeholder group is one that is inclusive and ensures that the full range of perspectives from all economic, social and environmental sectors within the community or region are represented. These integrated, inter-disciplinary structures present a new approach to traditional hierarchical governance by offering a forum for the expression of all interests. They also serve to enhance understanding, and increase coordination among different groups as they work towards a common goal. In a local round table (as with most other multi-stakeholder groups) the process of membership selection is of vast importance since it can be a direct reflection of the perceived neutrality of the organization (BCRT et al., Local Round Tables: Realizing Their Full Potential, 1994). An organization that excludes some interests or is biased towards others can seriously jeopardize its credibility and thus gravely hinder its progress.

There are essentially two types of multi-stakeholder groups: interest-based and value-based. Interest-based groups imply that each member represents a particular organization or sector. That is, members are required to ratify decisions with their representative group before coming to agreement at the table. This process enables the establishment of clear reporting relationships between representatives and their constituencies. Further it has the ability to commit large organizations or even communities to an agreement. Difficulties with this type of membership, however, lie in the fact that a large number of interests may be necessary and that a large group can make for a very cumbersome process. It has been suggested, therefore, that this process is a short-term one best suited for resolving site-specific plans and conflicts (BCRT et al., 1994).
By contrast, in value-based groups members participate as individuals and represent a particular or set of values rather than a specific interest group. Members must be carefully selected so as to collectively reflect the diversity of perspectives and interests within the community. This may include such things as background, experience, skills and/or the geographic location in which members reside. Due to their lack of responsibility for reporting to outside groups these groups may experience considerable difficulty in establishing links with the community, keeping abreast of local issues, and gaining commitment and/or support for decisions made by the table. Nevertheless, this process often leads to greater flexibility and creativity and is thus a useful technique for long-range planning, the development of choices, visions or policies (BCRT et al., 1994).

Note that there are variations of these two models. Some have both types of representation (e.g. the Anahim Round Table). Others enable members to speak for a number of interests at any time. The terms and type of membership may also vary. The Salmon River Watershed Round Table draws upon a pool of members depending on the type of issue that arises. The Comox-Courtenay Round Table invites all members of the public to attend their meetings which are essentially informal community forums. The Howe Sound Round Table consists of 18-25 members that are appointed for staggered terms (BCRT et al., 1994).

(ii) Consensus Decision-Making

Round tables and other multi-stakeholder groups typically make decisions by consensus. Consensus requires that all stakeholders agree to a decision. Agreement may not necessarily imply that all parties are completely satisfied with everything in the terms, but they are nevertheless willing to make some compromises and accept the agreement (i.e. there is no
substantial disagreement). In this manner, consensus-based processes strive for a mutually beneficial decision that avoids the creation of winners and losers. (BCRT et al., 1994). The BCRT (*Building Consensus for a Sustainable Future, 1993*) suggests the following key elements of consensus:

"-designed by participants who are responsible for and committed to the process.
-provides a forum that forges new partnerships and fosters cooperative problem-solving.
-ensures all significant interests are represented and respected.
-enables participants to deal with each other directly.
-gives an effective and equal voice to all participants." (BCRT, 1993).

Consensus-based processes are becoming increasingly common as more and more organizations realize the usefulness of this tool in decision-making. Business, government, non-governmental organizations, and other groups have explored the use of consensus in a wide range of applications. As an example, consensus may be used at all stages of decision-making around issues of sustainability: the establishment of broad policies and long range plans, the allocation of land and resources, conflict resolution, as well as monitoring and enforcement (BCRT et al., 1994). All in all, consensus may serve to improve the working relationships between all participating interests, to build respect and understanding, as well as to allow for better informed, balanced decision-making. Nevertheless, there are situations in which consensus may not be appropriate. *Building Consensus for a Sustainable Future* (1993) suggests that amongst other things, consensus can only be applied where there are incentives to participate, where the major interests can be identified, and where meaningful deadlines for reaching agreement can be established.
(iii) **Address Sustainability**

Local round tables have a broad mandate to address sustainability issues at the local level. The B.C. Round Table advocated the following broad principles for sustainability (BCRT, 1993e):

- limit our impact on the living world to stay within its carrying capacity.
- preserve and protect the environmental resources including biological diversity.
- promote long-term economic development through increased efficiency and diversification so that environmental assets are not denuded.
- meet basic human needs and aim for a fair distribution of the costs and benefits of resource use and environmental protection.
- provide a system of decision-making and governance that is more proactive and participatory and designed to address sustainability.
- inform, educate and promote values that support sustainability.

Many local round tables and other multi-stakeholder groups have adopted these basic principles in sum or in part.

Note that some local round tables address specific issues only. For example the Bulkley Valley Community Resource Board is engaged in the preparation of a forest land management plan for the Bulkley Timber Supply Area. It is interesting to note that in B.C. many round tables seem to have a natural resource/environmental focus. By contrast, in rural Manitoba, the Community Choices program found that: “economic development, education and health were the key areas of interest of most round tables, while environmental, infrastructure, recreation and heritage were less frequently addressed” (Bax, 1994).

(iv) **Continuing Bodies**

Local round tables (LRTs) typically have a mandate to address broad problems that require a long-term solution rather than specific problems that can be remedied in a short time span. Hence, LRTs tend to be continuing bodies with an ongoing mandate. The time and energy invested into their establishment, fundraising and membership reflects this long-term role.
Ideally, they should strengthen with every new challenge, yet be resilient and flexible enough to adapt to changing community needs. Since local round tables are a relatively new concept, not much is known about the average lifespan of these evolving bodies.

(v) Advisory Role

Local round tables can act as advisory bodies to the local government, community and industry groups that they serve. In this capacity local round tables (LRTs) may develop strategies, plans, ideas and recommend policies to be set forward to these groups who will then make the final decisions. Ronald Doering, executive director of the NRTEE, claims that many LRTs are unclear as to their advisory role. Doering (1995) suggests that an advisory process

"...occurs when one party (often government) consults with a broad range of interests usually to obtain comment on a prepared draft document. The function of the multi-stakeholder group is to provide feedback through comment and discussion according to the pace and terms of the initiating party." By contrast, “Consensus processes are participant determined and driven. A group is convened, asked to define a process to achieve certain shared objectives, and through that process the parties develop, at their pace, a position that each party or stakeholder can live with.”

Thus, according to Doering, consensus-based local round tables that have no authoritative supervisor perform a different role than those groups that are established to provide consultation to a sponsoring agency. Many frustrations have resulted from lack of clarity on this critical distinction as well as from attempts made to blend the two approaches.

It is important to note that there are many variations of these five general criteria for local round tables. Thus there is no single model that all LRTs follow. Alternative strategies may offer valuable lessons for other developing and existing LRTs thereby contributing to the greater understanding and effectiveness of these still very experimental structures.
2.4.2 Purpose and Potential of Local Round Tables

Round tables may form for a variety of reasons. For example they may be established in response to a perceived need in the community or region. They may be formed in reaction to a crisis or conflict or other important issue. Alternatively they may be founded to establish a forum to develop a shared community vision. In some instances, round tables have been formed under the direction of a local government (e.g. through the Chamber of Commerce, or the Ministry of Forests) --usually to obtain community advice on planning related issues. In still other cases, local round tables have been formed as joint initiatives with other already established community bodies such as Healthy Communities and environmental groups.

The B.C. Round Table et al. (1994) provides a very useful breakdown of the kinds of activities that LRTs might undertake. These activities include:

- drafting a vision, principles or goals.
- providing information and teaching necessary skills.
- encouraging efforts in sustainable living.
- reviewing government policies and programs.
- addressing specific issues.
- monitoring the state of local sustainability.
- helping to resolve conflicts.
- enhancing community self-reliance through networking.
- sponsoring "hands-on" efforts.
- raising community awareness of sustainability.

2.4.3 Role of Government With Respect To Local Round Tables

Many opposing and contentious opinions have been expressed as to whether and to what degree government should be represented on local round tables. Both models with and without government representatives have distinct disadvantages and advantages. The Capital Regional District Round Table in Victoria provides an example of a LRT that was initiated by local government agencies. This 21 member round table was appointed by the Capital Regional
District in August 1990. Its purpose is to obtain direct community input and it is responsible for undertaking specific inquiries on long-term planning issues affecting the region. While three Capital Regional District (CRD) members sit at the table, this group also reports and makes recommendations to the CRD Board. By contrast, the Howe Sound Round Table provides an example of a table that was started as a community initiative. This type of grassroots group may involve government agencies in certain activities (for example: defining terms of reference, appointing members and securing funding). Some may encourage local government officials to participate as members in LRT meetings. While others may have no have little or no connection to government at all.

Some local groups must make difficult choices as to the extent of government involvement at the table. Close links to government provide the following advantages: help to establish clear reporting relationships, help to build public profile for the LRT, improve possibilities of support and funding, and enhance the potential for recommendations to be given more immediate and serious attention. On the other hand, government involvement may reduce momentum and community acceptance.

Grassroots LRTs that minimize or prohibit government involvement are able to "avoid the controlling affects from political institutions and are perceived as having a greater degree of independence and neutrality" (BCRT et al., 1994). Unfortunately these benefits have to be weighted against the potential "resistance from local governments who may see LRTs as a potential challenge to their authority rather than complementing existing government structures" (BCRT et al., 1994).
2.5 CURRENT LOCAL ROUND TABLE GUIDES AND PRELIMINARY THEORIES

Local round tables are still a relatively new concept and thus any theories or guidelines on their function and operations are still largely experimental. In this province, at least four documents have made an attempt to guide the development of local round tables. Choosing the Right Path (BCRT, 1991) targets community leaders and municipalities alike. It reveals the importance of community involvement with sustainability and points to a number a successful local initiatives. The Guide to Establishing a Local Round Table (BCRT, 1991) provides a definition of local round tables and describes the purposes that they may perform. An introduction to the kinds of things that LRTs must consider are also given: geographic scope, membership, terms of reference, consensus decision-making and the role of government with respect to LRTs. Local Round Tables: Realizing Their Full Potential (BCRT et al., 1994) expands on the knowledge provided in the previous guide and sheds light on a few noteworthy examples of community round tables in B.C.. Most recently, Community Stewardship (FBMP, et al., 1995) provides a very hands-on and practical approach to the development of stewardship groups (including local round tables).

Local Round Tables: Realizing Their Full Potential (BCRT et al., 1994) outlines the following key steps to be taken in establishing a local round table:

- establish a terms of reference.
- develop an agenda or prioritized action work plan including specific strategies/ tasks to be taken.
- gain support and “buy-in” from interest groups and government.
- promote sustainability and educate the community at large.
- convene a process for the appointment of members.
- determine size and scope.
- cultivate a style of operation.
- agree on the definition of key terms (e.g. sustainability, consensus).
- build alliances (with government, First Nations, industry, labour, interest groups etc.).
- build in flexibility to adapt over time.
The following first tasks for LRTs, once established, are suggested by the Guide to Establishing a Local Round Table (BCRT, 1991):

- develop a community definition of sustainability.
- develop a community vision statement of sustainability.
- develop an agenda of priority sustainability issues and initiatives including explicit tasks and time frames.
- plan a workshop to brainstorm ways of measuring progress towards sustainability through community-based indicators.
- develop a strategy for reporting sustainability: newsletters, updates on activities and achievements within the community.

The success of local round tables has been attributed to how well they are able to tap local knowledge and resources, to develop clear objectives, to respond quickly to problems, and to present creative solutions to those problems (CORE, 1994d). Yet, while their ability to develop more constructive and acceptable decisions is a remarkable strength of these groups, the complexities inherent in such processes may diminish their chances for success.² Building Consensus For A Sustainable Future (NRTEE, 1993), while not specifically aimed at local round tables, offers a number of concise principles that could greatly enhance the performance of these groups. This document suggests that effective consensus processes should:

- be purpose driven --people need a reason to participate in the process.
- be inclusive involve all parties with a significant interest in the outcome.
- operate through voluntary participation.
- be self-designed --group ownership of the process.
- be facilitated --an impartial person can act as a catalyst in suggesting design options.
- be flexible --to enable it to adapt to changing environmental cues.
- offer equal opportunities to all parties to enable them to participate in the process.
- respect diverse interests.
- accommodate feedback --to help strengthen commitment and minimize surprises.
- be accountable --all parties are accountable to their constituencies & to the process agreed on.
- set time limits and manageable tasks.
- include a mechanism for monitoring and commitment /support for implementation.

² Few local round tables have documented in any detail their apparent strengths and weaknesses. The Skeena Round Table is a noticeable exception. In a letter to Rick Wilson dated May 9, 1994 the Skeena Round Table lists a number of factors that have contributed to their success and failure. A summary of these factors is provided in the Appendix.
Each of these documents, taken separately, provide useful guidelines for local round tables. Nevertheless, the information that is missing in each separate document becomes apparent when they are displayed side by side for comparison. Taken together, this information provides for a much richer, more comprehensive approach for LRTs. Thus, the elementary LRT principles and guidelines that currently exist reveal information in a very piecemeal fashion and have yet to be incorporated into an acceptable theory for local round tables. In addition, these principles and guidelines have not satisfactorily been proven to provide a suitable theoretical framework for viewing local round tables. As a result, this research uses the more studied and accepted model of collaboration theory for examining the establishment and operations of community round tables. Nevertheless, the above principles and guidelines should not be ignored. In fact, as will become apparent in the next section, their advice is in many ways strikingly similar to that of collaboration theory.

2.6 COLLABORATION THEORY

2.6.1 Derivation and Meaning of Collaboration Theory

While collaboration theory is a relatively new concept, its acceptance is growing. Gray (1989), one of the principle authors of this theory, describes collaboration as:

"...a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible."

Collaboration requires the participation of interested parties including all individuals, groups, or organizations that are directly influenced by the problem or by the actions taken to solve the problem. Participants are involved in a joint decision-making process that requires a recognition of their interdependence and a willingness to jointly search for tradeoffs. The collaborative
process is emergent rather than prescribed or fixed and it evolves as stakeholders learn to deal constructively with their differences (Gray, 1989).

Collaboration has been used by public officials, planners, managers, scientists, lawyers, dispute resolution practitioners, and private citizens alike. This tool is particularly useful where:

- problems are poorly defined.
- stakeholders have a vested interest in the problems and the latter are interdependent.
- stakeholders are not necessarily identified a priori or organized in any systematic way.
- disparity of power and/or resources for dealing with the problems exists.
- problems are compounded by technical complexity and scientific uncertainty.
- differing perspectives and interests lead to adversarial relationships among parties.
- problems are ongoing and cannot be alleviated by an immediate or ultimate solution.
- level of expertise and access to information varies (Gray, 1989).

Many of these situations fall into a category of what Rittel and Webber (1973) call “wicked problems.” These complex, societal problems are typical problems that planners must face. Briefly these problems are difficult to isolate and define, and are ongoing. They cannot be alleviated by a single solution and are usually inextricably linked with other problems.

2.6.2 Impetus for Collaboration

Gray (1989) and Chrislip and Larson (1994) offer a number of important incentives to collaborate. These include:

1. *Frustrations with Inadequacy or Lack of Public Participation Processes*
   Many public participation processes have left citizens feeling frustrated. Governments often do not seem to respond to the concerns of ordinary individuals and neighbourhoods, but instead focus attention on key interest groups and powerful players. Public hearings have been described as manipulative processes “...in which grudging officials perfunctorily fulfill their obligation to solicit public input prior to doing as they please...” (Chrislip and Larson, 1994). Interest groups, for their part, have been accused of inviting polarization, increasing antagonism as well as fragmenting power and political will. Each group is convinced of the righteousness of its case, and is prepared to battle against other groups for mutually exclusive positions. Few speak for the broader interests of society. United by a deep sense of commitment to themselves and the community, many community groups are striving to create a shared vision and joint strategies to address concerns that go beyond the interests of any particular party (Chrislip and Larson, 1994).

2. *Fear of Political Manipulation*
   Bruton and Howlett (1992) report that “In any field, the failure of “public” interests (including community organizations, business groups, citizen activists and experts) to establish “networks” which produce unified and
coherent policy proposals can allow both politicians and administrators to manipulate policy processes and outcomes in their own electoral or bureaucratic interests..." 

Global competition is redefining the roles of labour and management, business and government as well as integrating the relations between one level of government and another. Planners at the local level need to take leadership roles in convening stakeholders and initiating collaborative processes (Gray, 1989).

4. Dissatisfaction with the Judicial Process for Solving Problems
Costs and long delays associated with the over burdened judicial system are major incentives to collaborate (Gray, 1989).

5. Shrinking Federal Revenues for Social Programs
As federal funds evaporate, private-public partnerships emerge to fill the void. Local partnerships have also begun to address social (as well as economic and environmental) problems (Gray, 1989).

6. Rapid Economic and Technological Change
Existing practices/ methods may become obsolete overnight and some industries may not be able to adapt. Collaboration may provide expanded access to markets, may promote a sharing of information and resources and a reduction in competition (Gray, 1989).

7. Declining Productivity, Economic Growth and Increasing Competitive Pressures
These effects have been felt particularly hard by the USA and its major competitors. Results are manifested in a loss of competitive advantage compared to other industrialized nations. Collaboration may help to join forces and retain competitive edge (Gray, 1989).

8. Global Interdependence
New communications technologies and increased international trade have heightened the interdependence of local communities on national and international issues and have elevated local political issues to global importance (Gray, 1989).

2.6.3 Outcomes of Collaborative Processes
Different motivations for collaboration yield different outcomes. Gray (1989) suggests that the two key motivations for using collaboration are to resolve conflicts or to advance a shared vision. The principal outcomes of collaboration are to exchange information or to develop a joint agreement (See Table 2.3).
Table 2.3 Motivations and Expected Outcomes of Collaboration. (Adapted from Gray, 1989.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation to Collaborate</th>
<th>EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>JOINT AGREEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHARED VISION</td>
<td>appreciative planning fosters joint inquiry about the problem without expecting that explicit agreements will be reached or that actions will ensue. (e.g. community gatherings).</td>
<td>collective strategies create specific agreements to address the problem or carry out a vision. Often emerge from appreciative planning. (e.g. public-private partnerships, joint ventures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLVING CONFLICT</td>
<td>dialogues explore differences, clarify areas of disagreement and search for common ground without the expectation that binding agreements will emerge. (e.g. facilitated public meetings).</td>
<td>negotiated settlements produce agreements that are binding or recommendations to an agency that has agreed to ratify them as such. (e.g. regulatory negotiations, site specific disputes).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that these outcomes are not mutually exclusive and in fact a process that pursues an exchange of information may eventually, but not necessarily, evolve into one that produces a joint agreement as well. In addition, a very useful but perhaps somewhat neglected outcome of collaboration is the development of a sense of community. When collaboration succeeds, new networks and norms for civic engagement are established and the primary focus shifts from parochial interests to the broader concerns of the community. Thus rather than relying on advocacy, hierarchy, exclusion and power to achieve narrow ends; collaboration encourages trust, inclusion and constructive alliances to achieve a broader common purpose (Chrislip and Larson, 1994).

2.6.4 Benefits and Limitations of Collaboration

Gray (1989), Chrislip and Larson (1994) site the following benefits of collaboration:

- offers a broad comprehensive analysis of the problem and improves the quality of solutions.
- may help to reopen dead-locked negotiations, and minimize the risk of impasse.
- ensures that all interests/perspectives are considered in any agreement.
- enables parties to retain ownership of the final decision.
- enhances the acceptance of the solution and the willingness to implement it.
- may improve present and future relations between stakeholders.
• may ‘empower’ citizens and groups by allowing participants to take on new leadership roles within the community.
• may fundamentally change the way communities ‘do business’ by replacing widespread competition. (Although our inherited value structure is still very much against this reversal.)

Despite these benefits, collaboration does have some limitations in both its theory and its use. Wood and Gray (1991) note the following limitations:

• most perspectives are oriented toward the individual organization (firm or agency) rather than toward an inter-organizational problem domain. To apply most existing organizational theories to collaborative situations, the focus must shift explicitly from single organizational to inter-organizational relationships.
• business and government leaders need to recognize that collaboration rather than competition, must become the leading value in inter-organizational relations if organizations and nations are to survive growing economic pressures.

Further collaboration may be difficult to apply or even inappropriate where:

• there is no strong reason or incentive to participate.
• issues at hand are highly contentious and/or political and may need to be resolved through government policies or through the judicial system.
• progress is obstructed by a previous unresolved impasse or antagonistic relationship.
• a viable, mutually agreeable process cannot be structured (NRTEE, 1993).

Table 2.4 outlines some further barriers to collaboration.

Table 2.4: Obstacles to Collaboration. (Adapted from Gray, 1989.)

| 1. Institutional Disincentives: For example environmental groups claim that negotiation dilutes their cause and thus they prefer an advocacy approach. Also, participation in collaboration may be seen as a drain on time and financial resources. |
| 2. Historical and Ideological Barriers: Historical relationships characterized by long-standing bitter adversarial interactions among parties may hinder collaboration. |
| 3. Power Disparities: Some parties may be reluctant to collaborate if the process does not provide a level playing field for all concerned. |
| 4. Better Alternative: Other parties may prefer not to collaborate if they have a BATNA, or better alternative to a negotiated agreement (Fisher and Ury, 1981). |
| 5. Societal-Level Dynamics: Cultural norms (especially in North America) are rooted in a strong sense of individualism, which encourages people to view collaboration with skepticism, seeing negotiation as a sign of weakness rather than as a worthwhile challenge. |
| 6. Differing Perceptions of Risk: Differing perceptions of risk between proponents of a project and other stakeholders are often at the heart of the dispute. |
| 7. Technical Complexity: Complexity of issues may present problems especially with regard to information exchange and assessment. |
| 8. Political and Institutional Cultures: Institutional cultures within organizations (e.g. bureaucracy) are often formidable and very slow to change. They often require education about the advances of collaboration along with guidelines and incentives for use. |
2.6.5 Criteria for Successful Collaboration

Two obvious objective criteria for determining the success of collaboration are: whether or not agreement was reached, and whether or not the agreement was implemented. But subjective criteria are also important to reflect the participants' assessment of the process. Gray (1989), Chrislip and Larson (1994) site a number of objective and subjective criteria or conditions for successful collaboration. These criteria are summarized as follows:

- sense of urgency and timeliness to maintain interest and momentum.
- broad-based involvement together with strong leadership.
- joint participant ownership of decisions so that parties feel they affected the decision.
- process overcomes skepticism, builds trust and fosters credibility and openness.
- good relationships are maintained with constituents, community, business and government.
- agreement produces joint gains for the parties and holds up over time.
- feedback and monitoring ensure that the outcome satisfies the real issues in the dispute.

Note that realistically, a successful collaboration will satisfy several but not all of these criteria.

2.7 DERIVATION OF AN APPLICABLE COLLABORATION FRAMEWORK

Local round tables have special qualities that distinguish them from other collaborative processes. Hence, in order to derive a suitable collaboration framework for examining local round tables, existing collaboration models cannot be used as presented, but must be slightly adapted. The following paragraphs draw attention to some of the distinguishing qualities of local round tables and show where existing collaboration models fall short of accommodating these factors.

McCann (1983) has suggested a model for social problem solving that identifies three steps: problem setting, direction setting and structuring. Gray (1989) adopted a similar model, but changed the structuring phase to implementation. Implementation and monitoring are extremely important for local round tables striving to stay in touch with community needs. Both
of these models provide an effective planning framework for identifying the problem, deriving goals and options, establishing responsibilities and carrying out the agreed actions. Waddock (1989), however points out two other activities—shaping out a planning framework and focussing attention on a particular issue—that begin prior to problem setting and are in fact influenced by the environmental context. External environmental forces such as societal values, public policies and community visions can exert considerable influence on the development and establishment of local round tables.

Another issue that Waddock (1989) raises, is the importance of coalition building. This term refers to the incorporation of the relevant actors and the balancing of power among them. These elements are especially important to round tables and dispute resolution groups and failure to address them adequately at the early stages of development can have a profound effect on the proper functioning and success of these groups.

Thus, a suitable collaborative framework for studying local round tables must explicitly include steps to assess the environmental context, to guide the establishment of relationships both internally and externally as well as to monitor its performance and obtain feedback. Figure 2.1 presents a framework for collaboration that is a composite of those derived by Waddock (1989), Gray (1989), McCann (1983) and Selin and Chavez (1995). Here, the original three stage model has been expanded to incorporate issue crystallization, relationship building and implementation as separate stages. The resulting model, adapted for relevance to local round tables, now consists of the following five steps: issue crystallization, problem setting, direction setting, relationship building, and implementation. By using this proposed framework to structure both the data collection and analysis of the case study, the merits of this framework as a mechanism to guide the establishment and operations of local round tables will be tested.
Figure 2.1: Proposed Collaboration Framework for Guiding the Establishment and Operations of Local Round Tables.
Note that all the stages in this model are interactive, iterative and cyclical. They also represent continuous and concurrent processes. Each stage will now be discussed in turn.

2.7.1 Stages of the Proposed Collaboration Framework

Stage 1: Issue Crystallization

Issue crystallization involves a process of shaping or forming of an issue (that has emerged from the environmental context) in a manner that builds understanding, and encourages parties to interact and form partnerships. Waddock (1989) claims that organizations that are potential partners exist in a broad societal environment that exerts many forces on them. Some of these forces are competitive, technological or task related; others are political, socio-cultural or economic. Waddock (1989) further identifies six types of environmental forces or pressures that can encourage interaction:

1. mandate of the legal system or public policy.
2. existing networks that introduce potential members.
3. pressure from a third party organization.
4. public pressure for a common vision or understanding about an issue.
5. public pressure regarding a crisis that directs the energies of potential partners towards a specific problem.
6. visionary leadership on the part of individuals who champion the partnership idea.

While not all of these forces are necessary in every partnership, at least one or a combination of several, must be present. Also, since these forces are constantly changing, the partnerships that they shape are inherently very fragile in this “preplanning” stage of collaboration.
Stage 2: Problem Setting

Getting people to the table so that face-to-face dialogue can begin, is a primary concern for this stage which Gray (1989) divides into the following steps:

(a) Common Definition of the Problem
If some stakeholders are satisfied with the problem definition but not others, the latter will have little incentive to collaborate. A neutral third party mediator is often needed to identify the barriers to collaboration, to draw attention to the interdependence of stakeholders or to tease out a problem definition.

(b) Commitment to Collaborate
Sharing a common definition of a problem is often not enough by itself to encourage people to commit to the process. A participant’s commitment to collaborate is strengthened if he/she believes that: collaboration will produce positive outcomes, a fair agreement is possible, all participants are equal players, there is no better alternative to collaboration and the timing for collaboration is ripe.

(c) Identification of the Stakeholders
This step together with the next are extremely important in determining the legitimacy and credibility of the collaborative process. Chrislip and Larson (1994), provide a summary of questions that need to be addressed in the stakeholder identification process: Which interests and perspectives must be represented in order to reach an agreement that can be implemented? Who are the people who can speak for these perspectives and interests? Who are the people who are affected by the problems and possible solutions? Who can block action and control resources? Who are the people/ groups needed to implement solutions? And who, in agreement, could generate the political and institutional will to create significant change?

(d) Legitimacy of the Stakeholders
Care must be taken to ensure both legitimacy and ‘representativeness’ of stakeholders at the table. The assistance of a mediator may be required to convene various constituency groups and to help them identify an appropriate representative (Gray, 1989).

(e) Convenor Characteristics
Chrislip and Larson (1994) suggest that the primary role of leadership is to safeguard the collaborative process and to promote continued interaction. In other words, leaders must help to provide an appropriate forum in which participants can create their own visions and solve their own problems. Leaders or convenors require “convening power” which enables them to earn the trust of participants and to draw them to the table (Gray, 1989). The convenor may be an individual or group (e.g. initiating committees or steering committees) and may or may not be a stakeholder in the problem. Note that collaboration cannot succeed unless there are a few people whose primary attention is on making the process work.

(f) Identification of Resources
In most multi-party negotiations, some resources are needed to launch the process (mediator fees, mailouts etc.). Further costs in terms of both money and time may be incurred later by the parties in participating at the table. Securing adequate funds is a necessary step in problem setting to ensure that no avoidable hardships are posed on one or more stakeholder groups and each is given an equal opportunity to participate in the process.
Stage 3: Direction Setting

McCann (1983) refers to direction setting as that stage where stakeholders articulate the values that guide their individual pursuits and begin to identify and appreciate a sense of common purpose or direction. Here positive outcomes are associated with important procedural and substantive issues. Stakeholders identify the interests that brought them to the table, separate these interests according to their similarities and differences and thereby begin to form the basis for eventual trade-offs.

(a) Purpose Formulation
Waddock (1989) describes purpose formulation as the process of determining "what the scope or degree of domain overlap for partners will actually be; a process of building domain consensus and establishing goals for partnership." In partnerships attempting to address complex societal issues the goals themselves may be constantly emerging, as the mandate and agenda of the group evolves. Goals may need to be redefined to fit the changing environmental context. They should also be manageable and well-defined in scope. Final and interim goals once accomplished should be celebrated to reward participants for their efforts and to maintain momentum.

(b) Establishing Ground Rules
Reaching agreement about how stakeholders will interact with each other is vital. Solid ground rules—which should be agreed upon by all parties—can remove many of the uncertainties associated with roles and responsibilities and modes of operation, thereby also reducing any misunderstandings between parties.

(c) Agenda Setting
Care must be taken to ensure that all parties are given an equal share in contributing to the agenda. If some parties are not convinced that the agenda reflects their interests they may lose commitment to the process. Agenda items should include both substantive and procedural aspects of the collaboration and should suggest a reasonable time frame for completion.

(d) Structuring
The type of structure assumed by the group will depend in part as to whether the collaboration is organized for information exchange or for dispute resolution. Collaborations organized purely for information exchange tend to be less formal, ad hoc processes. In addition, the structure may vary depending on who has responsibility and resources to affect change and implement the recommended actions. The formation of subgroups or task forces is a useful tool to allow the main group to function more efficiently. Subgroups may be charged with exploring one or more issues each and preparing a report to the plenary group along with recommendations for addressing the issues.

(e) Joint Information Search
Often parties have access to different sources of data or insufficient data. A joint information search is needed for parties to mutually examine relevant data. For complex technical problems that use scientific terminology and theoretical principles a panel of experts may be required.
**Stage 4: Coalition or Relationship Building**

According to Waddock (1989), coalition building focuses on four principle factors: balancing power amongst stakeholders, building and maintaining working relations among members, exploring different interests/values, building trust as well as gaining top management commitment and support. Yet there is another factor of particular importance for local round tables that should be added to this list: that of building acceptance and support from constituency groups and members of the broader community. Reasons for this shall become apparent later.

**Stage 5: Implementation and Monitoring**

Carefully forged agreements can fall apart unless deliberate attention is given to several issues during the implementation phase. The steps below are adapted from Chrislip and Larson (1994) and Gray (1989).

(a) *Dealing with Constituencies*
Representatives at negotiations are faced with having to persuade their respective constituencies that the agreement reached is the best that could be secured. If parties do not have the support of their constituencies, the latter may be urged to disavow the agreement or block its implementation at a later date.

(b) *Building External Support*
Establishing the support of those responsible for implementing the agreement is critical. In order to encourage this support, clear and effective communication channels must be in place.

(c) *Monitoring the Agreement and Ensuring Compliance*
The establishment of a sound negotiated agreement is no guarantee that the solution will be implemented. Collaboration is especially susceptible to collapse during implementation and particularly if the issues at hand are contentious and the potential for conflict is great. In some cases it may be necessary to create a temporary organization to oversee the implementation of a negotiated agreement. Alternatively a referent organization may be able to help in this regard. Chrislip and Larson (1994) suggest that collaboration is an interactive process that requires sustained self-critical evaluation and monitoring.

(d) *Feedback and Review*
The importance of feedback cannot be overestimated. Feedback from participants and from the broader community keeps the organization and its process in touch with the changing environmental context and societal forces. It steers the deliberations to keep them focussed and it helps to broaden agendas.
CHAPTER 3: CASE STUDY OF THE HOWE SOUND ROUND TABLE

3.1 ORIGIN AND IMPETUS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HOWE SOUND ROUND TABLE

The Howe Sound Round Table (HSRT) is a community-based advisory body made up of members from a wide variety of perspectives. A relatively new organization, this body was launched in July 1993 with a broad mandate to promote environmental, social and economic sustainability in the Howe Sound watershed.

The Howe Sound watershed region as defined by the Howe Sound Round Table is comprised of: a number of municipalities (West Vancouver, Lions Bay, Squamish, Sechelt, Whistler), unincorporated areas (Britannia Beach), two islands (Gambier, Bowen) and two First Nations Bands. (See Figure 3.1) This area of approximately 4000 square kilometres offers a wide variety of amenities and natural features including: a world class ski resort, pulp mill and other major industries, large tracts of forested lands, fisheries, wildlife, water resources as well as panoramic views.

Nevertheless, the region is already succumbing to negative impacts due to the influx of residents, tourists and developers that have been lured to this rich and diverse landscape. The population of the Vancouver-Whistler corridor is expected to rise from its current level of 20,000 to 85,000 by early in the next century. Logging, mining, residential development, pulp and paper production and other activities place increasing demands on the resources within the area. Water and air quality have suffered from the release of wastewater and chemical pollutants (Lacombe et al., 1994). Severe loss of fisheries and fish habitat has occurred. Steep terrain and sensitive areas have led to the establishment of inadequate infrastructure and sewage facilities, while rapid development calls for an urgent area-wide growth management strategy (HSRT, 1995).
Figure 3.1 Map of the Howe Sound Region as Defined by the Howe Sound Round Table.

(Adapted from Survey and Mapping Br, Dept. Energy, Mines and Resource 1978)
Management of the region forms an important concern for government. Whistler, Squamish, Sechelt, and West Vancouver all have Official Community Plans to guide development and land use within their urban areas. Recent plans for the development of Britannia Beach, Furry Creek and Porteau Lands have spurred efforts towards the establishment of a Howe Sound East Master Plan (which will cover all those areas). At the provincial level, the Ministry of Forests; Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks; Ministry of Tourism; Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum all have specific roles to play. At the federal level, Department of Fisheries and Oceans has jurisdiction over fisheries resources and habitat.

Many difficulties with respect to governance are found here: increasing competition for scarce resources, cross-jurisdictional boundaries that bisect a watershed region and a diverse spectrum of interests and perspectives. Effective governance of the Howe Sound region requires the active participation of the citizens working and residing within the area. Some citizens are starting to assume more responsibility, and to take on their own stewardship initiatives instead of solely depending on government as they used to. The Howe Sound Round Table (HSRT) is one example of a community stewardship organization that has formed within the region. Other examples include the: Sunshine Coast Community Resource Council, Howe Sound Research Council, and the Squamish Estuary Society.

The initial task of establishing a local round table for the Howe Sound region was adopted by the Save Howe Sound Society—a local environmental group— in the summer of 1991. With the aid of volunteers, this society organized a conference to bring together representatives of a wide range of interests to discuss this proposal. The April 26, 1992 conference was attended by 70 delegates from such sectors as: industry, First Nations, local and provincial governments, business, recreation, environment, health and education. Conference participants supported the
establishment of a local round table for the Howe Sound region and appointed a Steering Committee to discuss the operations and structure of the HSRT and then to report back to the conference delegates, government and the community at large. Over the course of the next year, the Steering Committee, which roughly reflected the diversity of interests in the community, deliberated over the goals, terms of reference, structure and membership requirements of the HSRT. Finally a *Proposal to Establish a Local Round Table for the Howe Sound Sub-Region* was produced. This document was presented at a conference in July 1993 attended by members of the community, CORE, the B.C. Round Table, elected officials as well as the newly selected members of the HSRT. Thus the Howe Sound Round Table was launched.

### 3.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE HOWE SOUND ROUND TABLE

#### 3.2.1 Mission Statement

The Steering Committee recommended that the HSRT adopt the following mission statement:

> The Howe Sound Round Table is an advisory planning body that seeks to promote integrated environmental, social and economic sustainability in the Howe Sound sub-region in part through the development of a sustainability strategy (Howe Sound Round Table Steering Committee, 1993).

Further it was recommended that the work of the table be guided by the principles of sustainability as set out by the B.C. Round Table (Refer to Section 2.4.1 (iii)).

#### 3.2.2 Objectives

The Steering Committee also outlined a series of objectives for the HSRT, emphasizing that the group should establish strategic priorities from amongst these objectives according to the availability of resources and funding. When the HSRT officially became a non-profit group
under the *B.C. Societies Act* in late 1993, these objectives were incorporated into the HSRTs constitution with only a few small changes. These objectives are as follows:

**Objective 1:** To provide recommendations on environmental, economic and social sustainability with respect to specific initiatives or issues.

**Objective 2:** To review, develop, support and promote policies and initiatives for environmental, economic and social sustainability for the Howe Sound.

**Objective 3:** To assist with consensus-based processes for resolving site-specific issues within the Howe Sound.

**Objective 4:** To consult with and consider submissions from concerned individuals and groups on issues and problems related to sustainability.

**Objective 5:** To promote public education and action on the principles of environmental, economic and social sustainability in the Howe Sound, as well as the roles and responsibilities involved in achieving this goal.

**Objective 6:** To encourage a bioregional or watershed perspective through inventory, monitoring and assessment of economic, environmental and social systems in the Howe Sound. (HSRT Constitution, 1994)

### 3.2.3 Membership

It was established at an early date that HSRT membership should reflect the diversity of backgrounds, experience and values within the region. In other words, members were to be representative of the wide range of perspectives (social, cultural, economic and environmental) within the Howe Sound region, while at the same time balancing representation from all the geographic areas present (including rural and urban). Table 3.1 lists examples of community sectors that should be considered for representation. In addition, care should be taken to ensure a balance of gender, culture and ages. Finally, members of this multi-stakeholder group should be selected as individuals and not as representatives of any particular interest group or organization (HSRT Steering Committee, Feb. 1993). Thus the HSRT is a value and not an interest-based multi-stakeholder group. (Refer to Section 2.4.1(i) for a full explanation of these two terms).
Table 3.1 Examples of Community Sectors to be Considered for Representation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agriculture</th>
<th>business, industry</th>
<th>education</th>
<th>utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fisheries</td>
<td>forestry</td>
<td>mining</td>
<td>mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labour</td>
<td>mining</td>
<td>mining</td>
<td>mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth, seniors</td>
<td>recreation, tourism</td>
<td>recreation, tourism</td>
<td>recreation, tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial appointment of members to the HSRT was performed by a Selection Committee comprised of: Steering Committee members, one representative each from CORE and the B.C. Round Table and one or two additional members (at the discretion and invitation of the Selection Committee). While these initial appointments were staggered for one and two year terms to ensure continuity, standard terms of appointment would be for two years, with no member serving more than three consecutive terms.

Recognizing that a large number of people would be particularly cumbersome for this consensus-based process, the Steering Committee recommended that a maximum of 25 members be appointed to the Howe Sound Round Table (HSRT Steering Committee, 1993). Currently the HSRT consists of 17 members. A complete list of Steering Committee members and HSRT members is provided in the Appendix.

New members are currently appointed through a Community Appointments Committee (CAC) made up of individuals from CORE, government as well as three HSRT members. Their selection process and criteria for selection are much the same as those used by the Steering Committee Membership Selection Group. So far three new members have been appointed.

The involvement of elected officials in the HSRT process was debated at length by the Steering Committee. Finally, since elected officials would not be able to commit their council, party or legislative body to a HSRT decision without formal ratification, the Steering Committee recommended that no elected official be a member of the Round Table. Nevertheless,
recognizing the importance of being on good terms with local governments as recipients of potential planning and policy recommendations, and partners in the implementation of these recommendations, the Steering Committee further recommended that elected officials:

- be requested to suggest criteria for membership to the Selection Committee.
- be directly involved in the distribution of information related to the nomination process.
- jointly participate in the announcement of membership to their communities.
- be given an opportunity to meet with HSRT members on a regular basis and be invited to participate whenever it is deemed appropriate.
- be provided with updated information on the HSRT and that the latter assume responsibility for maintaining ongoing communication and interaction with elected local government (HSRT Steering Committee, Feb. 1993).

The HSRT still remains at arms length with government, but continues to recognize the importance of maintaining links. The Community Appointments Committee was seen as a suitable mechanism through which to establish these links. Thus, by inviting government officials to sit on the CAC, it was hoped that liaisons could be formed. Nevertheless, the issue of government involvement and the exact purpose and nature of these links remains unclear.

### 3.2 OPERATING PROCEDURES

In October 1994, the HSRT approved a set of Operating Procedures which outlined: the principles and definition of consensus for the group, modes of communication, terms of reference for the sub-committees, meeting logistics and more. Highlights of these procedures are discussed below.

#### 3.2.1 Structure and Roles

The structure of the HSRT includes members, sub-committee chairs, two co-chairs and two co-ordinators. The latter, who were both founding members of the HSRT Steering Committee, are not considered members of the table. Sub-committees or sub-groups have formed a very important part of the HSRT right from the beginning. Both the tasks undertaken
by these sub-groups and the membership in each is constantly in a state of flux depending on the nature of the project to be achieved and the knowledge and expertise that is required to do it. In addition, while some sub-committees are long-standing and continuous (funding, finances committees), others are more ad hoc and temporary (watershed tour, administrative assistant committees). It is interesting to note that in the first year of operations, most of the sub-committees had an administrative focus and it was not until the second year that project-focussed groups emerged. The present sub-groups within the HSRT along with a brief description of their purpose is given in Table 3.2.

### Table 3.2 Current Howe Sound Round Table Sub-Committees and Their Functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Appointments</td>
<td>to select new members for the HSRT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>to develop an effective accounting system, prepare finance reports including budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>to develop a diversified funding base and to prepare funding proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>to perform legal functions for the group including: application for Society and Charity status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>to develop a communications strategy, plus produce HSRT brochure and newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Stewardship for Sustainability (S3)</td>
<td>to liaise with DFO, design S3 project &amp; prepare Final Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe Sound Conference</td>
<td>to develop a structure and to organize the upcoming visioning conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Projects</td>
<td>to work on special community initiatives including the Household Waste Event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>to schedule agenda items, to circulate information and to make recommendations to the HSRT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2 Internal Decision-Making and Meeting Format

HSRT plenary meetings usually take place once a month in locations that are rotated throughout the region. Sub-committees may meet once or twice in between and sub-committee chairs are expected to give comprehensive updates at the plenary sessions. Full meetings typically last for 4 hours and are usually scheduled on Thursday evenings from 5:00 to 8:00 PM.

The HSRT makes decisions by consensus thereby avoiding the creation of winners and losers. Here, consensus means unanimity, or more precisely, no substantial disagreement. The HSRT goals and principles of consensus (outlined in their Operating Procedures) were adopted, almost word for word, from the BCRT’s consensus policy statements. These goals and
objectives are discussed in more detail in Section 4.3.3. At HSRT meetings, consensus is to be used for decisions addressing all substantive rather than administrative aspects of its mandate.

"In putting the consensus principles into practice, it is recognized that many administrative matters (e.g. location, timing of meetings, budget approvals) and other matter which are not central to the substantive purpose of the Round Table, merit the application of less demanding rules of consensus" (HSRT Operating Procedures, Oct. 1994).

The Steering Committee recommended that the HSRT develop an open-forum policy to guide its interaction with the public. In this manner the round table would be free to invite outside resource persons to participate in discussions of issues where special expertise or knowledge was required. Individuals or groups could also request permission to make a presentation to a particular meeting of the round table when specific issues of concern are to be addressed. Currently, the HSRT has an open door policy, but guests must first be invited by the chairs.

3.2.3 Reporting Relations

While the HSRT was intended to operate as an independent body, it was also anticipated that this society could make recommendations to appropriate decision-makers including government, industry and the broader Howe Sound community. To date the round table has no legislated status, and no formal avenues for advising or reporting to government. As will become apparent later, there are those who feel that without formal government recognition, the success of the group will be seriously hindered.

It was also thought that the HSRT would develop strong links with provincial agencies such as the Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE) and the B.C. Round Table on the Environment and Economy (BCRT). Both these agencies have expressed strong support for the HSRT, but the more formal links that the Steering Committee expected to be forged between
the HSRT and these bodies over time, never materialized. CORE continues to be involved only peripherally, since it has a number of its own pilot local round tables to take care of. The BCRT (while still in existence) paid considerable amount of attention to the HSRT and sighted it as worthy example in *Local Round Tables: Their Full Potential* (1994). In addition, the HSRT itself was fortunate to have an ex-member of the BCRT as one of its co-ordinators and founding members. Currently the Whistler Centre for Business and the Arts is organizing a Council for Sustainability that is expected to take on some of the duties of the former BCRT and the former B.C. Energy Council. So far the Whistler Centre has offered to help fund an upcoming conference to be organized by the HSRT. Further ties have yet to be established. The HSRT is also struggling to develop formal reporting mechanisms with the members of the broader community. Strategies for this line of communication are not very clearly articulated in the *HSRT Operating Procedures* and need to be addressed.

3.3 FUNDING

The Steering Committee recognized that the success of the Howe Sound Round Table would depend largely on the support and commitment of the individuals and communities within the Howe Sound region. For this reason, it was determined that the long-term responsibility for securing funding should rest at the community level. Nevertheless, provincial, federal and even private sector support may be required to cover start-up costs. Further, it was suggested that guidelines for the acceptance and use of targeted funding and donations should be established.

Fund-raising and financial management are key concerns of the HSRT. A reliable source of funding is needed to cover both operational costs (including administrative duties) and project costs (related to specific issues or events). In addition, limited funds must be carefully allocated
to the various duties and projects of the group. To date the organization has been successful in acquiring funds from several financial institutions (VanCity Credit Union and Nova Scotia Bank) as well as from various government agencies: Department of Fisheries and Oceans, CORE etc. While no funds have yet been received from community and business groups, the HSRT is currently in the process of applying for status as a charitable organization in order to facilitate fund-raising.

As a representative community body, accepting donations and funding from various sources does present difficulties. Frequently financial support comes attached with conditions stipulating when and how the money is to be used. On more than one occasion, funds have been donated with the understanding that they are to be used for a specific project only and not for operational costs. Further, the donating body may request input into the objectives and mandate of a particular project. Such conditions may not only hinder the important day-to-day operations of the group, but they may also affect the credibility of the group if it is seen as accepting too much support and advice from any one particular interest group or agency. The HSRT therefore needs a comprehensive set of guidelines for the acceptance and allocation of resources. Table 3.3 presents the original budget of the Howe Sound Round Table.
Table 3.3: Steering Committee budget for the first year of operation of the HSRT. (HSRT Steering Committee, 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Secretarial Staff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator/Administrator</td>
<td>25 000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Secretary</td>
<td>15 000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Research</td>
<td>7 500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>47 500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>2 400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>1 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>1 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Relations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising, Brochures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Forums and Consultation Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>to be determined</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Round Table Membership Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax/Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>to be determined</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>54 000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding 3 and 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 WORK PERFORMED THUS FAR

The HSRT has concentrated its efforts into three main areas since its first meeting in October 1993: establishment, maintenance, and goal achievement (addressing specific projects and issues). The principal achievements made in each of the three areas is provided in Table 3.3. To date the HSRT has directed the majority of its efforts into establishment and maintenance -- developing a better understanding of its role and methods of operation. The S3 initiative is the only outside project completed by the organization as yet, although two others are already well under way.
Table 3.4: Principal Achievements Performed by the HSRT thus far:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTABLISHMENT</th>
<th>MAINTENANCE (ongoing)</th>
<th>GOAL ACHIEVEMENT (ongoing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- clarifying terms of reference, mandate and objectives.</td>
<td>- establishing an office.</td>
<td>- working towards the establishment of a HSRT newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- securing seed funding.</td>
<td>- scheduling regular meetings.</td>
<td>- building awareness through community workshops and forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- developing a set of <em>Operating Procedures</em> to guide decision-making, &amp; to outline responsibilities</td>
<td>- selecting chairs, co-ordinators, ongoing membership.</td>
<td>- building relationships with business, community, gov’t, &amp; first nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- obtaining legal status as a non-profit society.</td>
<td>- securing ongoing &amp; project funding.</td>
<td>- participating in community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- applying for charitable status.</td>
<td>- maintaining member morale.</td>
<td>- projects: Shared Stewardship Shared Stewardship for Sustainability (S3),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- developing a constitution and society logo.</td>
<td>- establishing sub-committees</td>
<td>Household Hazardous Waste Day (HHW), Howe Sound 20/20 Information Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- administrative duties: taking minutes, doing mailouts, fielding inquiries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- producing an annual report &amp; budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- strategic planning review session.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- education and training of members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- working together as a team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- allocating resources (funds &amp; manpower) in an efficient manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- information sharing and exchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that these three types of activities are overlapping and that maintenance and goal achievement are ongoing and must occur concurrently. It should also be appreciated that these activities call for considerable amounts of time and work and that the volunteer members of the HSRT deserve much credit for their significant efforts. It is worthwhile to examine in more detail the three projects addressed by the HSRT.

**PROJECT 1: Shared Stewardship for Sustainability (S3)**

**Purpose:**
This project had three principal objectives:
- to build a vision of sustainability for water resources and aquatic habitat in the Howe Sound.
- to identify specific goals for planning and management of water resources and aquatic habitat.
- to explore new approaches to management that better meet the needs of stakeholders and communities and which ensures sustainability (S3 Stage III Report, March 1995).

**Outline:**
Project began in late 1993, and sponsored by the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Consisted of three separate phases: (I) Initial research including an inventory of the state of habitat and aquatic resources and an overview of the current jurisdictional framework for managing water resources in Howe Sound. Also a scoping workshop (Lions Bay, March 1994) to refine project objectives. (II) Stakeholder workshops in Squamish, Whistler, Gibsons and Bowen Island to allow participants to: work towards the establishment of a vision, identify goals for sustainability, and develop management objectives. (III) Case study of the planning and management processes and partnerships that can be established. Also review of examples of initiatives currently underway in the Howe Sound. As a part of stage III, the HSRT identified the (soon to be developed) Howe Sound East as an opportunity to incorporate sustainable, environmentally sensitive regulations into the official community plans for this area. A partnership was formed with the Squamish Lillooet Regional District (SLRD) to jointly organize a Howe Sound East Master Plan public forum to establish a development and land use vision.
Outcomes:
Key concerns raised by the participants of the March 1994 workshop included the identification of: population growth, vulnerable habitats, conflicting interests, level of decision-making, direction of management of resources and habitat and the need to raise community awareness. The stakeholder workshops produced the following recommendations to help move the region towards sustainability: develop an inventory of all stakeholders, develop an inventory of both government and non-government initiatives, establish an inventory of water and wildlife resources, build linkages, streamline management and improve enforcement of policies and regulations (S3 Stage III Report, March 1995). Unfortunately, the SLRD withdrew its responsibility for hosting the forum. To date, it remains to be seen whether the recommendations outlined in the S3 Stage III Report will be implemented.

Challenges:
The complexity, large scope and somewhat loosely defined objectives of this project presented considerable challenges for the newly established HSRT. Insufficient advertising resulted in relatively small numbers showing up at community workshops. Other hardships included: getting funding from DFO on time and getting support from Squamish Lil’looet Regional District.

PROJECT 2: Regional Household Hazardous Waste Collection Day (HHW)
Purpose:
• to develop a program for a regional event that would include the collection, separation and disposal of household hazardous waste.

Outline:
This event is to be fashioned after the model that has successfully been used in Whistler for several years. Further, this regional event will require the joint co-operation of communities, government and business. The date for this event has not yet been set.

Outcomes (expected):
If successful, this event will remove hazardous waste that would otherwise end up in local land fills. It will also educate the general public about the proper disposal of household hazardous waste. It is hoped that this event will be continued on an annual basis.

Challenges:
While many municipalities have shown an interest, and technical and financial support has even been committed by various businesses, some councils are proving more difficult to bring on board.

PROJECT 3: Howe Sound 20/20 Information Conference
Purpose:
• to develop a community vision for sustainability in the Howe Sound region through a three stage collaborative process.

Outline:
This project is to consist of three stages. The first will include the creation of a discussion paper on growth and development within the Howe Sound, followed by an information and visioning conference scheduled for Sept 15th to 17th, 1995 at the Whistler Conference Centre. An expected 200 participants from various sectors of government, business and community will be asked to discuss population growth, settlement patterns, environmental protection, infrastructure and transportation needs and to assist in building a picture of the region over the next 25 years. The second stage will consist of compiling the information from the conference into a draft report to be distributed to the community. Finally, the third stage of the project will include a public consultation process to review the draft document and the preparation of the final report.
Outcomes (expected):
The conference will produce a community vision for the Howe Sound region. This event, however, is still in its planning phase and many details still need to be worked out. e.g. Who will take responsibility for writing the recommendations of the conference? Who will these recommendations be given to? and Who will be responsible for implementing them?

Challenges:
The preliminary conference agenda raises many issues for discussion: population growth, settlement patterns, urban form and containment, infrastructure, transportation, environmental protection, economic growth and jurisdictional issues. Attempts to discuss all of these issues within the narrow time frame of the conference may prove unwieldy. Also, some community members may be hard-pressed to take two days off to attend a weekend conference in Whistler.

The next two chapters (4 and 5), present an analysis of the research findings. The analysis is separated into two sections to distinguish between the establishment and operational phases of the Howe Sound Round Table.
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS PART 1: ESTABLISHMENT PHASES

Interviews were carried out in the following manner. After obtaining the consent of the HSRT co-chairs to study the organization and to administer a set of interviews, a letter was circulated to each member outlining the intent of the research and requesting their voluntary participation. Considerable geographic distances separating the members as well as the lack of funding dictated the use of telephone as opposed to in-person interviews. Hand-written notes were transcribed and entered into the computer immediately following the interview.

Almost all HSRT members were interviewed, as well as both co-ordinators and one previous member. Unfortunately, both First Nations members on the round table were unable to participate due to lack of time. The analysis that follows is based on the information gathered from these 16 interviews as well as from available documents and other literature. In addition, relevant comments from a small sample of government officials and one council member are also included for interest only. (Both sets of interview questions are outlined in the Appendix.) Where interview comments on a specific issue were similar, this phenomenon is noted and comments reflecting this agreement are documented. Where comments varied, a number of comments are given to reflect the full range and diversity of opinion. HSRT Minutes and available literature were used to both confirm and supplement interview comments.

The adapted stage model of collaboration, presented in Section 2.6.4, was used as a comprehensive framework within which to frame the questions and gather data. Here this same framework will be used to present the analysis. Note that where the term “member” appears in the analysis, this is meant to refer to HSRT members unless otherwise indicated. Also, any quotations given represent the statements of HSRT members unless otherwise indicated.
Due to the comprehensive and detailed analysis that the collaboration framework presents, the recommendations derived are addressed in each section of the analysis rather than saved till the final chapter. These recommendations represent the author's informed advice after examining the interview comments and relevant literature. In several (but not all) cases the recommendations given are in agreement with those suggestions made by the interviewees.

4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT/ ISSUE CRYSTALLIZATION

A thorough examination of the environmental context in which an organization emerges, is extremely important in order to fully understand the need for and the evolution of that group. Here the term 'environmental' is used comprehensively to include the ecological, economic, political and social context as well.

It was recognized that members of the broader Howe Sound community can be a useful resource for information on the environmental context at the time when the HSRT emerged. However, time and budget constraints prevented the interviewing of community members directly. Nevertheless, a community workshop organized by the HSRT in March 1994 (in connection with the S3 project) gathered some important facts. First, one of the principal concerns of community members was the threat of vast uncontrolled residential development within the Howe Sound region (HSRT, 1994). Specifically, citizens were concerned about increased pressures on services and infrastructure, increased traffic flows, pollution of streams, loss of forest and recreational opportunities and other repercussions of development.

Trends towards increased growth have been evident for some time and do not appear to be subsiding. The population of the two largest communities, Whistler and Squamish, are expected to double and quadruple respectively by early next century. The Sunshine Coast has
become one of the fastest growing regions in the province. Bowen Island, which grew from a population of to 1,447 in 1988 to 1,791 in 1991, continues to grow at a rapid rate. Recent proposals for the development of Britannia Beach, Porteau Lands and Furry Creek are expected to accommodate another 12,000 to 13,000 residents (HSRT, 1995).

Second, community members were concerned about the management of local resources and the processes for making decisions and resolving multi-stakeholder conflicts (HSRT, 1995). Chapter 1 (Section 1.1) outlines in greater detail the particular problems faced by multi-jurisdictional governance and the need for greater efforts towards sustainability, increased public participation and collaboration. These same problems are experienced in the Howe Sound region. Workshop participants advocated a more integrated and proactive planning approach as well as the development of an area-wide land use plan or long-term master plan.

Finally, community members were concerned about the protection of habitat and sensitive areas and recognized the need for both greater community awareness and responsibility (HSRT, 1994). One example cited was the excessive exploitation of the Howe Sound commercial salmon fishery that forced it to be closed as early as 1963 (HSRT, 1995). Participants felt that more responsible planning strategies were needed in order to: educate the community, enable them to develop a long-term vision for the area and engage them in action-oriented, stewardship tasks. Further, a local round table such as the HSRT could be greatly instrumental in leading the community down this path.

In summary then, the environmental climate facing the Howe Sound region at this time was characterized by:

- threats of rapid development and population growth.
- inadequate modes of governance.
- absence of a proactive, integrated and watershed approach to planning.
• loss of species diversity and habitat as well as growing competition for scarce resources.
• general lack of community awareness and responsibility.
• need to engage the community in deriving a long-term vision for the watershed region.

It is important to note that when the HSRT emerged, it was met with mixed reviews from government, community and business alike. Many groups welcomed the idea whole-heartedly and were willing to participate on the round table or to offer their full support of the initiative. Some recognized the need for such a grassroots, sustainability venture but were unwilling or unable to participate or to support it financially. Some feared that the round table would become "an environmental advocacy group" and attempt to hinder development and industry in the region. Others wondered about the role of this body and saw it as an excuse for "yet another level of bureaucracy"; while some government bodies saw it as a potential threat to their power and control over the region (HSRT member, 1995).

The environmental climate facing the HSRT now remains largely unchanged from that of its early days. Similar conditions continue to challenge this newly-evolved and somewhat fragile organization. Also, despite attempts to reach out into the community and advertise its presence, the HSRT remains relatively unknown.

Recommendation 1: The HSRT must remain sensitive to its surrounding environmental context. It must have an effective means for keeping in touch with this changing climate and for tapping into the "community pulse." It must also be robust and yet flexible enough to adapt to changes where necessary.

4.2 PROBLEM SETTING

4.2.1 Common Definition of the Problem

The issues and environmental context surrounding the Howe Sound Round Table are both dynamic and complex. While there is no single or specific issue that the table addresses, the
common thread underlying each of the members' concerns is the need to promote sustainability
in the Howe Sound region. This common interest is reflected in the mission statement of the
organization (see chapter 3). Nevertheless, sustainability itself is not a clearly defined term.
HSRT members gave varied explanations of sustainability and what their vision of a sustainable
Howe Sound would look like. (See Tables 4.1(a) and 4.1(b)).

Table 4.1(a): How HSRT Members Described Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “sustainability occurs when you can carry on indefinitely within the framework of the physical habitat...at the very least maintaining a healthy biophysical environment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “activity that leaves the natural capital as is...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “looking at the Howe Sound region in terms of its best overall use &amp; how it can be maintained.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “three legged stool of balancing environmental, social and economic interests.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “sustaining the environment...not so sure how to do social and economic side...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “physical characteristics, greenery is maintained, taken into consideration.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “accessibility for tourists/ recreationalists.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “wouldn’t change too much from status quo.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “living in an environment in such a way as to preserve it for future generations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “ensure that whatever we do today doesn’t negatively impact others tomorrow.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “higher density and lower usage of resources, e.g. reduce waste, conserve rain water, avoid duplication of vehicles and household.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “remain as much as possible in its natural state with opportunities for safe recreating and living, suitable housing and minimal crime.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “affordable housing with smaller properties/living space compensated for by lots of shared open space, playgrounds, recreational space.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “cluster housing, self-contained green communities with lots of green space.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “diversified economy within each community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “clean burning pulp mills, region-wide salmon enhancement programs, more bike paths.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “no four lane highway to Whistler, but instead a commuter rail/ transit line to Vancouver...no fast ferries to Sunshine Coast and no deep sea port.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “people should be able to make a living by working within the community, less dependency on the automobile.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1(b): HSRT Strategies for Bringing About Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “by improving water and air quality.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “paying attention to natural setting and aesthetics.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “developing a comprehensive bioregional/ long-term plan that everyone takes responsibility for.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “long-term master plan looking at the short and long-term management. Big picture of the whole region...all agencies need to pool information.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “may require limiting growth and population, excluding some activities e.g. to protect wetlands and green corridors.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “long-term proactive planning/ guidelines for the region. Better OCP, bylaws and regulations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “follow the example of the B.C. Energy Council’s Sustainable Energy Strategy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “control growth and development so that it doesn’t impose on the environment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “citizens need to take more responsibility.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “need to get people working together.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “decisions need to consider the overall context of the region...rather than be ad hoc.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “need to ensure that people know the true costs (environmental, social and economic) ...of their activities and include consideration that those who benefit ought to pay.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “plan that is built along the lines of consensus.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “educate the public in the areas of recycling, also develop small neighbourhood communities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “increasing efforts to involve all citizens in visioning including those tourists, and commuters.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “natural resources must be used wisely and systems must be put in place to ensure this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “decision-makers must be accountable...in order to be true stakeholders.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “people must work together to solve common problems...so that the people who are affected are part of the solution.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “educating public as to what the options are.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “encouraging greater reliance on local energy and food production.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These variations in visioning and strategies to reach sustainability are typical and serve to illustrate the difficulty in grasping the meaning of this elusive term. Yet taken together all these diverse opinions could be combined to offer a rich and meaningful expression of sustainability. However, one should be reminded that the complex and indeed “wicked” nature of this concept cannot be remedied by a quick solution, and may only be resolved by several different types of long-term solutions. Thus, by installing this poorly defined, complex and long-term concept at the very root of its operations, the HSRT is faced with an enormously difficult task.

The Puget Sound Sustainability Community Round Table has developed a detailed vision of sustainability for each of the following areas: natural environment, population growth and settlement, resource consumption, transportation, housing, economic development, social equity and justice, governance, education, culture and health. (Sustainable Community Round Table, 1995). Having a detailed vision makes it easier to develop strategies to work towards that end.

Recommendation 2: The HSRT should develop a clearer understanding of what sustainability means to the community and what the community’s vision of sustainability would look like. Knowing this, it would be easier to set its own priorities and targets, as well as to develop manageable tasks and strategies towards sustainability in the region.

4.2.2 Identifying Key Stakeholders and Ensuring Broad-Based, Inclusive Membership

The HSRT Steering Committee went to considerable lengths to establish a fair process for identifying the key perspectives in the region and for selecting the initial round table members. The HSRT itself, through the Community Appointments Committee (CAC), works hard to ensure an equitable process for the selection of ongoing members. To this end, the CAC still attempts to balance perspectives, gender, culture, age, and geographic representation. (Refer
to Table 3.1 for a list of community sectors that the HSRT considers in membership selection.)

Yet, a number of questions about the representativeness of the table still arise.

(i) Has the HSRT Adequately Explored the Diversity of Cultures and Interests?

Sectors and perspectives currently represented on the HSRT include: development, construction, Sechelt and Squamish Indian Bands, small business and economic development, forest industry, pulp and paper industry, healthcare, environmental conservation, commercial fisheries, water quality and habitat protection, mining, heritage, and environmental sciences. Members representing these perspectives come from or currently hold the following professions: engineering, consulting, architecture, planning, construction, law, communications, nursing, environmental sciences, geology and academia (HSRT, 1995).

While the diversity of perspectives on the table seems to be fairly comprehensive, some HSRT members were able to identify a number of gaps. Specifically youths, seniors, lower income groups, recreationalists/tourists, and school teachers were found to be missing. HSRT minutes confirmed these observations. One individual added that round table members were on the whole "too polite" and that a few "red-necks" were needed to spice things up. A need for a more balanced selection of people from areas throughout the region, as well as a greater cultural mix were also revealed. Of the 17 members currently on the HSRT, the majority are middle-aged, Caucasian, well-educated and middle class. A statement from Matthews (1983) drives this point further:

"Community leaders...generally come from among the better educated, and better informed members of the community and are also likely to have more contact with the outside world than the majority of community members. Such characteristics immediately set them apart from the community and their opinions and decisions do not necessarily reflect the attitudes and values of the majority of those they supposedly represent."
While the Howe Sound region is characterized by a diverse and broad spectrum of people, there is a useful tool for developing a better understanding of the region. Manitoba Rural Development, through *Community Choices* --an initiative to encourage sustainable rural communities-- strongly advocates the establishment of a community profile (Manitoba Department of Rural Development, 1994). Such a profile could provide a sense of the history of the area, where it stands today, and what future trends may be. It may draw on information such as: economic base, available services and industries, population and growth rate, local resources, etc. which may be available from various sources (StatsCan, library research, and consultant reports).

**Recommendation 3:** Due to the diversity of backgrounds and perspectives within the Howe Sound, the HSRT should develop a community profile of the area to assist the group and its Community Appointments Committee in ensuring adequate representation of all perspectives.

(ii) *Are the HSRT Stakeholders Really Stakeholders?*

Members of the HSRT are selected as individuals and are representative of perspectives and not the interests of any particular group or organization. (This distinction was clarified in Section 2.4.1.). Selin and Chavez (1995) define stakeholders as: "individuals, groups and formal organizations who have a perceived interest or impact on a particular resource." It is interesting to note that many groups, including CORE have steered away from using this term since it seems to imply that something is at stake and to advocate an adversarial approach. At any rate, as representatives of perspectives, it is debatable as to whether or not HSRT members are in fact true stakeholders. This issue is explored because it raises important problems with respect to communications with the outside community (as will become apparent later).
(iii) Does the HSRT Lean Towards Any One Particular Interest?

Ensuring a broad-based, balanced and inclusive membership is particularly important to establish and to maintain the credibility of multi-stakeholder processes. As one member commented: “The HSRT must never be ...biased in favour of any one particular group or else it will lose its credibility.”

Nevertheless, the HSRT minutes of May 9th, 1994 document a concern that the group may be perceived as being environmentally-leaning. One member commented that this perception may be due to “...the nature of the area and the people therein...” That is, had it been a largely urban as opposed to a relatively undisturbed area, the approach may have been different. Another member wondered whether the HSRT paid adequate attention to “the social well-being of the community” and suggested that more socially-oriented people (such as police officers) should be included at the table. Other points raised were that “...a lot of people think sustainability is about environmental sustainability...” and that “...social concerns are not as high profile (as environmental concerns).” Compounding these difficulties is the fact that, at present, funding for environmental projects is more readily available than for social and economic issues.

Recommendation 4: Clearly the HSRT should pay more careful attention to social and economic interests less the legitimacy and credibility of the group be jeopardized. They should not be afraid to take on social and economic projects, so long as they comply with sustainability principles.

(iv) Are those Responsible for Implementing the Decisions at the Table?

Collaboration theory suggests that those responsible for implementation should also be present in the partnership. As noted earlier, the outcomes of this particular collaborative exercise are likely to be joint agreements. Further these agreements may be in the form of
recommendations or advice to various receiving bodies be they government, business or public. The majority of members felt that the HSRT itself was not, and indeed possibly should not be responsible for implementing these recommendations. Instead, this implementation was seen as the joint responsibility of government, business and public. However, while the last two perspectives are present at the table in one form or another, government is absent. Hence, strictly speaking, not everyone involved in implementation is represented. The difficulties this presents in obtaining government support for projects are well recognized by the Howe Sound Round Table.

(v) Should Members of Government be Represented at the Table?

The Steering Committee wrestled at length with this question and finally decided, with the advice of several elected officials on the committee, that to preserve the integrity of this community body, government should not be seated at the HSRT. Most HSRT members agreed with this decision. As one individual remarked: “The HSRT is there to advise government, and assist them with decisions. Once you put government on the table it becomes a political process.” Others feared that government would try to steer the table with their own political agendas and also prevent a “more open and human interaction between members.”

Nevertheless, despite their unwillingness to have government at the table, most members also agreed that there were real benefits to be derived from maintaining a good relationship with government officials. For example the Anahim and Slocan Valley Round Tables, possibly because of their close association with CORE (as pilot projects), seem to have achieved credibility and acceptance more easily than other groups that have not had this affiliation. Thus,

Note that while the HSRT may not be responsible for implementing its advice and recommendations on government policy etc., it is nevertheless, responsible for implementing its own programs (e.g. public education), organizational and administrative duties.
it was recognized that the establishment of formal links to government was probably vital. Currently these links to government are established through the Community Appointments Committee (CAC) of the HSRT.

 Recommendation 5: The experience of other local round tables has shown that there are benefits to be obtained from maintaining good relations with government, and hence the HSRT should continue to establish sound links.

(vi) Is the Structure of the Community Appointments Committee Itself Equitable?

The Community Appointments Committee (CAC) aims to select ongoing membership in an equitable manner. This committee also provides a vehicle through which links to government can be established. Currently, the CAC is made up of: 8 government, and at least 2 Howe Sound Round Table members. HSRT members raised two important questions regarding the CAC: Given the need to maintain the integrity of this grassroots group, should government be involved on the CAC? and If the HSRT truly represents the Howe Sound community, shouldn’t the community be given an opportunity for input into the selection process?

Ideally the HSRT should accept appointments from an unbiased, independent board. Having government at the table raises concerns that they may try to manipulate the agenda by selecting people that advocate their own political agendas. On the other hand, if community members are to be involved on this committee, who will select them? One member was assured that “...practically speaking, the lack of community involvement on the CAC won’t lead to worse decisions.” The 8 members on the committee were thought to provide enough diversity so as to ensure that no single perspective is favoured over the others.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the structure and operations of this committee probably deserve more thought and careful monitoring. One recommendation that the HSRT may want to
Consider taking some of the responsibility for selection off the shoulders of the central committee. For example, the selection (CAC) committee could go out into the community, approach various organizations and interest groups and get each to recommend or commit one person to be a member of the HSRT approximately every five years. (Dorothy Craig, Personal communication, 1995). Alternatively, nominations for membership may be invited from the community.

Recommendation 6: The structure and operations of the Community Appointments Committee need to be reviewed. If possible, community organizations themselves should be given more responsibility and asked to suggest or even volunteer nominees for participation at the table.

4.2.3 Ensuring Commitment to the Process

For collaboration to work successfully, members must be committed to the process (Gray, 1989). Selin and Chavez (1995) add that participants will remain committed to the process if the issues at hand are seen as important and if the members believe that the benefits obtained from participating outweigh the costs. As volunteers, HSRT members show strong commitment (although some more so than others). At least 13 of the 17 members are usually present at any one plenary HSRT meeting (HSRT Minutes). Many put in considerable time and effort in between meetings and at various sub-committee sessions.

Nevertheless, there are times when HSRT members feel exasperated by the seemingly slow and tedious process that the organization sometimes demands. Much of the early work of the HSRT was concentrated on getting itself established, refining its terms of reference, developing a communications plan, securing funding and performing administrative duties. While all of these activities are very important, they hold very little excitement or appeal and seldom offer any great reward or recognition upon their completion. However, whether for emotional and altruistic reasons, or out of frustration with government; or out of desire to be part
of a new community-oriented experiment for addressing watershed sustainability; HSRT members still feel it is in their best interests to proceed with what they started.

4.2.4 Leadership

According to Gray (1989), collaboration requires a strong leader to safeguard the collaborative process and promote continued interaction. Few members of the HSRT will dispute the fact that strong leadership has been a powerful force in both the establishment and continuing operations of the HSRT.

(i) Role and Qualities of Leadership:

Members of the HSRT felt that the role of leadership was: “to get the ball rolling,” “to show there is commitment and to get everyone else on board,” “to encourage motivation,” “to keep people on track,” and “to maintain continuity and momentum.” Some people felt strongly that a leader should be an instrument of the HSRT and not vice versa. As an example, one individual claimed that an ideal leader “...would be a ‘Jeeves’, a butler who runs the house, but lets the owners (RT members) make the decisions...and then follows (their) directions.”

Members also recognized certain qualities necessary for leadership. For one, leadership can only be displayed by “...someone who can be heard and respected; that is someone whose name is known within the community.” Many organizations are started by a charismatic individual, but as one member commented this allure, by itself, is not enough. “Leaders must have more than just charisma. They must have knowledge and background about the area, the community history, as well as the roots and cause of the organization.”
(ii) Where Leadership Comes From:

A clear distinction was made by members as to where they felt leadership of the group should come from and where it actually did come from. Almost all members felt that leadership should come from within the HSRT. Also, leadership should not necessarily be taken on by one or two individuals, or even by a small core of individuals. It was noted that ideally, since “each member has a role to play in their community ...leadership should come from each (and every) member in their own way.” Upon self-reflection HSRT members felt that some individuals had shown great initiative and leadership especially in connection with a project or issue that they felt strongly about or were involved with. However, in most circumstances leadership was seen as coming from a small core group of individuals upon whom the remaining members rely heavily.

Members gave much credit to its two co-ordinators (of the past year), who have played an integral role in this core leadership group. There are those who believe that these co-ordinators have helped to “hold the HSRT together over the past few years.” In recognition of the outstanding leadership shown by these individuals, an ‘honorary’ position seems to have been created for them. While they are not considered official HSRT members, they have similar rights as members and hence may take part in consensus decision-making. Also despite the fact that both individuals have now tended their resignation as co-ordinators, they remain actively involved with the operations of the table and are still present as chairs or co-ordinators of several sub-committees. So integral is the role of these individuals that several members genuinely feared that the survival of the group would be threatened should they depart from the group. Others felt that the group was too dependent on these co-ordinators. To illustrate, one person explained that “the coordinators, whoever they are, should play a peripheral role” in the operations of the group. Another felt that the resignation of the coordinators would provide an
excellent opportunity for HSRT members to take on more responsibility. “The HSRT is now in a position where it has built up relationships, it has sound operating procedures, ... (and thus) has the capability to show more leadership...Members must give a little extra effort and share the load.”

(iii) Leadership and Consensus:

Several individuals identified an apparent conflict between consensus and leadership. It was felt that leadership, especially when exhibited by a core group of individuals, may in some circumstances jeopardize the equality of members --a very necessary condition for consensus. Hence it was stressed that “...leadership should come from everyone.” Further, in order to achieve this, all members must participate fully for “...unless we get equal participation, leadership tends to drift towards those that are doing the work.”

Recommendation 7: To spread out the responsibilities of leadership, to ensure continuity, and to avoid complications with consensus, the HSRT should encourage each and every member to show leadership and initiative.

4.2.5 Administration

While the need for a partnership to perform administrative duties is to a certain extent overlooked by some collaborative theorists, one should be reminded that these activities are a very necessary part of any functional organization. In addition, while administrative duties are seldom very exciting, they also tend to be very time-consuming and certainly ongoing. Through much of its first year of operations administrative duties of the HSRT were performed on a volunteer basis by the two co-ordinators. The HSRT is in the process of hiring a part-time administrative assistant to take on these duties.
Members expressed a strong need for the HSRT to have a “home” and in particular a permanent fax/mail address. A sub-committee has recently been formed to address these concerns.

**Recommendation 8: Providing the HSRT has the resources, the hiring of an administrative assistant is encouraged so that more time can be freed to devote to projects. The need for a ‘home’ and a permanent fax/mail address are also important and should be addressed.**

### 4.2.6 Funding

The importance of adequate funding in ensuring the survival of any organization (non-profit or otherwise) cannot be over-emphasized. All members of the HSRT recognized that access to funding was extremely important, and that inadequate funding could not only seriously limit their achievements, but could also seriously jeopardize the livelihood of the organization. Members, however, showed varying degrees of concerns regarding the present financial status of the group. One member believed that: “The HSRT is in dire straits right now. Boards like this die from lack of funds.” Another claimed that without adequate funds “…the HSRT will flounder no matter how idealistic the volunteers are.”

**Challenges to fundraising:**

The HSRT faces a number of difficulties in raising money. First, it is a time-consuming exercise and members can only be expected to devote a limited amount of time. Second, because the HSRT is supposed to represent many different perspectives equally, it must exercise caution so that it does not appear to support or be supported by any one particular group. Third, donations frequently come attached with certain conditions. (See Section 3.3 for more details).
Fourth, some members attributed the round table’s current shortage of funds to its relatively low community profile. Fifth, competition for funding from limited sources is high.

One member described the situation as a ‘chicken and egg’ scenario: “Funding is a problem and will be until we establish credibility, but ...this requires more money.” Several members expressed a strong need for a newsletter (to be sent to all households in the Howe Sound region) that could serve to increase awareness and build a community profile. In fact, at least two members were assured that with increased advertising and a newsletter “...donations will come pouring in.” At any rate, it was generally agreed by most members that more efforts should be committed to securing more funds and that building awareness, improving advertising, and becoming more actively involved within the community were necessary first steps to overcome.

Griss (1993) offers some useful advice on funding for community groups:

“There is no clear link between the budget of an organization and its influence. How much money a group has is less important than how it is spent. More importantly, in an age of partnerships, it is how the resources are leveraged that matters. Diversity and creativity will be the keys to financial growth and stability in the future. Handouts are rare, and becoming a thing of the past, and money will increasingly follow good programs... Groups that can demonstrate that they have a clear mandate and objectives, and can put plans in place to fulfill those goals, will be much more likely to attract funding from all potential contributors.” (Griss, 1993)

Recommendation 9: Since access to resources places huge limitations on the achievements of the group, the HSRT would be well-advised to increase its community profile as well as to explore the formation of innovative partnerships with other groups.

It is difficult to establish just how much money the HSRT needs on an annual basis to function effectively. Costs may vary considerably from year to year. For example, the start-up year was particularly expensive due to the costly, but necessary expense of an independent facilitator. Gordon (1994) reported that, on average, Canadian local round tables had budgets that ranged from $250 to $10,000 annually. The HSRT’s budget ($54,0000 in 1993) is
considerably larger by comparison. While a large budget may offer more opportunities to
achieve the group's goals, it also attracts greater scrutiny, increased expectations, and greater
vulnerability to economic hardships. Thus, it is imperative that funds are carefully managed and
allocated.

Recommendation 10: The HSRT should develop sound strategies for acquiring, managing
and allocating funds so as to carry out the goals of the group in the most efficient manner.
Detailed budgets should distinguish between special project and operational expenses.

Sources of funding:

Most members agreed that the sources of funding should be balanced: coming from
community, government and industry. One individual felt that "...ideally everyone that lives in
the (Howe Sound) area (should donate) $1 per person per year to keep the HSRT running."
Another member agreed with this ideal notion because "...ultimately it is the community that will
benefit from the work of the round table." Nevertheless, neither could come up with an
acceptable manner in which this could be administered by the municipal governments. Perhaps
on a more realistic note, the Fraser River Action Plan (1994) observes that:

"Volunteer time and other in-kind resources are more readily available to the local community. Finances and
specialized expertise and equipment are more readily available to government. Local communities and all
levels of government need to create working partnerships, including funding mechanisms, seconding
personnel and other devices to get the job done."

Membership funding:

All HSRT members are volunteers and are hence not paid for there services. However, it
is imperative that each member be given an equal opportunity to participate. Doering (1995)
claims that "the absence of major (interest groups) may significantly undermine the legitimacy
and credibility of the exercise." (Doering, 1995). To ensure equal opportunities, some multi-
stakeholder groups find it necessary to compensate those members that must travel furthest to
meetings. Funding constraints make it impossible for the HSRT to refund the travel expenses incurred by some members. One member recognized that: “Right now there is an inequity here, in that the cost to some members is greater than that for others.” Most members agreed that this needed to be changed as soon as the organization is secure enough financially to do so.

**Recommendation 11:** All HSRT members should ideally have an equal opportunity to be present at the table. Hence those that must travel greater distances should be compensated.

### 4.3 DIRECTION SETTING

#### 4.3.1 Determining their Domain Overlap

In a sound collaborative partnership individuals should “determine what the scope or degree of domain overlap will actually be...” and then “...establish goals for the partnership” (Waddock, 1989). Further this requires that “stakeholders identify the interests that brought them to the table, separate these interests according to their similarities and differences and begin to form the basis for eventual trade-offs” (Waddock, 1989). In the case of the HSRT, these concepts are somewhat difficult to apply. For one, HSRT members are not real stakeholders in the sense that they are not likely to be significantly impacted by the kinds of decisions and agreements forthcoming from the table. Hence the exercise of coming to terms with their similarities and differences becomes less important.

Secondly, the organization is still relatively new and thus the majority of issues that it has addressed so far tend to be either administrative or operational activities which generally do not pit one interest up against another. Examples of these types of decisions include: determining where to keep the phone/fax, which agencies should be approached for funding, what the HSRT logo should look like, what definition of consensus should be used by the table, and what rules to
use for communicating with the media. Really contentious issues resulting in strong differences of opinion and conflicting views, and which call for the use of tradeoffs or compromises, have yet to be discussed. Hypothetical projects that would lead to a discussion of substantive issues may include: gathering information on the possible effects of freight traffic as it winds its way through the Gulf Islands, providing advice as to the position of wildlife corridors, collecting ecological information to assist decisions about the size of buffer zones for development purposes, or proposing plans and responsibilities for improving the safety and clean up of acid mine drainage at the Britannia Beach Historical Mine site.

Both the Steering Committee and the HSRT itself emphasized that time and effort should be invested at the beginning to ensure that effective operational procedures are in place before any substantive issues were dealt with. It was thought that efforts taken early to dispel any discrepancies would save much anguish later and avoid costly errors that may severely compromise the credibility of the group. Nevertheless, deliberations over procedural issues hold little excitement for members. Hence, even in the group’s first few months members were quite anxious to undertake more substantive projects. These inclinations have grown steadily. At present, some members are starting to feel somewhat discouraged and indeed skeptical that the group will ever get to a stage where it can address these types of issues.

**Recommendation 12:** During its first two years, the Howe Sound Round Table necessarily devoted large amounts of time and effort to building its foundations and establishing its roots. However, the organization must now focus more attention on specific strategies and projects to reach its sustainability goals. Taking on a contentious, substantive issue may be risky, but failure to do so may slowly extinguish member interest.

This leads into a discussion of the role of the group. The HSRT sees itself as performing an advisory role, but what is meant by this? and who does it give advice to? Some discrepancy
exists as to whether the HSRT will make its own decisions and position statements or whether it will merely transmit information that it has gathered from community forums. In its present form, with members that are representative of perspectives and not interests, it seems unlikely that the group is adequately equipped to arrive at credible decisions on substantive issues on its own. It also seems as though without interest-based membership its ability to resolve site-specific issues or conflicts is diminished. The HSRT Operating Procedures suggest that the group may give advice to community, government and business groups. Yet, since the HSRT has no formal recognition from government, it is not a recognized mechanism for giving advice. Thus, to this point it would appear as though the HSRT plays not so much an advisory role, but that of a messenger, relaying the voice of the community that it represents to various receiving bodies whether they be government, business or community groups. This notion is also suggested in The Future of Local Round Tables (Dovetail Consulting, 1994):

"The role of local round tables is ...to interpret and articulate community values and concerns and to bring those values and concerns into the decision-making process."

CORE expands on this notion by saying that the role of community resource boards --a variation of the local round table model-- is to:

"provide a forum in which diverse community perspectives are brought together to help negotiate or otherwise develop resource management solutions that balance economic, social and environmental interests in keeping with the best overall long-term interests of the community. They provide an opportunity for communities to shape their future in a way that balances competing values and contributes to stability ... maintaining or enhancing the quality of life and ... creat(ing) a sense of shared responsibility..." (CORE, 1995).

**Recommendation 13:** The development of a clearly defined role and terms of reference is imperative to the effective performance of any group. The HSRT should review and clarify its role as an advisory body. Specifically it needs to determine: to whom, how and the type of advice to be given.
4.3.2 Establishing Goals

Successful collaborative partnerships must have clearly defined and common goals (Gray, 1989). Section 3.2.1 outlines the mission statement and objectives of the HSRT. In addition, the complex and indeed “wicked” nature of sustainability issues are alluded to, as are the challenges that this concept may pose for the HSRT.

Importance of Having Clear Goals, Objectives and Activities to Reach Them

A clear understanding of the group’s role and aim is insufficient without a clear means of getting there. Goals and objectives must therefore be accompanied by a clear set of activities or tasks to reach these goals. Cunningham (1978) suggests that goals or principles may be used to identify the intended direction of the organization; objectives are used to add clarity and meaning to the overall goals; and activities represent the actual means for carrying out those goals.

The HSRT’s objectives present broad directions that demand ongoing attention. These objectives, as presented, lack clarity and meaning. Further, they are not accompanied by clearly articulated means or set of activities for reaching the group’s objectives. In fact, these objectives seem to operate better as the primary principles or over-arching goals of the organization. To illustrate these ideas, it may be useful to examine one of the objectives.

Objective 1: Provide recommendations on environmental, economic and social sustainability with respect to specific initiatives or issues.

This objective does not indicate: how the recommendations will be determined, to whom the recommendations will be made, what kind of initiatives and issues will be addressed and how they will be selected. Note that while it would be unrealistic and unwieldy to include all this information with each objective, a clear set of sub-objectives is needed for further clarification. This point is important since without clear goals and objectives, no clear activities and tasks can
be assigned to reach those goals. Two comments made by HSRT members illustrate these ideas: “the HSRT needs strong, clearer goals and means to achieve these goals” and “while goals may be clear to HSRT members, they may not be clear to the general public.”

Recommendation 14: The HSRT would be well-advised to establish a sharper, more defined set of targets for working towards sustainability and to articulate specific means or strategies for achieving them. These goals and strategies must be clear to HSRT members as well as to members of the Howe Sound community.

Redefining Goals and Objectives and Setting Priorities

In collaborative processes, goals and objectives need to be constantly redefined to keep them steered towards the desired end, to engage all participants and to keep the organization moving forward. Further, organizations with multiple objectives (such as the HSRT) need to set new and review previous priorities. The BCRT (1991c) suggests that:

“Broad terms of reference could be put in place at first by the initiating agency. The local round table could then set more specific objectives and tasks for itself within that framework as it gets underway. It is also useful to review these objectives and terms of reference periodically to ensure that there is still broad support within government, the public and the round table itself to continue to pursue those tasks, and to reduce overlap with other agencies and advisory bodies.”

The HSRT objectives were initially set up by the Steering Committee with the advice that the HSRT itself should establish strategic priorities from amongst them and refine them as needed (HSRT Steering Committee, 1993). Today the HSRTs terms of reference remain relatively unchanged and unprioritized. Nevertheless, interviews with the HSRT revealed that Objective 5: “educating the public on sustainability...” was viewed as the most important priority for the group and that Objective 6: “encouraging a bioregional/ watershed perspective...” was a close second.
Setting Realistic Goals and Interim Objectives:

Goals for a successful partnership and the activities outlined to achieve them should be manageable and should be completed within a realistic time frame. While the HSRT Terms of Reference (1994) outlines a number of highly commendable objectives, they are enormous and ongoing. They place huge demands on this voluntary organization that is already burdened with administrative duties and restricted to a limited budget. To make these tasks more manageable, the HSRT does however, establish interim goals (even though they may not be recorded as such).

A few examples of these important interim goals include the following:

- apply for and obtain funding for operational expenses.
- establish legal status of the organization.
- maintain contact with local government officials.
- develop an operational and communications strategy.
- inform the press about progress and upcoming events.
- organize regional tours to provide an educational experience of the Howe Sound.
- start to work on a project to build community awareness and profile of the HSRT (HSRT Minutes, 1994).

The importance of establishing time frames or deadlines for work completion should not be neglected. The Guide to Establishing a Local Round Table (BCRT, 1991) explains that:

“Deadlines play an important role in consensus processes because they provide incentive to reach agreement as well as the means for terminating the process when consensus cannot be reached. A local round table may wish to commit itself to establishing deadlines and make every attempt to achieve the deadlines set for any project.”

Recommendation 15: Given the time and resource restrictions placed on the group, it is recommended that the HSRT establish specific priorities and focus efforts on a few specific and manageable projects with reasonable deadlines. Some refining and perhaps trimming of existing objectives may be required.
4.3.3 Setting Ground Rules for Operating

Good rules for operating make for more effective collaborations. The HSRT developed a set of *Operating Procedures* in the fall of 1994. (See section 3.2 for more details). The discussion that follows highlights some of the most important guidelines in this document.

(i) Consensus

The *HSRT Operating Procedures* state that:

"The goal of the RT is to arrive at all decisions by consensus. For matters of substance associated directly with its mandate, the Round Table strives for unanimity. Unanimity should be read here as meaning no substantive disagreement and this implies no public expression of dissent."

Roughly half of the HSRT members interviewed thought that the group fully understood and was comfortable with using consensus; the other half disagreed. One member, realizing this discrepancy, offered the following meaning of consensus is: "Consensus occurs when everyone can agree to accept something even though they may not agree with everything." Several interviewees pointed out in many instances consensus had so far been used in connection with "administrative," "start-up" and "housekeeping" issues indicative of the establishment phase that the group had until fairly recently been going through. Examples of these types of consensus decisions made by the HSRT include the following:

- approved that the Financial statements and the Directors report be received.
- approved that phase III of the S3 project be tied into the Howe Sound East Master Plan.
- agreed to call a visioning conference Howe Sound 20/20.
- agreed that Paul Hundal be appointed as co-chair of the body.
- agreed that a sub-committee be formed to establish a communication strategy. (HSRT Minutes, 1994).

A number of members had observed that consensus was not always effective or appropriate. Some thought that administrative and operational issues did not require consensus decision-making and that the latter should be reserved for contentious, substantive issues. This
point is reiterated by the BCRT (1991a): “Many administrative matters, ...not central to the
fundamental objectives of LRTs can be dealt with by less demanding decision-making rules.”

One member commented that “consensus ...leaves a lot of people frustrated; instead of airing our
views and reaching consensus, we reach a compromise. That is people tend to give up, or give in
without being convinced that the agreement is the best one that could be reached.” Others felt
that unequal leadership could interfere with consensus (Refer to section 4.2.4). Scott (1995)
advised against this saying:

“Rather than give in on what you consider to be an important point, it is better ...to show where there is
consensus and where there is not and present this information to decision-makers.”

Recommendation 16: Efforts should be taken to clarify the meaning of consensus, to
reserve it for situations in which it is most effective, and to ensure that its principles and
use are well understood by all concerned.

(ii) Setting the Agenda

Collaboration requires that all parties be given an equal share in contributing to the
agenda (Gray, 1989). HSRT agendas appear to be made through a rather elaborate mechanism
outlined as follows in the Operating Procedures: “The Chair of the HSRT and the Chairs of each
(Sub-)Committee ...will be responsible for the preparation of the agendas for meetings of the
Round Table Plenary and the (Sub-)Committees.” This mechanism for developing agendas is
deemed necessary to ensure that the large number of items presented at the plenary meetings are
covered. This method does, however, raise the question as to whether or not individual members
are afforded an adequate opportunity to contribute to the agenda. The majority of HSRT
members felt that they are. Several quotes may be used to illustrate this: “The agenda
committee ...is accessible and open to all members”; “The agenda is generally not a problem to
access, one just has to take the initiative to do so.” However, some frustrations were also voiced.
At least two members felt that when they had tried to bring up an item for discussion, the issue was brushed aside without adequate explanation.

Recommendation 17: Care must be taken to ensure that all interests are expressed and listened to. Where an individual has submitted a concern or a suggestion in a timely manner, that item warrants discussion at sub-committee meetings if not at the plenary meetings.

(iii) Joint Information Search

Access to information is needed by any group wishing to make sound decisions and provide useful advice. Members of organizations made up of many different interests and perspectives should jointly research and exchange information. Most HSRT participants thought that the group had no trouble in gaining access to information and thus should be adequately prepared to make well-informed decisions. One person observed that members themselves provide a “wealth of expertise and information.” Nevertheless it is realized by the group that it would be impossible for each member to become well-informed about every sustainability issue within the region. Not only would this take more than one lifetime to do, but it would also be prohibitively expensive for the organization to research all these issues. HSRT members identified the following problems in acquiring information:

- “There is heaps of information about the region, but not all of it was prepared with the RT in mind. Hence it needs some sorting out. Also, information on social, economic, geographic subjects ...exists but in a piecemeal fashion.”
- “Members have different perspectives on a variety of interests...” and hence it is “...difficult to have everyone at the same knowledge level.”
- “Members... need to take the time to read and assimilate the information available.”
- “…Members are all intelligent, with reasonable knowledge of the area,” but need to do more “information exchange.”

A small number of measures have been taken so far to share the information gathered thus far with members of the broader community. A brochure of the HSRT outlining its current
initiatives was made available at each of the S3 community workshops. Several articles on the HSRT have been featured in the *Watershed News* and one in *the National Round Table Review*. As yet the group has not produced a newsletter, although it hopes to do so in the near future. The Fraser River Action Plan (1994), advises, that amongst other things, “Round Tables... should market success stories of sustainable watershed innovations with the same diligence and technical expertise as the private sector markets its goods and services.”

The HSRT has yet to determine its information needs and then to amass the necessary data. So far, with the exception of two studies --one on the jurisdiction of the area (Lacombe et al., 1994), and the other on the state of aquatic habitat and resources (Bent et al., 1994)-- very little research has been done by the group to gather information about the Howe Sound region. A recent *Community Stewardship* guide (FBMP et al., 1995) suggests that the following types of data may be useful: biophysical, social/ cultural, economic, strategic/ governance. Besides performing research, mapping the area also forms a very useful exercise.

**Recommendation 18:** HSRT members should establish their information needs and develop a strategy for assimilating available data. Further, more effort should be spent in sharing and exchanging information both with other HSRT members and members of the broader community.

*(iv) Teamwork:*

“An ENGOs most precious resource is its people. With the proper management structures in place, an environmental group will achieve far more... if it is getting the most out of its people.” Gelfand (1993).

Any organization or partnership functions most effectively when all its members are participating actively and fully. There is evidence to suggest that some HSRT members are able to offer more commitment that others. (This is inevitable with any organization). To begin, membership is at present rather low with only 17 individuals seated while the ideal target, as
suggested by the BCRT (1992), is 25. Low membership increases the workload for those present. Secondly, unequal levels of participation have been observed. Below are a number of quotes to support this.

- “Right now...one third of the members are taking two thirds of the load.”
- “There is a core group of very active people that is stretched thin.”
- “All members have contributed something, some more than others. Those that have done more have the resources and the time to do so.”
- “Certain members at different times have carried more weight than others.”
- “Effort has been concentrating into fewer people...partly due to the structure of co-chairs and sub-committee chairs. Must have a process that involves everyone.”
- “We need to make sure that everyone is on board and not just the coordinators.”

Other comments suggested that tasks were not delegated in an effective manner:

- “Some people are still waiting for a job... for something to do.”
- “The HSRT needs to ensure that everyone is on at least one subcommittee.”
- “The HSRT needs to distribute work better...based on people’s abilities and interests.”
- “It is difficult to measure the level of involvement or commitment that everyone should give, but perhaps this should be established before dealing with any issues.”
- The HSRT needs a strong coordinator or administrator to “pull the organization together” and to “follow through with tasks when a member volunteers to take on a duty.”

Recommendation 19: Members form one of the most valuable assets of any community group. The HSRT needs to keep its members interested and to encourage full membership. Strategies for delegating tasks and emphasizing teamwork must also be developed.

4.3.4 Developing a Structure

Development of an organizational structure forms an important part of collaboration since it is through this process that roles are assigned and ‘participants formalize responsibilities and assume mutual control over the resolution of issues that confront them’ (Selin and Chavez, 1995). While the HSRT struggled initially with establishing its structure, it seems to have settled on a format that involves two co-ordinators, two chairs, various sub-committee chairs and other members. The benefits of this framework are summed up by one individual: “this structure is... different from traditional structures. It is not hierarchical, that is, it doesn’t make executive
decisions...it isn’t exclusive.” Also sub-committees enable the plenary group to achieve more than it could on its own.

However, this structure is not without its weaknesses. To begin, the roles of the co-chairs are not well defined. For instance, the HSRT Operating Procedures suggest that the group chair should or may: “make appointments to the various sub-committees”, “grant more time to sub-committee chairs to resolve a disagreement”, “strike a subcommittee ...to seek an agreement” etc.. However, it is unclear as to the exact role that the chair plays at HSRT meetings. Does the chair ensure that everyone has an adequate opportunity to express their interests? Does the chair act as a facilitator or a mediator? These uncertainties are manifested in the fact that often the terms “co-ordinator,” “facilitator,” “administrator,” “director” and “chair” are used interchangeably by HSRT members. For example one person remarked: “We could use a facilitator, but cannot afford one... We do need help with running meetings ...and co-ordinating efforts.” Two people thought that the role of the chair was “…to improve tightness at meetings and to keep things on track” and to “pull the organization together.” Another thought that the chairs should really be “…spokespersons who can responsibly speak to the media and government.” Several members thought that the idea of having rotating chairs (a recent experiment in which a different member acts as chair of each plenary meeting) was very worthwhile and should be continued since it “brings people to the table at an intense level...and (members) learn from the experience.” The Guide to Establishing a Local Round Table (1992) offers the following advice on chairs:

“It is important that the chair be seen as neutral and is respected by all sectors represented on the round table. The chair should also be experienced in facilitating group processes so that he/she can assist the group in seeking consensus.”
Similar uncertainties arise with respect to the responsibilities and roles of other players in the group. One member commented that: “Members don’t have specific roles, but there are specific objectives attached to each sub-committee.” Another commented that if sub-groups failed to give adequate reports to the plenary or if one was not a part of a subgroup, then “(one) ...sometimes doesn’t feel as though (one) is a part of the process.” Most members agreed that the use of subgroups was both necessary and expedient for the group to function effectively. The Guide to Establishing a Local Round Table (BCRT, 1991) offers the following advice on the responsibilities of members:

“Each member has the dual responsibility of informing the community of the work, policies and recommendations of the round table as well as bringing community concerns to the round table. (This is) particularly true with respect to the sector that each member may represent. This responsibility should be articulated in the terms of reference.”

**Recommendation 20:** The roles and responsibilities of the chairs as well as other members of the HSRT warrant further distinction and clarification. It is also recommended that each member is a participant of at least one sub-committee in order to encourage their active involvement and to enable them to contribute to the process. Once clear responsibilities are assigned member interest may be enhanced, and tasks may be more evenly and effectively allocated.
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS II. OPERATIONAL PHASES

5.1 RELATIONSHIP BUILDING

The development of sound relationships (or “coalitions” after Waddock, 1989) among the members in a partnership is extremely important to facilitate collaborations. This process requires that members get to know one another as well as explore different perspectives and gain trust. Round tables collaborate in a complex manner. Not only do they require that their members develop sound working relationships, but that the entire group as a whole must also form solid ties and networks with members of the broader community in which they are located.

“Few stewardship groups can be effective working in isolation. Your group will benefit from developing a constructive relationship with government, your community, media and private landowners. But the ways you enter into relationships are different for each of these potential collaborators” (FBMP et al., 1995).

5.1.1 Relationships within the HSRT

(i) Balancing Power

Sound relationships within a collaborative partnership begin with balancing power among stakeholders. This is achieved by ensuring that each member is given an equal opportunity to voice his/her concerns and interests, to contribute to the agenda, and to participate in decision-making. Power, or at least influence on the HSRT is seen to be acquired through one of three avenues: holding a position such as chair, sub-committee chair or co-ordinator; exhibiting leadership and initiative in a project that supports the goals of the group; or holding an important and prestigious position or occupation outside of the organization. The following comment may be useful to illustrate the latter: “Upon coming to the HSRT I felt somewhat intimidated, at first, by the presence of two lawyers.” Ideally, this type of professional recognition should be left at the door when members enter the room so that members of all different backgrounds and occupations may come to the table as equals. For the most part, the organization has been
successful in ensuring equilibrium in this case. The presence of uneven levels of participation within the group has already been mentioned. One individual summarized the problem very effectively: “Unless we get equal participation, leadership tends to drift towards those that are doing the work.” Hence, it is imperative that all members participate actively to balance leadership and influence equally throughout the group.

(ii) Expression of Interests and Perspectives

In a collaborative process the expression of new ideas and interests are encouraged. On the whole HSRT members thought that the atmosphere at meetings was open and that different interests were adequately expressed and heard. Only a small number of concerns were raised. One person felt that at times, “some people talk too much and dominate conversations.” Another member noted that “some members just back off or give in rather than pushing a point.” Another was “not sure that all interests are expressed.” For example, there have so far been no discussions that called for a perspective on health. One individual felt a number of interesting substantive issues were being discussed among several members during the meeting breaks, but these issues were often not addressed at the table. Another person expressed a keen desire to learn more about the wealth of different interests and experiences --as yet largely undiscovered and untapped-- that members themselves brought to the table.

Recommendation 21: The HSRT must continue to ensure an even balance in power and influence among its members. It must also learn to recognize and to tap into the wealth of information that each member brings to the table as well as ensure that all perspectives are heard.
(iii) Building Trust

Conflict resolution is greatly facilitated if participants within a given group have established trust. Trust gives participants confidence in the process and enables them to display their bottom line so that solutions and trade-offs can be worked out. While some local round tables--such as the HSRT--may be more focussed on building community awareness than on resolving conflict, trust is still important. Participants need to establish good rapport with each other if they are to feel comfortable in expressing their interests and perspectives. An open and trusting environment nurtures the development of creative ideas and opportunities. Most HSRT members felt that a level of trust had been established and was still building. Due to the fact that the organization is ongoing, new relationships and new trust will have to be built each time a new member comes on board, before further progress can be made.

(iv) Communications Between Meetings

Many members felt that their communications between meetings could be improved. One person felt that “A fair amount of work is going on behind the scenes...(such that) decisions appear to be made and you don’t know where they came from.” Another argued that “the plenary is ... kept informed. If (members feel they are) not, it is because of their own lack of initiative.” Another noted that “we have an efficient way of getting information to members, but no effective way to get information from one member to the others.” This comment was confirmed by another: “To a limited extent members try to get information out to other members, but communication between meetings is onerous.” Long-distance phone and fax charges between members spread out over the Howe Sound region, and the time-consuming nature of information transfer and exchange were cited as common hindrances to communication.
Recommendation 22: The exchange of information and perspectives needs to be encouraged both at and in between meetings. Not only will this facilitate communications between members, but it will also cultivate new ideas, and increase members’ knowledge of the region.

5.1.2 Relationships with Members of the Howe Sound Community

For a local round table, perhaps more than any other collaborative partnership, the processes of establishing networks with and building support from the constituency groups and members of the broader community, are vital. As a grassroots bottom-up organization, the HSRT needs to pay particular attention to its ties with the community. Most members thought that there was much room for improvement in this area.

HSRT members generally recognized that few people living within the Howe Sound community had actually heard about the group. Fewer still are familiar with and understand its role. This lack of awareness is not surprising. A poll by Marketrend Research Inc. showed that in 1991, citizens were no more aware of the BCRT than they were one year after its inception.\(^4\) With a much smaller budget, and without the capacity to produce and distribute numerous documents, it is easy to see that a much smaller body such as the HSRT could experience great challenges in building community awareness. Several reasons for lack of community awareness may be offered: a waning interest in environmental concerns, a lower interest in being proactive rather than reactive, a desire to avoid anything that may require donations of time and/or money, and a lack of information. When talking to their peers about the HSRT, members identified reactions ranging from “enthusiastic” and “encouraging” to “skeptical” and even “cynical.” One member described difficulties in explaining to others the concepts behind the group. Another

---

\(^4\) Marketrend Research Inc. found that the following percentages of British Columbians were aware of the BCRT: May 1990: 35% had heard the term; Sept 1991: 31% had heard the term.)
found that only those already working within similar planning forums, for example municipal planners, have an interest in and attempt to understand the HSRT.

On the whole members agreed that greater efforts had to be made by the HSRT to better inform members of the Howe Sound community. Most thought that this could in part be accomplished through the development of a HSRT newsletter that could update and inform people about the group. Nevertheless, while having its own newsletter would help to establish the group’s identity and increase its profile within the community, the costs involved in this endeavour were a concern. It was also recognized that the group should continue to provide information for the *Watershed News* —a local environmental science newsletter— as well as write articles for local newspapers such a the *Lions Bay Sea Gull*, and the *North Shore News*.

Aside from informing the community, HSRT members realized that measures had to be developed for interacting with and engaging local people in its activities. So far the HSRT has hosted a series of community workshops and a public forum, all in connection with the S3 project. One member, however, observed a high proportion of government employees at these workshops. “The S3 workshops were a good step, but HSRT activities and public events are too loaded with council, bureaucrats, and CORE etc... (I) would like to see more involvement from the community... from the old lady living in the apartment.” Other suggestions indicated that the HSRT members themselves had to be encouraged to get out into the community and participate in local events as much as they tried to encourage local people to engage in HSRT activities. The following different forums for reaching out into the community were recommended: “putting up a display booth at fairs,” “educating elementary school children,” and “participating in Community Day events.” It was also recognized that many of these activities may require time and resources that the group may not have at this point.
Recommendation 23: As a grassroots, bottom-up organization the HSRT needs to pay close attention to its ties with the community. The development of a HSRT newsletter is strongly encouraged as is the active participation of HSRT members themselves in community events.

Accountability:

The issue of informing and maintaining ties with the community raises a number of pertinent questions. Through what channels does the HSRT maintain contact with local interests, and both give and receive information from the community? To whom does the HSRT report? or in other words, To whom is the HSRT accountable? These are all important questions that the group is struggling to come to grips with.

Individuals on the round table are expected to represent the perspectives of their particular backgrounds and experiences and in so doing may be seen as an indirect resource of community interests. But several participants thought that HSRT members should do more than provide their own perspectives and values. Each member should establish networks within their neighbourhood and/or work place so that information can be carried back and forth from the HSRT. At least three members carried this notion a step further concluding that members are carefully selected to “ensure a high quality of membership.” In fact, members should be “active” and “well-respected...leaders” within their respective areas. They “should be going out into the community” and delivering the message of the HSRT. In this sense, the people within each of these neighbourhoods and work places act like “constituency groups” for HSRT members. However, there are some important differences. In multi-stakeholder groups where members are representative of interests, members are under obligation to report back to their constituency groups and can only make decisions based on their consent. In other words, members are accountable to their constituency groups. In the HSRT model, which is
representative of perspectives and values (and not interests), no such obligation exists. Hence the
group is formally accountable to no one.

Lack of accountability raises several concerns. To begin, there is no established
mechanism to deliver information to the community and members are unclear of their role with
respect to outside groups. To confound this issue, while members are expected to be leaders
within their areas, the HSRT Operating Procedures (as seen in the following quote) place fairly
tight restrictions on what may or may not be communicated by individual members.

“All public statements on behalf of the Round Table will be made by the Chair or a designate of the Chair.
Committees and individual members will not represent the Round Table or release public statements or
communications, without prior consent from the Round Table.

Credibility:

Another reason to be concerned about lack of accountability has to do with credibility.
With no real obligation to report to the outside community and no one to ensure that they are
doing so, there is a danger that the group may be seen, as one member described, as a “self-
serving” entity that follows its own direction. Since this organization claims to represent
community perspectives, this perception could potentially be very damaging to the group’s
reputation and also its credibility.

The majority of HSRT members thought that credibility was something that had to be
earned “through experience and results.” In other words, it could not be acquired through close
association with another respected body such as CORE or the B.C. Round Table. One member
claimed that credibility was gained by “performing concrete initiatives ...that are of benefit to the
community.” Another thought this type of respect was gained through “enduring, persevering
through the political trials, and by... doing things that are in the best interests of people in the
Howe Sound region.” Several thought that credibility could be established by being accountable
to and representative of the community and various stakeholders groups. Others thought that in order to gain respect, the HSRT needed to “go out into the community,” “convene community forums,” and “be more open.” Yet another member commented that the RT “must have stability, clear goals and be financially responsible.” At any rate, it was generally agreed that the HSRT needed more credibility.

Some members expressed concern about the lack of credibility and accountability. One member commented that: “currently the HSRT is not accountable to anyone, but (it) should be accountable to members of the Howe Sound community.” Attempts made to address this issue include the establishment of an ‘independent’ Community Appointments Committee (CAC). As one individual explained, “due to the lack of formal accountability to the public, ...the CAC is one of the only means of ensuring representation of the community.” The establishment of a HSRT newsletter is yet another mechanism for increasing the accountability and credibility of the group. However, a formal strategy for reporting needs to be established before the HSRT can hope to address any contentious issues and make any substantive decisions. Admittedly, as several members noted, the HSRT has not yet had to deal with any substantive issues that necessitated a full-scale public communication strategy. Nevertheless, the HSRT would be better off to prepare for these things now before the need arises. Griss (1993) advises that:

“Groups must also become more open and accountable to enhance their influence and resources. Those that provide no information on activities or finances to their supporters, or allow them no input into either decision-making or electing those who will govern the organization, will come under increasing scrutiny. Groups that advocate transparency, accountability, and participatory democracy must demonstrate those qualities in the conduct of their own affairs. Groups that find ways to communicate their concerns in a manner which enables all Canadians to contribute to solutions, and respects their interests, will prosper.”

Recommendation 24: The establishment of an effective mechanism by which HSRT members should communicate with and report to outside community groups is vital. This mechanism must not only be clearly stated, but also documented in the group’s terms of reference. As long as this mechanism does not exist, HSRT members will be uncertain as to their responsibilities with respect to communication and the group itself will experience great difficulties in earning much needed credibility and accountability.
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Accessibility:

The HSRT claims to have an “open door policy” and yet its Operating Procedures state that “Guests may attend the Round Table or committee meetings at the invitation of the chairs.” So far no community member has come to HSRT meetings without a formal invitation. When HSRT meetings are held in different regions, little effort is made to let the community members in those regions know that they can attend. One member commented that “the RT is open to the public,” but that coming to one meeting, like “a snapshot taken out of time, is meaningless.” The HSRT has not made any decisions about different forms of involvement or part-time membership. (For example, a community member may want to volunteer time on certain projects without becoming a full member). The HSRT has discussed extended membership especially for those who leave as members and want to stay on as members of the society, but such a situation has not yet arisen.

Recommendation 25: The accessibility of the group to members of the broader community needs to be improved. Once the HSRT gets involved with specific projects, it may wish to consider expanding its membership to include temporary, project specific volunteers. In addition, the HSRT needs to play a more active role within the community. The community workshops conducted by the S3 project provided a step in the right direction. More of these forums and open houses that put the HSRT in direct contact with members of the broader community are needed.

In summary, building and maintaining working relations both among members and between other groups forms a very necessary collaborative role for HSRT. Clear ground rules establishing the expectations and obligations of each member, and outlining how members interact with one another and with other groups; as well as frequent information exchanges and
reporting are essential for building and maintaining the reputation of the group. As one member explained: “For a RT, no news is bad news.”

5.1.3 Relationships with First Nations and the Media

Unfortunately, due to time constraints, both First Nations members of the HSRT declined to participate in this research study. While their input would have been a valuable contribution, other members were nevertheless able to offer some useful insight. One member reported that the group was “still learning how to communicate with First Nations.” Several individuals thought that contact should be improved through a variety of ways: “organizing meetings on reserve lands”, “engaging in a cultural exchange”, inviting respected First Nation leaders to talk to the HSRT on land claims. Another drew attention to the fact that building ties was “a two way street.” Several people noted that First Nations members were frequently absent from meetings, while one member indicated that “absence (of First Nations) at meetings is not a good indicator of the level of their participation... it is the nature of the way they do business.” All members were fully aware that First Nations people throughout the province are currently very preoccupied with land claim settlements, and are reluctant to take part in activities that might undermine this process. The Fraser River Action Plan (1994) suggests the following advice for liaisons with First Nations:

“Natives and non-natives have common interests in watershed ecosystems ...stewardship and good management... which can form the basis for cooperative action. To develop such cooperation... First Nations’ initiatives and concerns regarding the environment, economy, social issues, styles and customs must be recognized...and respected.”

HSRT members tended to think that the media, including community newspapers, had no particular interest in the organization. One member commented that: “the round table gets very little press... not news worthy ...because (we) are not using sensational tactics such as hanging off
bridges.” Nevertheless, the mass media may be seen as key players in the local political process through:

“... the coverage (or lack) of local government activities and issues... and ...due to their sheer size (and influence) on some major corporations...” Tindal and Tindal (1990).

Recommendation 26: More efforts need to be taken to interact with and earn the respect of First Nations. Cultural exchanges and local meetings are important first steps. Measures should also be taken to keep local newspapers up-to-date on the group’s activities since the media can be a very effective tool for informing members of the Howe Sound community.

5.1.4 Liaisons with Other NGOs in the Howe Sound Region

HSRT members have made an attempt to contact several non-governmental agencies within the Howe Sound region especially those with similar concerns. Groups that have been contacted include the: Sunshine Coast Community Resource Council, Howe Sound Environmental Science Network, Howe Sound Research Council, Squamish Estuary Society, Healthy Communities, Whistler Centre for Business and the Arts. However, no ongoing liaisons or joint ventures with these groups have been established with the exception of the latter, who will be helping the HSRT to host a community conference in September.

Members had a variety of comments with respect to forming liaisons. One member felt that “some individuals do liaise, but the table doesn’t do so as a group. This needs to be improved.” Another agreed that liaison was limited, but suggested that this might “perhaps be a job for administration.” Another expressed that liaisons are a necessary means of “gaining support, sharing information, and collaborating” with other groups, while another felt that it is important “to maintain links with other groups, but (that) one does not always need to form alliances with them.” Accompanying this comment was a word of caution that other groups may not operate, or have similar values as the HSRT. One group in particular was thought to have a
more social and environmental emphasis that may conflict with the sustainability goals of the HSRT.

Co-operation and collaboration are increasingly becoming a matter of necessity for ENGOs struggling to survive in current times. The National Round Table Review devoted an entire issue (Spring 1993) to NGOs and challenges facing them. In this issue Paul Griss writes:

"...Success requires a shift in strategies, tactics and management... Each group needs to rise above its own self-interest to develop a greater understanding of the realities of confronting others and the movement as a whole. Progress will be obstructed by those with unfounded fears that greater cooperation will threaten their funding, profile, power or credibility. Partnerships of all types are proving to be one of the more effective ways to both secure progress on issues and increase the resources that can be brought to bear on solving problems." (Griss, 1993).

Ferretti (1993) confirms this point:

"While ...environmental groups have worked together on issues in the past, there is now a need to work together more strategically and effectively to capitalize on the varying niches they occupy as individual organizations in the larger community of the environment. This ...will mean greater specialization among groups in terms of issues, approaches and skills. But in order to be effective, specialization will have to be complemented by greater cooperation."

Thus, especially with its limited funding, the HSRT could stand to benefit substantially from strengthening ties with other groups in the area. Other groups that present opportunities for partnership building in the Howe Sound watershed include the:

Howe Sound Watershed Stewardship Project;
Bowen Island Forest and Water Management Society (Mapping Project);
Dakota Creek Watershed Restoration Project;
Squamish River Watershed Project; and the
Whyte Cliff Park Marine Protected Area Initiative. (HSRT, 1994).

Recommendation 27: To make the most of its limited resources, and to reduce duplication of efforts within the Howe Sound region, the HSRT should cooperate and strengthen its ties with other NGOs in the area.

5.1.5 Relationships to Government

Cooperative strategies to improve success do not stop at building partnerships with business, labour, first nations and community. Strategic alliances must also be made with
government (Griss, 1993). The HSRT's collaborative relationship to government is an extremely significant one that demands careful attention. It has been suggested that:

"The actions of public officials affect the readiness of bystanders, adherents and constituents to commit to the movement or work against it." (Woliver, 1993).

Further,

"A local round table should ...make clear its working and reporting relationship with government, for it is through government that the round table can influence public policy and programs." (BCRT, 1991c).

Here the term 'government' includes both elected officials and bureaucrats of all three levels of government. However, as will become apparent later, the relations of the HSRT with each level and agency exhibit important distinctions.

Building links to government:

It has already been mentioned that in order to preserve the integrity of this community organization, there are no government officials on the HSRT. Nevertheless, the group does recognize government as a key player within the Howe Sound region. With many citizens of this area not showing much interest in planning and sustainability, and fewer still having any knowledge of the HSRT; the latter realizes that while they may have different ways of conducting their business, government and the HSRT are at least working towards a somewhat similar cause. In addition, government can be greatly instrumental in improving the credibility and stability of the group if the HSRT earns their support and possibly funding.

Almost all HSRT members advocated the importance of links with government. In the absence of formal links, the HSRT has established informal connections with various officials throughout the region by means of the Community Appointments Committee. (See Section 3.2.3 on Membership). The exact nature of this link is not well understood and the concept is still in
its early stages of development. The officials who accepted this invitation have done so with varying degrees of enthusiasm.

Members described general government reactions to the HSRT as follows: "mixed from enthusiastic to hostile," "government has not embraced the HSRT," "the HSRT is being stonewalled by government," and "government feels threatened" by the group. The following reasons for these responses were offered: "...this is partly based on misunderstanding (as to the purpose and role of the RT) and partly based on a fear of public involvement in decision-making." "Some local governments feel if they put enough obstacles in the RT's way it will go away." Some governments feel the RT is "interfering with its own role", and others who "already have a lot of planning issues to address, ...don't want to deal with another body and especially one that has no credibility." One member commented that enthusiasm and approval received from technical staff and bureaucrats for a particular initiative, were subsequently "barricaded" by elected officials and council politics.

Despite these challenges, one individual felt that "the HSRT needs to keep trying... to keep links strong with those that give it their support and then the others will follow suit." Another member thought that "instead of trying to be what local government wants, the HSRT should focus on its mandate and ...government will buy into (the process) later." At any rate, it was generally agreed that any misconceptions as to the role of the RT should be clarified and that perhaps a meeting with governments throughout the region should be organized for this purpose.

Recommendation 28: The HSRT needs to continue to strengthen ties and earn the respect of government. The exact nature and the purpose of formal (Community Appointment Committee) links to government call for further review and clarification. Also, any fears or misunderstanding that government may have as to the role of the HSRT need to be clarified. Note that in order to do this, the group itself must have a very clear and common understanding of its role.
HSRT Role with Respect to Government:

HSRT members were asked to explain what they thought their role with respect to government was and where if possible the HSRT could fit within the existing governance framework. The majority of members felt their role was to “act as an advisory body,” “alerting government to broader, current issues” within the Howe Sound watershed area. In addition, the HSRT “could act as a sounding board, bringing public concerns to government.” Several individuals emphasized that “the HSRT is not going to replace local advisory boards,” nor become “another layer of bureaucracy,” but that the HSRT will “provide a watershed perspective.” In addition, it is not the group’s intention to “interfere with local government decisions.” Instead, the HSRT could provide “a background for decision-making”, “a comprehensive framework for looking at issues”, as well as perhaps “provide recommendations to government” who ultimately must make the decisions. Only one member felt that the HSRT “could be a giant watchdog. Not against industry and jobs, but acting to hold industry and government accountable.”

Suggesting a position for the HSRT within the existing governance framework proved difficult for HSRT members. It should be remembered that the HSRT operates within a boundary that falls under the jurisdiction of five municipal governments, three regional districts, two First Nations, the Islands Trust as well as several provincial and federal agencies. Some members felt that the organization could play a small part in the referrals process --“acting as a sounding board for the impact of certain projects, licenses, and permits.” One member thought that since the RT is concerned with the whole Howe Sound region, and not just at individual, local jurisdictions, it may “fit in better at the regional district (as opposed to the municipal) level.” Another noted that they “could see (the RT) on a level with regional government, and
perhaps even replacing it.” This notion however, did not seem to be shared by other members of the group. Others thought that the HSRT could be looked upon as providing “a forum for bringing together diverse interests and perspectives from throughout the Howe Sound region.” Some felt that the HSRT could act as a co-ordinator, convening and “facilitating planning meetings for the area” while at the same time “promoting joint, integrated regional planning.”

Dovetail Consulting grappled in a similar manner with this difficult exercise. Their findings, summarized in The Future of Local Round Tables (1994), identified “a strong need for the roles of LRTs to be more clearly defined particularly regarding their relationship with government, and specifically how that role should fit in the existing land use planning and watershed management processes.” CORE (1994d) presented a chart indicating the relationship of its own pilot projects (local round tables and community resource boards) with other land use planning systems. This chart is reproduced in Fig. 5.1.

Recommendation 29: The HSRT needs to work with other local round tables and government to establish a more clearly defined purpose and relationship for these important community groups in land use planning and watershed management processes. Clarifying this relationship will enhance their recognition and credibility.

Strengths of the HSRT over Government:

“Non-governmental organizations and private and community groups can often provide an efficient and effective alternative to public agencies in the delivery of programs and projects. Moreover, they can sometimes reach target groups that public agencies cannot” (Our Common Future, 1987).

HSRT members were asked to describe the potential of the group and in particular, those strengths and assets that they could provide over existing governance agencies. Four very important points were offered. “We as a RT have the opportunity to be better informed than the government. The latter are only informed about their own jurisdiction and policy, but have...very little communication with other jurisdictions.” Another member offered that “government
decisions are removed”; in other words government decisions are frequently derived in a location that is often distant from the problem area, and people affected by the problem are often not a part of the decision-making. Thirdly, it was suggested that the HSRT has the potential to provide a watershed approach that local governments cannot. Finally, it was suggested that the HSRT has the ability to “pull together a much greater cross-section of interested parties.”

Recommendation 30: The HSRT should identify, acknowledge and cultivate its strengths.

It is interesting to compare government’s response in regard to their perception of the HSRT as well as their thoughts on its role and potential. Various individuals from municipal, regional, provincial, and federal government departments were asked for their opinions on this subject. It is important to remember that due to the multi-jurisdictional watershed region that the HSRT covers, this community organization, will come into contact and need to interact with all these levels of government and not just with the local level. (A detailed list of the questions asked of government officials is provided in the Appendix.) However, due to the small number of people interviewed at each level, the results cannot be considered conclusive and hence are merely presented in a chart for comparison (See Table 5.1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Government and community, Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response of Gov't to RTS</strong></td>
<td>Balanced from community, Industry</td>
<td>Advisory to Gov't, Soundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of Funding</strong></td>
<td>Government, Industry</td>
<td>Balancing Regional Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Links to Gov't</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board, Editorial/Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of RTs with Respect to Gov't</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory to Gov't, Soundings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1:** Response of Government to Local Round Tables in General

**Table 5.2:** Balanced from community, Industry

**Table 5.3:** Advisory to Gov't, Soundings

**Table 5.4:** Board, Editorial/Commissioner

**Table 5.5:** Balancing Regional Interests

**Table 5.6:** Advisory to Gov't, Soundings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVICe FOR RTs</th>
<th>CHALLENGES FOR RTs</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>community, multi-stakeholder body</td>
<td>has minimum 4 internal members, is led by a team of RTs</td>
<td>fund development and growth of regional industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring links and display any RT issues</td>
<td>RTs need to be realistic. Regional industries should also be realistic in their representation.</td>
<td>ensure that regional industries are represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fund development and growth of regional industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ensure that regional industries are represented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 (continued) Response of Government to Local Round Tables
From the above table, it may be observed that municipal, regional, provincial and federal
governments may all have different expectations as to what a local round table can and should
do. For example, municipalities may have their own public advisory processes and ways for
developing visions, but they may lack integrated and comprehensive information about the
overall region. Federal government agencies may have access to regional information, but they
may be relatively out of touch with the community needs and interests. Also, while local round
tables are generally keen to have their role legitimized and to establish formal links with
government, the latter would like their role to be better clarified and their objectives more
precisely defined. (Similar findings were reported in *The Future of Local Round Tables*, 1994).
Thus, a challenge exists for the HSRT to take careful note of and to cultivate its strengths, and to
remain sensitive to the needs and expectations of each level of government.

**Recommendation 31:** The HSRT should remain sensitive to the needs and expectations of
each level of government.

**Role of Government with Respect to the HSRT:**

Jean Charest (1993) recognized the value of community involvement in moving the
nation towards sustainability. He also realized that increased awareness, shared responsibility
and collaborative problem solving would be necessary prerequisites for sustainability.

"Governments cannot single-handedly achieve social, environmental and economic sustainability. These are
inextricably linked and only achievable through the full and active participation of all sectors of society... Successful action on these fronts requires a common purpose and a capacity and willingness to engage others as partners in effecting change at all levels. It also requires that we change our approach from one of exercising our rights as stakeholders to one of assuming our responsibilities as shareholders in the environment... Collaborative problem solving means forging and strengthening working relationships with other sectors, such as governments, institutions and corporations." (Jean Charest, 1993).
Since local round tables can be of assistance to government in promoting community sustainability, it would seem as though government would seize the opportunity to liaise with these groups. In reality though, only a few local round tables have access to and recognition from government. These groups include those round tables and community resources boards that form pilot projects for CORE and the FBMP, as well as those groups that were initiated by local governments in the first place. So far the HSRT lacks formal recognition from the local governments within its area. Clearly, some governments are not yet equipped nor ready to engage in such a partnership. These governments need to be better co-ordinated, more accommodating, more ‘bioregionally’ focussed, and more serious about sustainability before any such recognition or liaison can take place.

Several other authors have found that the institutional culture within many agencies often hinders collaboration. Schatz et al. (1991)

“...criticized the dominant centralized, rational-comprehensive planning process as impeding collaboration with local interest groups. The(y) ...suggest that a more decentralized approach to planning, using small working groups throughout the planning process would encourage consensus-based decision-making.” (Selin and Chavez, 1995).

Selin and Chavez (1995) declared that:

“(Environmental) Managers comfortable with the hierarchical decision-making of public agencies are finding it difficult to cope with the lateral decisions needed to sustain effective collaboration... Managers need new skills to move from the expert opinion role in traditional environmental management to an empowerment role as a mediator, catalyst or broker in the new order.”

Community Stewardship (1995) summarizes a number a ways in which local groups can support governments and vice versa:
LOCAL GROUPS CAN SUPPORT GOV'T BY:

- undertaking research.
- communicating community needs and preferences.
- gaining community support for conservation projects.
- providing independent advice and innovative ideas.
- modeling new and creative ways of doing stewardship.
- supplementing government stewardship resources with labour and human resources at low cost.
- providing support for government stewardship work.
- achieving consensus among diverse interests on controversial topics.
- bringing the community closer and easing government decision-making.

GOV'T CAN SUPPORT LOCAL GROUPS BY:

- allocating resources (office space, equipment).
- providing operating funds.
- providing specialized expertise.
- providing start-up facilitation, administrational, organizational, or planning skills.
- providing information on government programs.
- improving the group's profile for potential lenders.
- providing leads to financial and technical resources.
- providing access to government decision-makers and various departments.
- providing authority, legitimacy and influence with respect to other government agencies.

Recommendation 32: The HSRT should undertake activities (undertaking research, gaining community support on government stewardship initiatives etc.) that may be useful to government. They should also encourage government support by clearly articulating the manners in which government can support their efforts. (Governments, for their part, need to be more accommodating and accepting of such community groups.)

5.2 OUTCOMES AND MONITORING

Much of the success with this final stage of collaboration hinges on the careful consideration of the earlier stages. If an organization is not ready to implement and monitor its collaborative agreement, it may have to revert back to an earlier stage in this iterative process. Nonetheless, it is still possible for collaboration to fall apart even in this final phase. Since the HSRT is relatively newly developed, aside from operational and administrative duties it has, to date, completed only one special project (the Shared Stewardship for Sustainability or S3 initiative). Nevertheless, the collaboration framework still provides a useful tool for examining this and upcoming projects.

5.2.1 Implementation

Depending on the nature of the organization and its expected outcomes, some bodies may not have the ability to implement the agreements that they make. Most members agreed that aside from operational and administrative duties, the HSRT was not responsible for
implementing its decisions. Its role is to “gather information, make recommendations and submissions to government (or other receiving bodies within the Howe Sound region), but not to implement.” As an advisory body the HSRT can facilitate and co-ordinate a community planning forum, gather information, and make recommendations, but it has no authority to implement these recommendations. This release of responsibility is done for both practical and political reasons. For one, the organization lacks the resources required to implement its recommendations and secondly, many of the consensus agreements arrived at by the group may affect various jurisdictions so that government will ultimately need to make the final decisions. So who, then, is responsible for implementing the recommendations of this group? Most members thought that implementation should require the co-ordinated efforts of government, business and the community. The exact mechanism for this will depend on the particular project.

**Recommendation 33:** Since the HSRT is not responsible for implementing its own advice, it becomes that much more important for the group to establish the support of prominent community and business leaders as well as elected officials who may be crucial for the implementation of proposals.

### 5.2.2 Defining and Selecting Issues and Projects

Some researchers of community organizations believe that such groups should be founded around a clearly defined and specific issue that local people are affected by and genuinely concerned about. These deep concerns for the issue at hand then encourage people to gravitate towards the problem and make possible the formation of partnerships to resolve them. The Baker Creek Enhancement Society, centred in Quesnel, is an example of such a community organization. Its practical concern is the restoration of the Baker watershed.

The HSRT is not held together by any one specific issue. True, there are a myriad of issues facing the Howe Sound region -- ranging from water quality to transportation and
affordable housing—, but no particular issue has been singled out as the most important concern for the round table to address. (Although, rapidly increasing development and the need for growth management, has been discovered as an important concern for almost all members.) Instead, the HSRT is driven by a need to promote a sustainable and watershed perspective for the region. It is interesting to note that many community organizations that are formed around a specific issue disintegrate once a solution is found. By attaching itself to a concept whose realization requires ongoing attention, the HSRT has thus extended its longevity. Nevertheless, the HSRT could run into problems if the concept is poorly defined, and if there are no established and measurable targets and strategies for reaching this end or if this concept is so nebulous that it cannot be broken down into manageable pieces.

Other sustainability community groups can offer useful advice in this area. Some groups have developed inventories and mechanisms for mapping their watershed regions. *Leaving Our Legacy: Mapping Our Home Place*, produced by the Salt Spring Island Community Society, is a much sought after mapping manual for community groups. Other local groups, such as Comox Valley Round Table, have developed a detailed community vision, while still others have developed strategies to measure the community progress towards sustainability. The City of Burnaby, District of Matsqui and City of Richmond have or are in the process of preparing “State of the Environment” Reports and are working towards the incorporation of environmental policies into their Official Community Plans (BCRT, 1991a).

**Recommendation 34:** The HSRT needs to establish measurable targets and strategies for working towards sustainability. Developing a community vision, performing inventories and mapping the watershed region (and other strategies) may be very useful exercises.
At least two processes are important in getting started on a project: bringing issues and
potential projects to the table, and deciding which project to undertake.

*Bringing issues to the table:

How are potential issues brought forward to the table for consideration? Most members
thought that individuals from all sectors: community, business and government should be able to
approach the HSRT with their concerns. Also, members of the group themselves should generate
ideas for consideration. With the exception of the S3 project (a federal government assignment),
all other projects (including the HHW and the visioning conference) have been initiated
internally. Further, a study of the HSRT minutes reveals that initiatives and special projects
suggested by HSRT members tend to be made in a somewhat arbitrary fashion, based more on
the particular interests of an individual or due to the opportunities that present themselves to the
table, rather than a conscious decision by the group to set specific priorities and to concentrate or
focus on a particular area. For example, one member commented that the S3 initiative literally
“...fell into the laps of the HSRT,” who “…weren’t quite sure what (they) were looking for at that
time.” To date the HSRT has not yet established any mechanisms whereby submissions for
potential projects can be brought forward to the table. Relatively weak ties with various
constituency groups and invitation-only attendance at HSRT meetings exacerbate this problem.

**Recommendation 35:** The HSRT needs to establish a mechanism whereby issues can be
brought forward to the table for consideration. Stronger, more active links with the community, as well as improved accessibility to HSRT members and meetings will be required.
Project selection:

Once an issue is raised, the HSRT must decide whether or not to undertake the challenge. To ease this selective process, the round table has established a set of Project Selection Criteria (Oct 20, 1994). These guidelines suggest that in order for a project to be undertaken by the group it must:

- be a sustainability (social, environmental, economic) issue that has an impact within the Howe Sound watershed.
- be manageable and have realistic funding, time and other resource requirements.
- have educational opportunities and serve to increase public understanding of sustainability.
- should have clearly stated goals and objectives that are consistent with the goals of the HSRT.
- should be a participatory process.

HSRT members raised several concerns with respect to these criteria. At least two members felt that too much responsibility for final decisions on project selection rested with chairs, sub-committee chairs and co-ordinators and potential projects were inadequately discussed at the table. Some members recognized a problem with selecting manageable tasks. While HSRT members were eager to take on the S3 project, in retrospect, those actively involved thought that the project was “too big, too much and too soon.” Others were concerned about the extent to which the availability of funding guided the selection of the project. For example, how would the HSRT choose between a well-funded government project and a poorly-funded, but nonetheless worthy community cause? One member commented that, “in reality, not having a big budget restricts the projects that the HSRT goes after.” Concerns were also raised that various funding agencies could exert considerable influence on the way in which a given project is to be conducted, and who the beneficiaries may be.

Concerns over the size of the region that the group was attempting to cover were also expressed. As one member observed, the Squamish Lil’looet Regional District has had great
difficulty in covering this region, and hence it should be no surprise that a non-profit, volunteer organization should experience considerable challenges in covering a larger region.

**Recommendation 36:** Criteria for project selection should be carefully re-evaluated, and procedures for using them need to be established. Special care must be taken to balance decision-making and to emphasize the selection of manageable tasks. HSRT members should also be wary of allowing certain criteria (such as funding) to take precedence over others.

### 5.2.3 Co-ordination and Allocation of Efforts and Resources

Effective co-ordination of program efforts requires a thorough understanding of the group's goals as well as a series of carefully designed strategies for reaching them. Priorities among tasks must be set, all potential strategies and options raised, and all the costs and benefits weighed. Budget and other resource requirements must be considered. Finally, the selected strategies must be carefully and equally distributed among members. Merely dividing the organization into sub-groups is insufficient to get tasks done; the full and active participation of all group members is also required.

Corbett (1993) claims that community groups have much to learn:

"...from the business community, especially when it comes to running efficient and effective organizations that achieve results. This is especially true in the area of strategic planning and human resource management, areas which are often not a priority of ENGOs, but which have a tremendous impact on their effectiveness."

Strategic planning, which provides a systematic plan to guide a group towards achieving its goals, should not only be discussed, but also documented in detail well in advance of its execution. The following example of a strategic action plan is adapted from the *Community Stewardship* guide (FBMP et al., 1995).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)</td>
<td>• dispose of waste in proper manner.</td>
<td>• organize a regional HHW day event.</td>
<td>• examine how other groups have been successful with such an event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• educate the public and build awareness.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• build support from local government, business &amp; community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• establish dates and advertise etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other personal and group skills that could greatly facilitate goal achievement include:

(i) **public relations skills**: interacting and communicating effectively with the public.
(ii) **co-ordination skills**: integrating and delegating activities.
(iii) **management and allocation of resources**: distributing funds and manpower in the most effective manner.
(iv) **technical and research skills**: members should be proficient at gathering and analyzing technical information (as well as able to relay this information in an understandable manner to community members.
(v) **teamwork**: all members must support each other and give their active and full participation.

The discussion that follows examines the use of these skills by the HSRT in performing each of its major projects.

The Shared Stewardship for Sustainability (S3) project of the HSRT is the largest and most comprehensive community endeavour that the organization has completed thus far. Some attention is due to this project since it offers several valuable lessons for the group. Despite the challenges (budget constraints, political hurdles, lack of community awareness etc.) that the project was faced with, the member’s overall response to this exercise was positive. Several members thought that it worked towards the group’s objectives of promoting a watershed perspective and public education. Some claimed that by holding various community workshops, a small contribution was made towards increasing the HSRT’s local profile. Some suggested that efforts to encourage a bioregional and sustainability approach in conjunction with the Howe Sound East Master Plan was a first and positive step towards building partnerships with government and community. Members that participated in S3 gained valuable insight into the complexity of the region and its composite communities.
A few drawbacks of the project were also noted. Several members commented that the scope of the project was too large and unmanageable. One member was disappointed that the HSRT did not spend enough time "gathering ...information about the region, so as to enable it to make better informed decisions." These ideas point to a need for better planning. Others observed that community workshops were not very well attended and that these necessary events should perhaps be supplemented by other strategies (e.g. a newsletter, open house, display booths) for reaching out and communicating with the community. Several members expressed concern that the entire project was really driven by just a handful of people, with the result that not everyone participated in the S3, and either didn't feel a part of it or didn't fully understand what was going on. Hence more teamwork and more coordinated group efforts are required. In addition, strategies for allocating tasks outside of the group need to be addressed. So far the HSRT has contracted out the preparation of research proposals and papers to several agencies including: Dovetail Consulting, SFU and Capilano College students. The group may want to establish policies to draw on the talents and skills of professionals and students that are based within the Howe Sound region itself.

The upcoming Howe Sound 20/20 Conference and the Household Hazardous Waste Events promise to help heighten the group's profile and to increase community awareness and responsibility. However, some members are unclear as to the purpose of the Visioning Conference. The following issues still need to be addressed: What type of information is needed from the community? What form will this information assume (advice, recommendations)? To whom will this information be given and Who will be expected to implement the recommendations?
Recommendation 37: The HSRT may wish to identify the necessary personal and groups skills that are required of its members—planning, public relations, co-ordination, teamwork etc.—and take the time to learn and practice these important skills. Strategic planning for special events/projects and their follow-up will greatly improve the success of these activities.

5.2.4 Feedback

If credibility and recognition are to be earned from members of the broader community, it is especially important that local round tables are able to gather constructive feedback from these various community groups. In order to do so, round tables must have effective mechanisms for plugging into the rapidly changing environmental and societal contexts that surround the organization. Once received, this information must be assessed and organizational changes made or new goals set to reflect the needs of the external environment. Failure to do so may set the organization on a course that follows its own and not the collective will, thus jeopardizing its credibility and its survival. Notice that these information loops complete the cycle of the iterative process and feed back into stage one of the collaborative model (refer to Figure 2.1).

Does the HSRT have effective channels for tapping into the changes and concerns within the community? One way to test this is to see if there is some mechanism whereby concerns can be voiced and listened to. Most HSRT members seemed to think that there were no effective or formalized channels for dealing with concerns raised either by HSRT members or by members of the outside community. In fact, a pervasive, but unspoken uncertainty as to the security of the organization, seems to prevent some members from expressing their concerns openly for fear of "rocking the boat."

Recommendation 38: More effective channels for receiving and for dealing constructively with feedback from both members and the community are needed.
5.2.5 Monitoring

Effective mechanisms for receiving feedback are by themselves not enough to enable the group to progress. Regular monitoring serves an extremely important function by:

- ensuring that the organization remains flexible to be able to adapt and change its focus as required.
- evaluating how well the chosen activities achieve the desired objectives.
- measuring the progress of the organization as it works towards its desired goals.
- measuring the outcomes of the groups activities and their impact on the broader community.

Most HSRT members could identify no formal mechanism that the group had established to monitor its performance. Only two members alluded to the Strategic Planning Review Session (October 1, 1994) as providing some type of monitoring structure. One member observed that some monitoring may take place informally through “various sub-committee discussions.” Another commented that sometimes concerns were voiced after plenary meetings, but that these expressions “took much courage to relate.” A proper forum for the expression of these concerns is needed.

A mechanism for monitoring can help to ensure the accountability of the group. One member pointed out that currently, “the HSRT has no accountability (and) ...if it is not doing what it is supposed to, it will not be taken seriously.” This member went on to suggest that monitoring should occur periodically to ensure that the table remains on track with community interests. A thought which was not entertained by any members, but which the group may want to consider is the possibility of having members of the outside community come out to one of these evaluative sessions on an annual basis (perhaps incorporated with an annual general meeting). In so doing the HSRT could also outline its progress towards the promotion of sustainability in the region.
Another reason for establishing a monitoring program is to draw recognition to the group’s achievements and successes. HSRT members deserve much credit for the outstanding amount of effort they have put into this process. Nevertheless, much of their work goes by unnoticed. Many members themselves recognized the S3 project as their most significant achievement accomplished thus far, while placing their many months of operational and developmental activities at a lower scale of importance. To maintain the energy and enthusiasm of the group, all successful achievements should not only be recognized, but also celebrated.

Recommendation 39: A formal and regular mechanism for monitoring needs to be established to provide a proper forum for the expression of concerns and feedback and to encourage constructive use of this valuable advice. Such a monitoring system would help to build accountability of the group by ensuring that the table remains on track with community interests. Also, to maintain the energy and enthusiasm of the group, all successful achievements should not only be recognized, but also celebrated.

The HSRT Strategic Planning Session held in October 1994 deserves more detail. This one day session, chaired by an outside facilitator, enabled the group to review its efforts over the past year and to set priorities for the upcoming year. Several members commented on the constructiveness of this exercise and felt that it should be continued on a regular basis. Nevertheless, by viewing HSRT minutes after this session, it seems as though insufficient follow-up was executed. True the organization underwent some tidying of sub-committee structures to more accurately reflect their focus. However, insufficient time has been allocated to the clarification of goals, the evaluation of activities (to see if they are still on track), the determination of benchmarks with which to gauge the group’s progress, the firm establishment of priorities and the allocation of funds to reach these ends. There has also been no further discussion as to whether this Planning Session will be repeated or whether some interim
monitoring process will be established. These are all important issues that the HSRT needs to consider.

Aside from having an event or forum to monitor the group’s progress, it is useful to establish a number of tools with which to measure that progress. These tools may take the form of evaluative criteria, for example, to measure success. Such criteria may include things like: Did the group meet the established deadlines for the completion of that activity? How well did that activity satisfy the group’s objectives? Was the task manageable or did it strain the group’s limited resources? How many HSRT members were actively engaged? How many members of the broader community were involved? How well did the exercise serve to strengthen communications and partnerships with other groups?

By contrast, it is also extremely useful to have a set of tools or sustainability indicators to monitor the changing state of the environment and any impacts that the RT may have on the region. For example, the RT may want to determine: Is community awareness of sustainability and the presence of the HSRT growing? How many community organizations with similar sustainability objectives have developed in the Howe Sound? At what rate is undisturbed space being lost to residential development? How many people will be living in the area by 2020 and what will be their ecological footprint? (Rees and Wackernagel, 1992.) How many days do people work at home rather than commuting by automobile to the city? Many of these types of indicators will need to be established in consultation with the community. Note that community concerns and interests will determine the indicators that are most valuable to them.

**Recommendation 40:** The HSRT should consider the use of benchmarks and indicators. These elements have shown to be very important instruments for measuring the progress of community groups as they work towards their goals, as well as for monitoring the changing state of the environment and any impacts that these groups may induce in their region.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 OVERVIEW OF THESIS OBJECTIVES

Round tables represent a fairly recent institutional approach to sustainability in Canada. As experimental bodies there is still much that needs to be learned about how these processes arise and operate. This thesis set out to test the use of the stage model of collaboration theory as a measure for guiding the establishment and operations of local round tables. It began by exploring the history and characteristics of round tables in general. These groups were found to have five distinguishing qualities: multi-stakeholder membership, mandate to address sustainability, advisory role, consensus-based and ongoing.

Next various stage models of collaboration were explored with a view to establishing a suitable collaboration framework for examining round tables. Due to the complex inter-organizational relationships inherent in round tables and to the importance of the environmental context in shaping their processes, the existing three stage models for collaboration had to be adapted for application to round tables. The resulting collaboration framework consisted of the following five stages: issue crystallization, problem setting, direction setting, relationship building and implementation/monitoring.

Having developed this framework, the next task was to test its effectiveness. The Howe Sound Round Table, which is concurrently undergoing establishment and operational stages, was selected as a suitable case study. Using the proposed collaboration framework as a guide, both data collection and analysis were carefully structured so as to reflect the stages and criteria presented by this framework. The result was a very comprehensive and useful list of recommendations for the HSRT. These recommendations are summarized below under the five steps of the proposed collaboration framework.
### 6.2 SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

To strengthen its establishment and to improve its operational performance the HSRT should:

#### A. Environmental Context/ Issue Crystallization

- remain sensitive to its environmental context and be tapped into the “community pulse.”
- be flexible and able to adapt to changing community needs and interests.

#### B. Problem Setting

- develop a clearer understanding of the community vision of sustainability.
- develop a community profile of the area to ensure adequate representation of all perspectives.
- review the structure and operations of the Community Appointments Committee and preferably give the community organizations themselves greater responsibility for nominations.
- pay more careful attention to and take on more social and economic projects so long as they comply with the group’s sustainability principles.
- encourage each and every individual member to show leadership and initiative.
- address the need for a “home,” a permanent fax/mail address and administrative assistance.
- increase its community profile in order to facilitate its drive for support and funds.
- seek to balance support from various sectors: community, government and industry.
- develop sound strategies for acquiring and managing funds.
- ensure that all HSRT members have an equal opportunity to be present at the table; may require compensation for those who must travel greater distances.

#### C. Direction Setting

- begin to turn efforts towards more substantive issues and projects.
- articulate a clearer terms of reference and review its role as an advisory body.
- develop a sharper set of goals and targets as well as outline specific means for carrying out the group’s objectives.
- establish priorities and focus efforts on a few specific and manageable projects.
- clarify the meaning of consensus, consider those situations in which it is most effectively used and ensure that its principles and use are well understood.
- ensure that all interests are expressed and listened to.
- establish its information needs and develop a strategy for assimilating available information.
- encourage its members to share and exchange information both with other HSRT members and members of the broader community.
- clarify the roles and responsibilities of all players at the table and distribute tasks evenly.
D. Relationship Building

- encourage the exchange of information and perspectives both at and in between meetings.
- develop a HSRT newsletter and build stronger links to the community.
- encourage its members to be actively involved in community events.
- establish a sound mechanism (besides a newsletter) whereby members can communicate with outside community groups.
- consider expanding its members to include other types of volunteer membership.
- develop a formal method of reporting to improve its accountability and credibility.
- improve the accessibility of the group to members of the broader community.
- nurture stronger interactions with First Nations and the media.
- cooperate with and strengthen its ties with other NGO’s within the area.
- strengthen ties with and earn the respect of government as well as be sensitive to the needs and expectations of each level of government.
- work with other local round tables and with government to establish a more clearly defined purpose and relationship for these groups in land use planning and watershed management.
- identify, acknowledge and cultivate its strengths.

E. Outcomes and Monitoring

- establish the support of prominent community and business leaders as well as elected officials who may be crucial to the implementation of proposals.
- establish a mechanism whereby issues can be brought forward to the table for consideration.
- re-evaluate the criteria for project selection and establish procedures for using them.
- identify and acquire the personal and group skills necessary to make the process work (including: strategic planning, public relations, co-ordination, and teamwork skills).
- develop a more effective mechanism for receiving and dealing constructively with feedback.
- develop and maintain a regular mechanism for monitoring to provide a proper forum for the expression of concerns and feedback as well as to ensure that the group remains on track with community interests.
- follow the example of other community groups and undertake community visioning, inventory and mapping exercises etc.
- establish suitable benchmarks and indicators for measuring the group’s progress towards its goals, as well as for monitoring the any impacts that the group may have on the region.
- maintain the energy and enthusiasm of the group by recognizing and celebrating all successful achievements.

While these recommendations are comprehensive and numerous, they are difficult to comprehend and apply in this current format. Therefore, it is useful to simplify these recommendations by grouping them into similar categories and highlighting the most vital ones. Based on the strengths of local round tables that are revealed in the research, and taking into consideration the basic objectives of such groups, two principal categories were derived: internal
and external goals. External goals are derived from the HSRTs objectives, but focus only on those three that the group performs most effectively. The internal goals are widely applicable to other organizations and form those objectives of the group that enable it to run its operations smoothly. These goals, often neglected and seldom documented, are nonetheless as, if not more important, than external goals. The recommendations from this analysis chapters were grouped together and prioritized, so that the following six key recommendations were identified:

**INTERNAL GOALS:**

- Build Credibility, Transparency and Accountability
- Maintain the Energy, Momentum and Continuity of the Group
- Survive and Make the Best Use of Available Resources

**EXTERNAL GOALS:**

- Build Awareness and Educate the Public on Sustainability
- Promote A Sustainability and Watershed Approach
- Create a Forum for the Expression of Community Needs, Interests and Concerns

It is recommended that the HSRT focus on this principal goals. Table 6.1 outlines strategies for doing so. These strategies are derived from the 40 recommendations developed in the thesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Community in the region: 
  - Build networks of people sustainably. 
  - Use local knowledge. |
| - Sustainable events in the development of OCP. 
  - Support local organizations to consider. 
  - Support the vision of sustainable events. |
| - Sustainable tourism initiatives. 
  - Promote and green tourism. |
| - Sustainable tourism initiatives. 
  - Promote and green tourism. |
| - Sustainable tourism initiatives. 
  - Promote and green tourism. |

**Recommendations for the SRT according to external and internal goals:**

- Support sustainable tourism initiatives.
- Promote green tourism.
- Support local organizations to consider sustainable events.
- Build networks of people sustainably.
- Use local knowledge.
- Support the vision of sustainable events.
- Promote and green tourism.
- Sustainable tourism initiatives.
- Promote and green tourism.
- Sustainable tourism initiatives.
- Promote and green tourism.
- Sustainable tourism initiatives.
- Promote and green tourism.
6.3 SUITABILITY OF THE COLLABORATION FRAMEWORK

Without the use of the collaborative framework, the comprehensive analysis and recommendations derived would have been extremely difficult. Not only does the framework provide a useful set of stages for local round tables to follow, but it also outlines a detailed set of criteria that must be addressed at each stage. Clearly defined stages and criteria are absent from available local round table and community stewardship guides. Based on the validity of the results and recommendations produced in this research study, one can conclude that the collaboration framework is a suitable guide for the establishment and operations of the local round tables. This answers the first of the thesis research questions.

It remains to be seen however, if the above recommendations can be effectively implemented and if they will facilitate the HSRT in its endeavours. Since the HSRT has been around for some time and has built up a structure and a method of operating (including a constitution with bylaws), making necessary changes may be more difficult than for a group that is just starting out. Further, despite the fact that several documents (through CORE, BCRT, and FBMP) are now available to guide the establishment and operations of local round tables and other community groups, many such groups still prefer to struggle through and invent their own processes rather than be restricted by a proposed model or set of criteria.

6.3.1 Limitations of the Stage Model

The stage model of collaboration as a guide does have some limitations. Prior to data collection and analysis it was realized that local round tables must deal with a number of important elements that are inadequately addressed by collaboration. These elements included: the importance of environmental forces in shaping the process, the need to perform
administrative duties, and the need for feedback and monitoring. In addition, the establishment of solid relationships deserves more attention than collaboration theory allows. Thus, the existing current stage models of collaboration (see Section 2.6.4) had to be adapted before they could suitably be applied to local round tables.

The very broad and general nature of collaboration theory, while seen as an asset for structuring a comprehensive analysis, may be a hindrance in other situations. For example, a community group wanting to form a stewardship organization will need to know: what type of group it should form (local round table, advisory committee, community resource board, watershed management partnership), what kind of issues to address, how many people to include, how much funding will be required and where to find it etc. Collaboration theory is unable to provide the answers for these specific and detailed questions. The recommendations produced by the collaborative framework do not specify how these measures should be executed. Neither do they provide examples of strategies or tools that various groups have successfully used. This type of information must be gathered from other sources.

Hence, while collaboration is a very useful tool for exploring the theory behind effective partnerships, the more practical stewardship and local round table guides that are available (through CORE, FBMP, BCRT etc.) should not be ignored. The collaborative framework developed in this research paper is not intended to replace these documents. Rather, the theoretical collaboration framework should be used to supplement these practical guides. Table 6.2 outlines the benefits and limitations of each stage of the proposed collaboration framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE CRYSTALLIZATION</td>
<td>-Collaboration theories presented by McCann (1983) and Gray (1989) lack sufficient emphasis on this stage which is particularly important for LRTs. Collaboration framework had to be adjusted to include this step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Identifies the environmental forces* that gave rise to the idea of a local round table in the Howe Sound region. (*mandate, local pressures, &amp; visionary leadership.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEM SETTING</td>
<td>-Does not provide sufficient detail on leadership (types, role etc.). Collaboration theories also focus more on leadership from one or two core individuals as opposed to group leadership which is extremely important to LRTs. -Administrative duties are somewhat neglected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allows for an examination of the following: common definition of the problem (sustainability); stakeholder identification, the importance of broad-based, balanced, membership; ensuring commitment to the process; leadership and funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTION SETTING</td>
<td>-Is unaware of the advisory roles that LRTs may play, hence it cannot provide advice in that area. Need to turn to LRT and community stewardship guides. -Does not provide much advice on consensus which is crucial to the operations of LRTs. See consensus guides for more detail. -General theory, unable to provide answers to specific questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allows for a discussion on: group role and objectives; goals and priorities; realistic targets and interim objectives; operating procedures; consensus; agenda setting; joint information search; structure; as well as the role and responsibilities of group members. (Exploring options and reaching agreement steps, have not yet been tackled by the HSRT.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP BUILDING</td>
<td>-Only Waddock (1989) places sufficient attention on this step. Included as a separate stage in the collaboration framework for relevance to LRTs. -Fails to recognize the importance of accountability, credibility and accessibility for LRTs. -Waddock (1989) focusses attention on relations between group members and with constituency groups, but does not deal adequately with inter-organizational relations (gov't, other NGOs, First Nations, media etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allows for an examination of: power relationships; expression of different interests and perspectives; building trust; communication between meetings; relationship with members of the outside community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOMES AND MONITORING</td>
<td>-Especially important stage for LRTs as continuing bodies that must reflect constantly changing community needs. Addressed inadequately by McCann (1983) and Waddock (1989) but is given more attention in Chrislip and Larson (1994). Collaboration model had to be adapted to include this separate stage. -Does not suggest practical tools for implementation (mapping, inventories, and indicators.) See LRT guides. -Directed in large part towards joint agreement and conflict resolution strategies which are difficult to apply to a LRT whose emphasis has so far been shared vision and information exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Allows for an analysis of: expected outcomes; responsibilities for implementation; project/issue selection; coordination and allocation of efforts and resources; feedback and monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 BROADER APPLICATION OF THE STAGE MODEL OF COLLABORATION

Since round tables (such as the HSRT) are just one type of consensus-based, multi-stakeholder group, and since the collaboration framework has proved to be suitable for round tables; it follows that the stage model of collaboration can also be successfully applied to a wide variety of other such processes (community resource boards, land and resource management plans, watershed management partnerships etc.). This conclusion satisfies the second research question. Note that while these principles provide a useful set of guidelines for consensus processes, each process must be designed to meet the circumstances and needs of its own specific circumstances.

Yet the application of the collaboration theory does not stop with community groups. Government, business, labour and other groups have found collaboration to be very useful. Planners, for their part, are starting to realize the benefits of having these community groups, but are nonetheless a long way off from establishing a sound method for organizing and building constructive alliances with them.

6.5 CASE STUDY CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLABORATION THEORY

As Pasquero (1991) pointed out with the National Round Table, there is a lack of attention in collaboration theory given to the partnerships and alliances that may be formed between various organizations. Pasquero referred to this type of collaboration as ‘supra-organizational collaboration.’ A close examination of the HSRT revealed the same importance of this inter-organizational collaboration at the local level. Thus it is agreed that, at least for round tables, collaboration theory needs to be expanded to incorporate the importance of partnerships between groups.
Using the knowledge gained from studying the HSRT, an attempt can be made to extend this notion further and to suggest what an inter-organizational theory might entail. Relationship building, implementation and monitoring stages are of vital importance to inter-organizational partnerships. Organizations should make an attempt to build ties with one another, learn and understand what other groups within their area are doing in order to become more effective and to avoid duplication of efforts. In time, once familiarity has been established, mutual partnerships or perhaps even joint ventures may be established. Creative agreements may lead to the exchange of resources such as: expertise, information, electronic and audio-visual equipment, project materials, and printing facilities. Other mutual arrangements may allow groups to: publish a joint newsletter, share an office space or an administrative assistant, or combine resources and volunteers to implement a particular project. Finally, measures should be established to monitor these relationships in order to ensure their proper functioning and effectiveness. There is already much evidence to suggest that these types of collaborations are becoming more and more important, not just for round tables but for other community groups as well.
6.6 DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This thesis reveals some important findings, but it also paves the way for further research in this area. The following directions may be considered for further study:

1. While it is recognized that community groups can be a great asset to governance, governments still have a lot to learn in terms of making the most effective use of these community organizations. Thus it would be very useful to explore methods by which local government could form alliances and collaborate with local community groups. (e.g. by maintaining contact, assigning projects, showing support, creating forums/channels through which community groups can at least be listened to).

2. Many different types of community organizations now exist. However, it is not well understood which type works well under which circumstances. Further there are no guidelines to suggest how a group should go about deciding which model to choose. A process for assisting community groups in determining what type of collaborative structure to assume, should be developed. (e.g. stewardship initiative, local round table, advisory committee).

3. As more and more community groups develop within an area the potential for duplication of efforts and increased competition for limited funding will become more intense. It would thus be useful to determine ways in which community organizations within a particular area (such as the Howe Sound region) can effectively collaborate in an inter-organizational manner.

4. This research paper discovered that different levels of government had different expectations of the HSRT. Federal government saw the HSRT as providing a valuable link to community interests, while local governments were interested in the regional approach of the group. A comparison of the HSRT's role with respect to provincial, federal and local governments would make for a very interesting study.

5. A number of recommendations for the HSRT were derived here using the collaborative framework. It would be useful to revisit the HSRT in a few years time to determine whether any of these recommendations were applied and whether any benefits were derived from them.
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APPENDIX

APPENDIX I: HOWE SOUND ROUND TABLE MEMBERS AND STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of HSRT Members</th>
<th>List of Steering Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elspeth Armstrong</td>
<td>Pat Boname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Ashford</td>
<td>Graeme Dinsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Dixon</td>
<td>Stan Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fine</td>
<td>Jeremy Frith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Carolyn Hachey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Harry</td>
<td>W. I. Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hundal (co-chair)</td>
<td>Dr. L.C. Kindree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Gordon-Collins</td>
<td>Adam Korbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Lemmers</td>
<td>Joan Lemmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Michalski</td>
<td>Sarah Lotz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Moonen (co-chair)</td>
<td>Phil Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston Mullan</td>
<td>Rozlynne Mitchell (chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Mullan</td>
<td>Marilyn Mullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Troup</td>
<td>Hugh O’Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Tyson</td>
<td>Anders Ourum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Vacek</td>
<td>Bill Remple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Weatherbee</td>
<td>Art Thevarge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracy Watchmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Weddigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Wisnea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitators: Dovetail Consultants.
APPENDIX II: LOCAL ROUND TABLES AND OTHER SIMILAR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN B.C.

Anahim Lake Round Table
Boundary Round Table
Bulkley Valley Community Resource Board
Capital Regional District Round Table
Comox Valley Environmental Council
Cowichan Visions Round Table
Creston Valley Community Project
Dawson Creek Land and Resource Management Program
Fort St. James Land and Resource Management Program
Howe Sound Round Table
Kamloops Land and Resource Management Plan
Kelowna Federation of Residents Association
Kelowna Grassroots Group
Kimberley Sustainable Communities Project
Kingfisher Local Round Table
Kispox/ Lakes Land and Resource Management
Ladysmith/ Naniamo Round Table
Nahatlatch Project
Nicola Watershed Round Table
North Columbia Resource Council
Peachland Voters Association
Penticton Grassroots Group
Pitt Meadow Round Table
Prince George Land and Resource Management Program
Richmond Advisory Committee
Robson Land and Resource Management Program
Salmon River Watershed Management
Salmon River Watershed Round Table
Saltspring Community Round Table
Skeena Valley Pilot Project
Slocan Valley Pilot Project
South Kalum Community Resource Board
South Surrey/ White Rock Round Table
Sunshine Coast Resource Council
The Rivers Committee Prince George
Vanderhoof Land and Resource Management Program
West Arm Land Use Forum
Williams Lake River Valley Project

Sum total: (40)
APPENDIX III: LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR HOWE SOUND ROUND TABLE MEMBERS

(A) ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT AND IMPETUS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A HOWE SOUND ROUND TABLE
1. List what you think are the most pressing environmental, social and economic problems within the Howe Sound region at present?

2. In your view, what was the main impetus for the establishment of the HSRT? Explain.

3. Describe the current readiness and willingness of citizens and government within the Howe Sound region to promote sustainability.

(C) ESTABLISHMENT STAGES OF THE HSRT: GETTING PEOPLE TO THE TABLE AND DEFINING THE ISSUES
4. What brings members together to participate in this collaborative process? (What are the incentives for participating in this process?)

5. Are HSRT members committed to the process?

6. In what manner will members benefit from participating in the process? (Or do they have an alternative strategy or means to achieve their needs? (BATNA)).

7. Comment on the process of membership selection.

8. Is the HSRT truly representative of the interests within the Howe Sound region. Explain.

9. Members come to the table as individuals and not representative of specific interest groups. What does this mean and how does it work?

10. How does such a multi-stakeholder group build credibility?

11. To whom is the HSRT accountable?

12. Comment on the role of government with respect to the HSRT and the establishment of links with government.

13. How would you describe what a "sustainable" Howe Sound region would look like? List some strategies for reaching this end.

14. How does the HSRT cope with administrative duties?
15. How does access to funding affect the operations and achievements of the HSRT? What are the potential funding sources for the HSRT?

(D) SETTING GOALS AND OPERATING PROCEDURES
16. What is the role of the HSRT?

17. What are the short- and long-term goals of the HSRT? Do they clearly and accurately reflect the directions of the group?

18. What specific steps/achievements have been made towards these goals?

19. In your opinion, are these goals measurable and within the group’s reach? If not, why?

20. The HSRT makes decisions by consensus. Do you fully understand and feel comfortable with using consensus?

21. Comment on the HSRT’s use of consensus.

22. Do all participants have an adequate say in contributing to the agenda?

23. What mechanisms does the HSRT use for obtaining information and remaining up-to-date with current issues?

24. Comment on the structure of the group as laid out in the HSRT Operating Procedures.

25. Do these Operating Procedures clearly articulate the roles and responsibilities of all the players? What are these roles and responsibilities?

26. Comment on the role and qualities of leadership for the HSRT. Where should this leadership come from?

(E) BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS (EXTERNALLY AND INTERNALLY)
27. Does the HSRT have effective channels for communicating with its members? Are all interests expressed and listened to? (Is the atmosphere trusting and open?)

28. How does the HSRT communicate with members of the broader community? media? First Nations?

29. In what manner does the HSRT liaise with other sustainability groups and NGOs in the area?

30. What is the role of the group with respect to government?

31. What is government’s response to local round tables?

32. Where could the HSRT potentially fit within the existing government framework?
33. In your opinion, what qualifications and skills (teamwork, planning, communication etc) greatly assist the progress of the group?

(F) PROJECTS, FEEDBACK AND REVIEW
34. How are issues/ projects brought forward to the HSRT for consideration?

35. What are the expected outcomes of this process? (information exchange or joint agreement?).

36. Who will be responsible for implementing these outcomes?

37. What mechanisms does the HSRT use to monitor its performance & effectiveness?

38. Does the HSRT have effective mechanisms for receiving and responding to feedback from the broader Howe Sound community? What are these mechanisms?

39. Consider the S3 project. (a) Describe your involvement in the project. (b) What valuable lessons have you learned from this project. (c) In what way has this project contributed towards the achievement of the HSRT goals?

39. What do you think the greatest barriers/ challenges facing the HSRT are?

40. Describe the kind of impact that the HSRT is likely to have in the region.

41. What advice can you offer to the HSRT?
APPENDIX IV: QUESTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENT

1. What is the role of Local Round Tables with respect to government?

2. Why is it important for LRTs to establish links with government? (Does a LRT need to be legally formalized to be effective?)

3. What role should government play in giving support and possibly funding for LRTs?

4. How would you characterize your government's response to LRTs?

5. What could LRTs potentially provide to government? (i.e. What services/information can LRTs provide more easily or effectively than government?)

6. Will the new emphasis on regional planning make it easier for government to work with LRTs that address bioregional, sustainability projects?

7. What are some of the challenges that LRTs must face?

8. What advice can you give to LRTs?
APPENDIX V: FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SUCCESS OF LRTS

Few local round tables have documented in any detail their apparent strengths and weaknesses. The *Skeena Round Table* is a noticeable exception. In a letter to Rick Wilson dated May 9, 1994 the Skeena Round Table lists a number of factors that have contributed to their success and failure. While this round table is no longer active, it provides a valuable lesson for others.

To: Rick Wilson, BCRT.
From: Leonard Vanderstar, Acting Executive Director, Skeena Round Table for Sustainable Development.
Date: May 9, 1994.

Factors that contributed to success:
- energy and enthusiasm and efforts of volunteers.
- volunteers covered the bulk of their expenses personally.
- broad representation of perspectives.
- personal contacts for providing input and assisting with implementation.
- professional and technical abilities of the members.
- donated use of facilities for meetings etc.
- support of employers and other area businesses.
- corporate donations (Alcan).
- Green Plan donations from the Federal Government.
- consistency, smooth transition of executive positions.
- organizational accountability.

Factors that contributed to failure:
- lack of recognition by the Provincial Round Table (BCRT)...(damaged credibility).
- size of the region which lead to problems with travel time and communications.
- lack of seed and operational funding.
- inability to fund an executive director who was badly needed to make the organization run effectively.
- member fatigue (burn out).
- lack of support from respective municipalities (pending recognition form the BCRT).
- complex and sometimes polarized nature of issues that group was not yet ready to handle.
- promises of funding never came through. (Lack of funding ultimately contributed to the demise of the group.)
- crisis management by the Provincial government appeared to hinder the proactive attempts of the LRT.
- one-way communication between BCRT and LRTs, that is the BCRT generation of reports to LRTs was never reversed to the generation of reports to the BCRT (until just before BCRT expired).