SESSION 4: UNDERSTANDING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

OVERVIEW

Purpose of session 4

To introduce participants to a range of perspectives held by different stakeholders at the interface between extractive companies and host communities, and to simulate the experience of being involved in a participatory approach. To deepen participants’ understanding of some selected participatory planning and monitoring tools and mechanisms, including focus areas and important dimensions related to successful implementation. To practice designing a participatory planning and monitoring strategy.

Objectives of session 4

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

- Identify key focus areas for participatory approaches
- Better understand the range of positions and perspectives of different groups involved in a multi-stakeholder participatory activity.
- Describe important dimensions of participatory planning and monitoring that relate to its successful implementation
- Understand the basic steps for conducting a participatory planning and monitoring situation assessment (or diagnostic) as a basis for designing a realistic participatory planning and monitoring strategy.

Materials required in session 4

- Slides 28-29
- Handout 10: ‘Situation Brief’ for role-playing exercise
- Handouts 11-17: ‘Character briefs’ for role-playing exercise
- Flipchart and markers for each group
- Optional ‘costumes’ or props
- Workshop evaluation forms.

Time required in session 4

Approximately two hours in total.
Facilitator’s Notes

The facilitator should introduce the purpose and objectives of this session.

Purpose of session 4

To introduce participants to a range of perspectives held by different stakeholders at the interface between extractive companies and host communities, and to simulate the experience of being involved in a participatory approach.

Objectives of session 4

By the end of the session, participants will be able to:

- Better understand the range of positions and perspectives of different groups involved in a multi-stakeholder participatory activity.
4.1 Understanding roles and perspectives

**Facilitator’s Notes**

The facilitator should introduce this slide noting that, as noted in session 3, a key success factor in successfully implementing participatory tools and mechanisms is understanding the many actors involved in corporate-community relationships. Additionally, relationships with a broad range of actors must be effectively managed. The facilitator should draw on the background paper to elaborate on this in more detail.

The facilitator should introduce the role playing exercise where participants will practice moving toward implementing participatory planning and monitoring tools and mechanisms and explore some of the issues that emerge when working with multiple actors in corporate-community relationships. Participants will be given Handout 9 to refer to for some diverse examples of participatory tools and their implementation.

The facilitator should circulate the situation brief (Handout 15) to all participants and character briefs (Handouts 16-22) to those individuals or teams representing that character. The facilitator could additionally employ costumes and/or other props to help build a more fun atmosphere and make the experience more memorable. The facilitator should note that if at any point any participant has any technical or process question, they should call for a ‘time-out’.

**Assigning character roles:** This exercise has seven characters. There are at least three options available to the facilitator about how to divide roles depending on the size of the group:

1. Each participant in the training module could play a role and there could be more than one person playing some roles (eg two or three community women for example).

2. Teams could be formed around each character, with each team discussing how the character should act in each round, and then one member of the team playing the role during the round. Team members could take turns in playing the character in different rounds. This option is attractive particularly if there are members of the group who are uncomfortable with
participating directly in a role play. Participants who are not playing a role should watch and give feedback during the debriefing.

3. If there are sufficient numbers, a third option would be to run two or more role-plays in parallel using the same materials – and comparing any differing outcomes and why they occurred during the debrief.

**Introducing the rounds:** The facilitator should introduce each round by describing the situation and issues as presented below. At the end of each round, the facilitator should draw the discussion to a close and relay the information about what has been decided and the circumstances and issues at play in the next round.

**Debrief:** Following the conclusion of the role-play, the facilitator should praise all participants for the effort they have put in to taking part. The facilitator should then explore three areas:

1. Ask different characters for feedback about what happened from their perspective. If more than one role-play was running in parallel, ask participants to share with other groups the course of events in their role-play.
2. Ask participants about their reactions to their experience.
3. Ask participants about what other scenarios could have emerged, and with what possible consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues for Round 1: The company and community must decide how to engage with each other.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1:</strong> Feasibility phase: The company and community start to get to know each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters: 1, 2, 4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision point 1</strong> (facilitator).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator lists issues below and states:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Land disputes with native titles have been resolved, and the process of resettlement is going smoothly. Construction crews are starting to move in as well. The company has decided to set up a community forum,” and reads off questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who will be in the community forum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much information will they be allowed access to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will there be a community development fund that they can administer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much money will it be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All options are on the table. If this was decided in Round 1, then talk about other participatory approaches in the community forum, like local labor recruitment targets or other monitoring indicators and measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2:</strong> Construction phase: Setting up the community forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters: 3, 5, 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision point 2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator notes that a community development foundation will provide funds for projects in the area of operations. There will be a signing bonus, and then 1 percent of profits per year, expected to be at least $500,000 annual income. It will be administered by the forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (If group did not come to a decision about how the forum would work, assume that there are 5
representatives to the Forum, one each from company and one from each of four community representatives.)

**Issues for Round 2:** The land-owning farmers are becoming increasingly frustrated and anxious as they feel their concerns are not being addressed or taken seriously. They begin to form links to international NGOs and the blogosphere, who constitute a new stakeholder group entering the scenario and who are bringing up the proximity of the mine to a national park in a biological "hot spot" in the international media. Operations are just beginning, but the Ministry of Mines has new leadership and has asked to re-do major segments of the EIA, as the original EIA had not included a thorough review of alternatives.

Meanwhile, other community members are beginning to become frustrated as the mine moves from the construction to operations phase. The frustration stems from a combination of social change brought on by inward migration to the area by the resettlement of villages as well as people looking for work, localised environmental degradation caused by the mining, and a decline in employment opportunities.

**Session 4 handouts**

**HANDOUT 10**
**Situation Brief: Goldex in Tanzakia**

GOLDEX, a Canadian company with significant operations in Africa and Southeast Asia, has found gold deposits in southeastern Tanzakia, in an agricultural rural area with several villages. The area is called Antana.

In general, the community is favorable to the mine. There are, however, land-owning farmers who have been working on the land for generations who have organized an opposition group, and reached out to international NGOs for advocacy, financial, and technical support. The country is recently politically stable, with a democratic government in place since 1990. The local labor pool has low literacy, works primarily in the cotton fields and tanning industry, and distrusts the land-owning farmers. The area is poor, except for the land-owning farmers. Women are poorly respected and do not play a prominent role in community decision-making. Local government is poorly resourced and is not trusted by members of the local community, who feel government does not act in their interests and is corrupt.

The Antana mine will be a joint venture between three companies, and GOLDEX will be the operator. In addition to the mine, there will be 200 km of pipeline built to carry concentrates around a national park and alongside a highway. The mine will require resettling 400 families. The ministry of mines has given permits according to due process of law. GOLDEX has hired consultants to study environment and social impact analysis, and to create a land resettlement plan consistent with WB and IFC standards.

**Characters**

1. Company - Community Relations
2. Company - senior management
3. Blogger
4. Community farmer
5. Community woman
6. Community potential labor
7. Local government officer
### HANDOUT 11

**Character 1: Company - Community Relations Manager**

You are a manager on the external relations team, which is responsible for interacting on the ground with community members and internally with company managers. This requires three levels of understanding: 1. an academic understanding of the issues in order to shape and understand social policy in the company, 2. an operational understanding for engaging with mine managers and stakeholders at the nuts and bolts level, and 3. a cultural understanding to make appropriate communication decisions. You try to do your homework on all three, but it can be difficult to keep up.

You have a sincere desire for the company to work in responsible partnership with the community, and you think that to make real progress in creating meaningful community engagement, you need to set up basic, fundamental systems for external measurement and evaluation. However, you aren’t an upper-management decision-maker, and you know there is some controversy at the senior level about their commitment to participatory engagement. You have little actual control over how to respond at a meeting with community members, and sometimes have to resort to saying you’ll get back to the issue at a later date. Furthermore, your budget is inadequate for the types of projects and systems you want to set up.

You think it would be great if the senior people would “front up” and meet the community, and you consider part of your role to get those senior people more engaged with community issues. Even though it’s a big part of your job, you don’t think communication is enough—participatory engagement and accountability are also about empowerment and sharing responsibility. In your experience, engineering types don’t understand how important this is.

### HANDOUT 12

**Character 2. Company - Senior Management**

You are vice president of the company GOLDEX. GOLDEX is a multinational firm with diversified projects in the extractives, specializing in gold. It was incorporated over 40 years ago, and you have been with the company for 15 years. Over the 15 years, and especially in the last five, you’ve seen significant changes in how the company talks about ethics. In general, you approve of the changes. After the scandal with security forces in 1987, staff morale was really low and a lot of good people left the company. Now there has been a turn-around in morale and people feel good about working at GOLDEX. From your perspective, though, there are appropriate limits to what a company can and should do with respect to its community engagement strategy.

Giving up control to groups of people who may not know what they are doing seems dangerous and ill-advised. You fear that they won’t make the right decisions, and anyway the whole process will be bogged down in petty disagreements. It seems terribly inefficient. You’re also afraid that if you allow a community to manage its own budget, you’ll have to deal with nepotism, cronyism, and corruption. It opens up certain risk for the company, and you aren’t sure that the new risk is better than the old, known risk.

Although you think sustainable development is a useful term and focuses the international debate in a practical way, you’ve been in the business long enough to know that everything is locally contextual. There will always be another stakeholder where you least expect one, so you’re skeptical that an adequate process can be set up to include all the outsiders wanting into the decision making process. The term stakeholder is a little fluffy, in your opinion, but there doesn’t appear to be a better one. You are really doubtful, though, that international NGO-types who start calling themselves stakeholders have any idea what they are talking about. You think they just stir up trouble and are completely unrealistic with respect to business economics and the real world.
### HANDOUT 13

**Character 3. Blogger**

You run a blog called the *Extractive Industries Information Alert*, which scrutinizes the actions and influence of mining companies globally. The blog has multiple contributors from many far-flung locations, including Sussex, Bonn, Paris, San Francisco, New York, and Washington, DC. The blog has a steering committee of people from a diverse set of international NGOs, both environmentally- and socially-oriented. In addition to being webmaster for the blog, you are a graduate student in the field of ecology.

You know there are compelling economic reasons that communities choose to support mining projects, but you believe they are not taking the long-term costs into adequate consideration. You think that educating local communities about the long-term costs is important, but sometimes that takes too long, and damage can be done in the meantime. To make up for the information asymmetries, you occasionally advocate for working with the community members who will be disenfranchised by the project, and amplifying their voice on the blog. From your perspective, the commitment of a few passionate people can shape the long-term benefit of many.

Contrary to what some people think, and to the impression that the blog gives, you are not totally opposed to working with mining companies to adequately, fairly, and responsibly address environmental and community impacts. But this is rare because you believe that the industry is growing too quickly, disrupting previously pristine environments in a shrinking world.
### HANDOUT 14
**Character 4. Community farmer**

You are a land-owning farmer. You grow cotton, walnuts, and pomegranates. You regularly hire about twenty-five day laborers from the community to work in the fields, and you have invested quite a bit of your own sweat into setting up a ditch irrigation system for part of your fields. Farming has been in your family in this area for generations, possibly for thousands of years. You are recently in debt due to the drop in price of cotton, but the price of pomegranates, on the other hand, has risen, and you have just switched over a whole field of cotton to pomegranate seedlings.

You are concerned the mine might pose a threat both to your livelihood and your status within the community. You could lose much of your land depending on where exactly the mine is eventually sited, and there is also a threat to water sources you rely on for irrigation. Since the mine will also offer alternative sources of employment to members of the local community, your position as the dominant group locally is also under threat.

### HANDOUT 15
**Character 5. Community woman**

You are a woman from a village that may be displaced. You were initially very concerned about the company Goldex, because they are foreign and obviously have a lot of money, but over the past six months you have become somewhat assured that they will act responsibly and hold themselves accountable to the law. You believe this primarily because you can tell they have been honest about the bad news as well as the good. But you’re afraid of being lulled by their promises, and are still watchful.

You are married and have three children. You work hard and have aspirations to start your own business, now that the boys are a little older. You are frustrated that men make such wrong decisions about money, which you can see all the way up to the government. If you had a little extra money, you would spend it on your children and your family’s security. You would welcome the opportunity to be part of a budget planning committee, and feel that you would only need the technical training; in other areas of budget planning and community negotiation, you are already confident.

### HANDOUT 16
**Character 6. Community man, potential labor**

You are a young man from a village that may be displaced. Although concerned about the effect displacement may have on the village, you are excited by the prospect of more lucrative employment than that currently offered in local agriculture.

### HANDOUT 17
**Character 7. Local government officer**

You are not from the local community, but come from another part of the country and have received a higher level of education. You are not corrupt, and share the widely held concerns about corruption within local government. Although idealistic and hopeful about creating a better future for your country when you were younger, you are now more jaded and despondent about the real chances of changing anything. You are overworked and poorly respected. You are concerned about the capacity of the local government institutions to effectively administer the potentially large sums of money that are likely to flow to it through royalties once the mine becomes operational – and your colleagues are already positioning themselves to take advantage of these new resources for personal gain. Although you find this abhorrent, you also don’t want to rock the boat for fear of losing your own job.