



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AT ORICA BOTANY

Brief discussion of Models

Barbara Campney
Manager Community Relations

1



Context of discussion

Why do we need to improve our community engagement?

- To do a better job for all stakeholders of managing our environmental legacy issues
- So that you know what we are up to, how you could influence what we do, and how your input is valued and used. Not "window dressing" but a move towards "involve the community and then Orica decides" philosophy
- We need future mechanisms that show corporate accountability
- Our measure: We will know how we are doing if you judge that overall Orica's behaviour is more responsive

2



Goals for today's discussion

- To capture not just our ideas discussed in the paper but other ideas that occurred to you as you read through the paper
- We may or may not agree on a future engagement model tonight - the goal is to make as much progress as practicable towards that agreement

3




The Models

1. Focus on specific legacy issues
2. Focus on whole-of-site legacy issues

What actually happens inside the boxes? Consider

- do the processes allow the community to participate and contribute so that Orica decisions take into account and satisfy community expectations?
- do the processes provide for a level of public confidence about and accountability for decisions made by Orica?

4



Model 1

Individual committees focusing on specific legacy issues


Pros

- Members are familiar with process
- Processes well established
- Processes comply with Orica's licences
- CPRC process has worked well. Or has it?

Cons

- Opportunity lost to manage whole of site picture
- Communication can be fragmented
- Duplication of administration
- History shows the process fails the broader community
- Lacks accountability

5



Model 2

Community Board that has several committees reporting to it - A whole-of-site focus

Pros

- More efficient structure
- Enables bigger-picture reflection
- Maximises volunteer time and capacity
- Working groups would provide focus and give feedback to overarching group

Cons

- Need to re-establish new committees & processes
- May inhibit single-issue interests
- Members may lack enough understanding of all issues to contribute well
- Needs regulatory endorsement
- May fail broader community
- Individuals' time


6



Who might / should / want to participate on 1, 2, 3 or 4 committees?

- On a Community Board - probably a representative from each of the liaison groups
- On a liaison group - probably those who have an active interest in a specific issue and want to limit their focus to that
- Other considerations?

7



Another model?

A hybrid of the two models? Or is it an enhancement of Model 1?

Individual committee/groups with access to paid expertise reporting back to a specific group?

An expert who can:

- work for the community members
- be relied on to understand all details thoroughly
- help community members figure out which details they need to be concerned about
- help identify which of their concerns have technical merit and which do not
- represent the technical concerns in dialogue with Orica's experts

8



What might the reporting structure look like for the “expert”?

Three options?

- A separate expert committee for whole site that reports to the Community Advisory Board - they provide advice to the group?
- Technical expert jointly working with the current committee/s on specific issues - sitting together with the community in an advisory role?
- Working for you - have experts not on a committee but reporting back to you with advice on specific issues?

9



Are there other models you would like us to discuss?

10