RESUMED [2.30 pm]

COMMISSIONER: We'll reconvene at 1430, and I welcome Ms Barbara
25   Campany. Thank you for joining us Ms Campany. Counsel.

MR JACOBI: Ms Campany is one of the principal consultants for stakeholder
engagement and social sustainability at GHD. In this role, she provides
consultancy services and advice to private, public and non-government clients
30   in stakeholder engagement, social planning and research, social impact
analysis, communication and community development in relation to a range of
client projects. In recent years her work has focused on engagement and risk
communication in the mining, water, oil and gas industries. Ms Campany has
over 20 years of experience in community relations and communications
35   primarily concerning environmental projects in Australia and New Zealand.
She obtained both her masters of arts in communication management and her
graduate certificate in dispute resolution at the University of Technology,
Sydney, 1998 and 200, and the Commission calls Ms Barbara Campany.

40   COMMISSIONER: Ms Campany, thank you for joining. I understand with
20 years' experience that your evidence today will be based on that experience
rather than as one of the GHD's principal consultants.

MS CAMPANY: Sorry, Kevin, I'm getting all of the feedback on what you're
45   saying and it's coming through like a time delay.

COMMISSIONER: Okay.

MS CAMPANY: Can you hear that?

5

COMMISSIONER: Yes. You're very clear. Let me try again.

MS CAMPANY: So I'm getting in my ear the recorded voice of what was just said. So why would that be happening?

10

COMMISSIONER: We have to adjourn, Barbara, and we'll see if we can fix it up.

ADJOURNED   **[2.32 pm]**

15

RESUMED   **[2.38 pm]**

COMMISSIONER: We'll reconvene at 1440. I think we've overcome the technical issue. So, Ms Campany, can I go back to my opening statement, that
20   we acknowledge that you're giving us your professional views over 20 years and not the views of GHD.

MS CAMPANY: That's correct, although I would suggest that they would probably support what I would share, but I don't want to make that claim.

25

COMMISSIONER: That's fine. We'll take your evidence based upon your professional 20-year background on these issue. Can I start with a very general question? We generally have a good perception of the technical risks of a major project. What are the other risks that we need to consider as we embark
30   upon major large projects?

MS CAMPANY: I think one of the key elements that often isn't considered until later on in the process are the impacts on a community that you might be considering, or building a project or doing exploration, or whatever the project
35   might be. Often the failure to acknowledge those broader social risks can lead to community anger or frustration, and it's not really that it's a deeply deliberate omission. It's about the way we do business. We often consider technical merit of a project before we consider the social impacts, and I think they need to be considered in parallel to each other, because one really can't be feasible
40   without acknowledging and managing the other.

So you can try and build a bridge, but if, you know, it's not going to fit technically, then it's not going to work. So I think you need to give as much consideration to the impacts, any kind of infrastructure or mining or resource a
45   project might have on a community. Many organisations just take a bit too

long to consider the social impact a project might have.

COMMISSIONER: So the social risk is something that you would consider as the project is developed.

5

MS CAMPANY: I think it has to be considered as part of the feasibility, and it's a harder risk to quantify, because social risk usually seeks to understand what the emotional connection to a community the project might represent. So it's not sort of a nuts and bolts matter. It's a much deeper, human element that

10 is much harder to quantify and that's why I think we often forget. So our perception of risk as an engineer might be quite different to a community who might be concerned about the impact of that project either on their health or on their local amenity and that drives up their emotional condition if you're not engaging with them early enough in the process before decisions are made. So

15 it's really important to consider their perceptions of whatever is being proposed prior to finalising a decision.

MR JACOBI: It seems clear enough to understand how one plans for a technical risk in terms of thinking about issues of engineering and design. I'm

20 just wondering what you have in mind about planning for social risk. What does that involve?

MS CAMPANY: Well, you need to really understand who a project might impact, and I have a very simple model that I use that comes from Jennifer

25 David, Professor Jennifer David out of UTS. She imparted this knowledge, I think in the 90s when I studied under her: is that people fall into three categories: they're either power based when you've got positions of decision making at your disposal; you're rights based, and that rights-based group of stakeholders are the community generally; and there are interest-based

30 stakeholder, and if you look at that - I did draw, if you like, a model just with three circles and you've got some overlap there. So when you're looking at your project, you need to look at your stakeholders and understand who it impacts and how they might perceive what it is you're proposing to do.

35 So it's very difficult to try and categorise how people will feel about what you're intending to do if you're not going to engage them in a stage of the process that's early enough for them to actually affect or influence the outcome of what you're trying to do.

40 MR JACOBI: Do you have any views about how you go about identifying those groups of people with whom you ought to be engaging?

MS CAMPANY: I don't think there's any sort of secret about that. I think it's a matter of mapping out your stakeholders as you would your, you know,

45 technical elements. You look at, you know, who is your local community, who

are the key leaders in your community, both from a council perspective and a government perspective, but also a community perspective, people who are key leaders, heads of chamber of commerce, for example, local businesses, local community groups. It could be the CWA. It could be a local interest group who already have a view about, you know, industry generally in the area. If you don't have the information, certainly there are research companies out there that can assist developing a good stakeholder map of those that would have a stake in what it is you're intending to develop.

And the other thing to remember, social risk and social perceptions, or perceptions of risk, go beyond the technical scope, because when you're building something, you're building it to become operational. A community has to live with a decision that, you know, engineers are making around a development, so that, you know, the community is left with the legacy if it's good or bad, you know. So you need to make sure the issues that the community would have about a development have the chance to be heard in the early part of the design and development of whatever it is that you're trying to put forward.

If you don't share that ownership and involvement in that development of a decision you will face a lot of controversy if it's potentially adversarial whatever project you're trying to develop. Nobody likes change. That's fundamental human nature. Few of us like to change too much, but if change is part of the progress that needs to be made, then, you know, it's mad not to engage those people that are going to basically bear the brunt of those decisions that are being made.

MR JACOBI: I'm just interested as to the extent to which the social risks - this is in your experience - reflect concerns that are different to actual or known technical risks that are perceived by the engineers or the proponents to be associated with a project.

MS CAMPANY: So is your question about a technical risk that can be proven that it's a very low risk, and yet the community might see it as a high risk? Are you asking me how do you bridge that gap?

MR JACOBI: I'm interested, first of all, as to the extent to which those social risks exist that differ from what you might understand to be technical risks.

MS CAMPANY: Okay. So that's a good question. I think the question really demonstrates that if engagement around a potentially high-risk project is started late in the game, you are going to face a lot of push back, generally because there may be a potential level of - it could be arrogance, it could be ignorance, but not recognising the validity of those stakeholders in the decision that you're making, I think you might - we live with risk every day, but we

decide, you know, that level of risk. When you're imposing a perception or a perceived risk on a community that they haven't discussion or involvement in influencing or shaping, naturally there'll fight back, because even though the risk might be technically proven to be low, and the science and all the evidence

5   points in that direction, not engaging the community or engaging your stakeholders in developing up the criteria about how you measured that risk, could be the undoing.

So I think it's really important to make sure you provide opportunity for early
10   discussions around controversial or what people perceive as high-risk projects, even though the science tells us, and the engineering tells us, that risk can be managed to a low level. I'll give you an example. When I worked for a large company - I know it's on the record that I've worked for Orica over the years. I was involved with a community at Botany that had been subjected to a
15   contamination problem and the company was asked by the EPA or regulator to clean up that groundwater because it was affecting the local community. And even though all of the science was telling us that it was a low risk, a low health impact, that the contamination wasn't causing, you know, the risks that people felt it could've been, it was too late.
20
People were clearly upset and angry that it had been allowed to happen in the first place, and for whatever reason - I mean, things do happen and we can't always engineer risk out. You know, communities have to understand how to - you know, how do they respond to an organisation? If they don't have any
25   credibility or they don't have any history, how should they react or, you know, respond. So you really need to do some baseline research around those community values and attitudes before you sort of head down a path of, you know, a decision and design and engineering of, you know, whatever it is that you're proposing.
30
MR JACOBI: Do you have a view about whether you ought to engage - I'm asking a question here about timing - in terms of projects development, about how early in the process that engagement ought commence, and I'm interested in whether you ought engage before you've necessarily completed the project
35   design.

MS CAMPANY: Well, I think, you know, in my experience, the higher the potential impact the greater the need to engage and share insights around that proposal, and I think that would be my rule of thumb. If you are going to
40   build, for example, a highly controversial - well, let's say nuclear, why not, we're talking about nuclear waste - that in itself, you know, conjures up all sorts of images in people's minds and if you don't invest early enough in a program that would engage the key opinion leaders, certainly, but certainly having a balanced discussion around those who are scientific experts and
45   engineering experts in that field versus those that have a very strong view

against it, you need to have a very healthy discussion very early on in the process so that you can manage that conversation and manage the concerns that emerge, and if there's some common ground that's where you try and go forward.

5

Now, that doesn't mean to say you will always please everyone. There will always be competing interests. It's about finding a balance that the broader community will tolerate so that you can actually, you know, progress your plan or, you know, your proposal, but if you don't engage you're at risk of that fight

10 down the track. You have to pay at some point. You pay or invest early on in the process and you have a greater chance in influencing outcomes that are more acceptable by the community because you've given them at least the respect to be involved in that conversation.

15 Now, how you get representation, how you get fair representation, is another discussion. You need to make sure that you have got the right people and everyone, you know, at the table early on in that process, and then there's always an opportunity for other people to be engaged as they would like to come in and out of that process, that conversation. Most of us, 80 per cent of

20 people like us, are quite happy with, you know, the decisions being made. They see community opinion leaders voicing, you know, the general interests of the community.

When they stop representing your view, that's when you might want to get up

25 and take charge yourself, but most of us are very time poor and we trust - we place our trust in a lot of these community leaders, so it's really important to tap into that early on in the process.

MR JACOBI: I think of the issue of timing and I'm interested in - we've all

30 seen examples of community engagement that involve decisions having already been made and people being told what the decision is as a process of community engagement. I'm just interested in your perspectives on decision making processes where the community itself is involved in making the decision as the process goes along.

35

MS CAMPANY: I can share again another story. When the groundwater treatment plant was being built at Botany to treat the contamination in the ground, we established a process where the community could participate in those workshops before an actual technology was decided or confirmed. For

40 example, the engineers were very keen not to go and talk to the community until they designed something that they knew was technically feasible, but the value of bringing in stakeholders early is probably a couple of things.

One is the community get to see you struggle and try and work out, you know,

45 how to get the best outcome that's going to meet the interests of all the parties,

and in a way they, you know, if you run through a process where they are able to be on that journey with you at the end of that process they are much more likely to be advocates for what the decision is because they've actually participated in that process. Now, we had four major half day workshops that we opened to the public that we conducted over a 12 to 18 month period and we didn't exclude anyone, so the process was inclusive.

It was a process where people, you know, were able to sort of view technical presentations, and we had community presentations about some of the issues that they had so that the conversations led to, ultimately, a groundwater treatment plant being built that was more energy hungry to make sure the impact - well, they were trying to engineer out - lower the dioxin omissions. Even though the dioxin omissions in a green energy plant would meet the guidelines the community was more concerned about further contaminants in the air shed.

I hope I'm not misrepresenting the issue technically, but I guess what I'm trying to explain is that if you involve people and they get a say and they get to share their real concerns, they understand that there might be a trade, and what they weren't willing to do was to compromise on the level of dioxin, they wanted to engineer that out to as much as possible below the guidelines, and were willing to have a more energy hungry plant. It really just simply demonstrated that if you involve people along the path in that time they can become educated and informed and they can make much more informed judgements about decisions.

They get to share some of the struggle that some of the organisations might have in developing up the most technically sound solution. Often engineers think that this is what the people would accept because, you know, that's a green energy footprint and a plant that would be complying with regulations, but in fact that wasn't the case. They wanted to lower dioxin omissions, that was such a key revelation in that process, that it really was a surprise to most people.

MR JACOBI: You've referred to the - - -

MS CAMPANY: Sorry, the question about time, the greater the impact, the greater the likelihood that you're going to have some controversy, I would suggest the earlier the engagement with the key stakeholders. How you find those key stakeholders is a simple enough process because you would sit down and you would look at all of the people in the concentric circles, you know, the rights based, the power based and the interests based. I go back to the rights based because they're the most important people to engage, and the rights based are those who are those that are often terms as the NIMBY, the not in my backyard, where most organisations want to run a mile and want to talk to them last because they're terrified.

In fact, there needs to be a level of respect and listening given to that group, and if they are genuinely trusting or find that your proposal is credible and you've already got some history that's demonstrated your trustworthiness, then it's likely they won't need to mobilise local MPs or non-local interest groups that would get involved in this debate. I think if you can satisfy the needs and interests of the rights based stakeholders you will have a much easier task going forward.

MR JACOBI: You've referred to the external expertise that was available at the firm of which you're working, and I'm just interested to the extent to which you thought that community groups having access to expertise both within organisations and also independent expertise was important in resolving the sorts of issues to which you were referring.

MS CAMPANY: I think that's a really important point. Let's face it, companies and governments have deep pockets, really, when it comes to having to fund - you know, the whole design process requires enormous effort and financial commitment, whereas a community, really, it's a very lopsided process because the community relies on their own time and, you know, they don't have any excess funds that they can access to commission their own independent reports. I mean, the whole process is concerning for a community where they feel a lot of reports written by consultants aren't exactly, you know, transparent, and that final report that's published often, you know, has gone through several iterations before, you know, a government or, you know, an organisation might want that released, because that's just the way it is.

That's their view of the world, and, you know, that's probably a fair assumption, and so by setting up some process that gives a community access to independent technical advice to scrutinise reports, I think that goes a long way to developing a greater transparency and trust in that process. Now how do you fund something like that? Well, in Orica's case, like I go back to the Botany project, it's on the public record, they've got an independent monitoring committee that was established for that very reason. The community's main concern was that they didn't know what to trust in publications and reports that were being prepared and so through a joint process, both Orica and the community group set up some criteria that was – on how an independent monitoring committee might function and hired some – and some of that criteria was like this expert couldn't have worked for an activist group and this expert couldn't have worked for Orica.

So somewhere in the middle they had to find someone who was able to remain objective about a process and bring that expertise to the table on behalf of the community. And that process, I understand is working very well and so Orica funds that on behalf of the community. So it's a way of providing – putting

that sort of financial commitment to the community in a way that gives them greater benefit and access to their own expertise, and that is a process that has worked well. I have also used that on another project HMAS Platypus, the former naval site, at an iconic site in Sydney, I'm not sure if you are familiar with it but it was an old defence site that formerly was a gas site and had lots of tailings and it was in the well heeled and highly – it's a very expensive Sydney suburb, very close to the city and that reflected the demographic who – of the people who lived there.

And again, providing that independent expertise around a process of deciding the best technology to remediate a site, it went through a process of assessment around the technology options. People were able to clarify, were they prepared to put up with a 24/7 operation versus 12 hours and then 12 hours closing? Having experts to talk about what impacts the odour might have on the community. I mean it was a very transparent process, it involved several workshops again with the community members to review and have the view of an independent expert available to them, to be able to answer the questions that they might have. So it does work. It costs money. That seems to be the hiccup in a lot of these processes but the genuine processes that – where they want – where industry wants good outcomes, they are seeking to achieve that through providing some independent expertise to the community.

MR JACOBI: One of the other issues that seems to emerge is the extent to which data is publicly available and I am just wondering whether you have got a view about the publicly available data, such as monitoring data or testing data associated with projects?

MS CAMPANY: Well, I think there are two elements to this. I think the first one is how do people feel about the way in which data is gathered, so the model that is used. A way – and so by, I guess, getting shared ownership of some of the way in which that monitoring data is collected, gives some ownership to the outcomes. So you have a way in which you can do a study that incorporates potentially the – reflects some of the values that the community might specifically want you to measure. Making them available, I don't even think that's – to me that's a no brainer. If you can – if you are prepared to do a study, why on earth wouldn't you share the outcomes with the broader public? I mean good, bad or indifferent; most information that goes and gets published can be found under different processes anyway. So being much more transparent with your key partner and that is how I see a community as being a legitimate partner in any of this, have a right to information that – where studies are being conducted within their home.

MR JACOBI: Is there a - - -

MS CAMPANY: Does that answer your question?

MR JACOBI: Yes. Is there a need to also provide the means for the interpretation of that information? I am really coming back to the question of the experts.

MS CAMPANY: Well, that's where an independent expert can help. So if you are conducting for instance, hydrogeology flows, ground water seems to be a major concern because the real concern with water is we can't see what happens underground so a lot of it is modelled and it's the word modelled where most people get concerned because there are different views around modelling. But we trust these models and experts that conduct these studies have qualifications to do exactly that. So we place our trust in their models. My question that - I think one of the questions that communities often have is that model can be skewed, or that model is – doesn't address this, so I think it's really important in doing studies for whatever reason, there is some process to have the community values captured and addressed in that modelling of whatever it is that you're trying to do. I think the key is get buy-in to what you're trying to do and if there is buy-in and it's – you can get some agreement around the terms then you have a much more robust process. And generally, in my experience, it is not different to what a hydro geologist would do; it's just perhaps another perspective to consider and I think that gives depth to any study, if you can make sure that you capture those issues a community might have. I mean I have met a lot of these specialists over the years and mostly they – their intent is of – it's their profession, they want to do a great job. It's not – when their own credibility and integrity comes in to question they can't help but want to defend that and that's natural. And so a way of correcting, I guess, or sharing the process is to get your key critics on board early and make sure whatever the critics might have to say is considered in the study. And that way at least at the end you've got some evidence that is being gathered against some of the criteria they might put forward. So it has much more robust – it is much less likely to be criticised if you have got that shared agreement early on.

MR JACOBI: I am just interested in understanding the extent to which there are tools for, or particular mechanisms for providing access to expertise and I particularly have in mind here, internal expertise?

MS CAMPANY: Sorry, I don't understand what you mean? Do you mean like through a company, or - - -

MR JACOBI: No, I'm just - - -

MS CAMPANY: - - in (indistinct)

MR JACOBI: Sorry, I will ask a better question. We have spoken a bit about our – providing for independent expertise through the monitoring committee

that you've talked about and I am just wondering - - -

MS CAMPANY: Yes.

5 MR JACOBI: - - - seeking to understand whether you think there are other
formats in which you can make expertise available, particularly internal
expertise within - - -

MS CAMPANY: Right.

10
MR JACOBI: - - - companies?

MS CAMPANY: Sorry. So, well yes of course. You can do a whole lot of
things. I think one of the methods that we've – that I've been involved with is
15 running some sort of sessions with authors of different reports. So experts in
noise, or experts in odour, or experts in air quality, or experts in hydrogeology.
So whenever – and when you are conducting a lot of these pre-feasibility
studies, you're doing a lot of studies as part of environment assessments and if
you make sure your – again, your studies reflect the issues raised by your
20 stakeholders then that's killing two birds with one stone. You are actually
making sure those issues are addressed early on. So I think one way is to run
sessions where you've got – those different experts in – available to the
community so that they can come along and have a kind of round table
conversation with experts. So what I have done in the past is set up several
25 tables, had several experts attend sessions and have community members rotate
to particular areas of their particular interest. So you are not – it's a way of
managing, having a big crowd and allowing them to self-nominate a process
where – self-nominate which experts that they have burning questions for. So
it provides a personal access to experts, they wouldn't probably otherwise get,
30 and they can be internal experts or they can be commissioned professionals in
their area of expertise, and I think the power is making access to them available
so that, you know, people in the community are able to ask questions of them.

MR JACOBI: Finally, there's one thing I want to draw out, and that is the
35 distinction between engagement where you've got a brownfield's site, such as
the sort of site that you were discussing about with Orica, and where you've got
what might be a greenfield's project where you're seeking to start an industrial
activity on a new site. Do you think there are key differences in the way that
the community engagement needs to occur?
40
MS CAMPANY: Yes, I do. I think that legacy sites are - usually, you know,
people have grown up around those sites and the affected communities have
often been, you know, employed. You know, most industrial suburbs, you
know, can be testament to that, our whole way of industry and manufacturing
45 has changed in the last 50 years. You know, developing up a greenfield's site

is the hardest, most challenging process because you're changing a landscape in the community's mind often for the worse or to the detriment of the community, and so you have a much more difficult challenge in making sure there's a balance in why, you know, the justification in such a project, whether it's, you know, a question of the price of progress, you know, what it - you know, it's a very - it's a different ball game going out to a greenfield's site than going in and trying to find a process to clean up an old contaminated site, and then you've got another conversation about where you might take all the waste to.

The whole chain of conversation presents its own, you know, challenges along the way. In a greenfield's site, I would absolutely make sure that very early on the justification for the project is really clear and it can stack up against whatever community may, or stakeholders, may want to test with you, so I would engage very early on. I would probably look at establishing some kind of advisory group where, you know, if this project wants to get up there are certain gates it needs to go through, and you're much better off going through those gates with, you know, people who would question or challenge and help you set criteria for any kind of assessment for that project.

It's very different, so I don't know if that's answered your question, but there's a whole methodology to it. I think the key is, though, to engage early and engage, you know, the key leaders in the community that you're going to impact otherwise you're sort of setting yourself up for a tough time ahead. If you can manage your engagement and manage that process early on and establish credibility and trustworthiness in that process early on, it's much more likely you will have an opportunity to inform an educate a community that hasn't necessarily formed a view about what it is you're doing.

You have a chance to engage in a much more transparent - it's a much more credible process, so you're involving and then deciding, and you're not deciding and offending. The whole process of making a decision and putting on a public expedition and defending it to the end degree, I mean you're kind of setting up, you know, sort of a battle before you even get past the first post. Sorry, I'm trying to be not too frank, but I think sometimes there's no other way of saying it.

MR JACOBI: Can I just come to the last topic I want to raise, and that's the issue of communication about risk. We've heard quite a bit about this, and I'm just interested to understand the extent to whether you've got any principles about communicating issues of risk associated with projects.

MS CAMPANY: Risk is a funny thing. If it's coerced people will fight, if it's a voluntary risk people couldn't care less. It's a bit like, you know, deciding to smoke, and everybody knows that smoking causes cancer, but people still

make that choice because they don't seem to care because they're making that judgement themselves. When people are imposed by what they see as a risk, they will fight, so you need to invest incredibly early and in a genuine way about what it is you're doing in the processes that the community or whoever it is that you're affecting can respond to.

There's not a silver bullet for any of this, you need to actually work out what is the most appropriate way to engage, and, you know, firstly understand who is your community and who are the stakeholders and what is the most appropriate way to engage, because, you know, you may have a community who has lived with industry next door all their life and don't feel there's any real concern about any, you know, expansion to that project because they've lived happily and safely in that neighbourhood, whereas going to a greenfield's site where you're changing the landscape forever of a community it requires much more sensitive engagement, you need to listen, you need to make sure that there's a way to take onboard issues raised, but most of all you need to really provide a pathway where people feel that they can shape the outcome.

That doesn't necessarily mean that, you know, saying yes or no to a project, it actually means finding out along the way what is negotiable. Where is the sort of negotiation that's available to people to make a difference? Risk communication is a toolbox you can apply to a number of circumstances. You can have a highly outraged community where there is technically proven very low risk. You can have a highly outraged community that are being subjected to what they see and is technically proven to be a very high risk, and that's different communication again.

Then you have another category where we often call it public relations where, you know, you're trying to educate people about real risk and they have no appreciation of that. For example, for those of you who remember when we were required to start wearing seatbelts because it proved very readily they save lives, there was a whole education campaign around safety and seatbelts, and that was a different set of tools to a community, you know, to an audience that, you know, is very upset about a risk that they think is being imposed on them, and if it's technically a low risk, and that's where I think the gap is, and that's where a lot of work is for risk communication and, you know, what we call outrage, community outrage, because they're attached, you know, very emotionally to an issue.

COMMISSIONER: Barbara, thank you very much for your evidence this afternoon. I appreciate the time that you've put in to helping us along our journey.

MS CAMPANY: You're welcome.

MR JACOBI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

5   **MATTER ADJOURNED AT 3.18 PM UNTIL
TUESDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2015**