

BEST PRACTICE

Pushing Past Impasse: The Alaskan Way Viaduct Story

Learning together creates the space for common ground.



Bennett Brooks
Senior Mediator



Scott McCreary
Principal & Co-Founder
CONCUR, Inc.

The City of Seattle had been struggling for years to find the elusive answer that would allow it to address a critical need: replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct, the at-risk stacked highway that separates downtown Seattle from its waterfront.

For nearly a decade, effort after effort fell short. Environmental advocates wanted a solution that would favor mass transit and bikes over more roadways. Major corporations and business interests wanted to ensure there would be sufficient capacity to keep their employees and products on the move. City officials were eager to reclaim Seattle's waterfront. And taxpayer groups pressed for low-cost options. Even those committed to maintaining a major roadway couldn't agree on an approach. The project was at an impasse.

In the wake of a failed public referendum, city, county, and state leaders committed to making another stab at forging a consensus approach among their respective governments. But how to succeed where almost 10 years of earlier dialogue had fallen short? And how to involve a public that needed to have a meaningful voice in the discussion but had had enough of what's known as "Seattle process" or, less affectionately, "consensus through exhaustion?"

We (Bennett was then at CONCUR) worked with state, city and county officials – and a battery of transportation and public involvement experts – to co-invent a new (and, ultimately, successful) way forward. The new path had many important elements: a commitment by senior transportation staff and political leaders to reach consensus; a reframing of the problem to look at the region's broader mobility needs; an independently led, integrated alternatives analysis; and, a joint pooling of agency technical expertise.

But a particularly interesting facet of the effort – and the focus of this piece – was the role of the Alaskan Way Viaduct Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), a group of thirty stakeholders convened to provide ongoing input to the three departments of transportation charged with developing potential solutions. The SAC proved to be an essential dialogue – creating a productive forum where stakeholders could raise questions, get answers and begin to build a common base of understanding. In fact, this non-consensus-seeking dialogue eventually generated many aspects of the agreement eventually adopted by the state, city, and county.

Elements of the SAC Process

Several crucial factors distinguished this "hybrid" process from other stakeholder dialogues.

- **Information-sharing, but not delegated consensus-seeking.** The SAC, by design, was established as a sounding board, a place where representatives of the varied interests could track and provide input into the three agencies' collaborative decision-making process. This charge – one that focused on information-sharing, not forging consensus – proved instrumental, as it enabled stakeholders to engage more freely. For most, discussions became an opportunity to understand the trade-offs among the

Continued on page 2

- » [page 3](#) Beyond NIMBYism: Exploring Stakeholder Landscape Values and Wind Energy Development
- » [page 4](#) Facilitating Tribal Input on Indian Land Consolidation
- » [page 5](#) Designing and Piloting a Global Grievance Mechanism for the United Nations Development Program
CBI Announces
- » [page 6](#) Improving Development Outcomes by Including Women in Community Dialogues
- » [page 7](#) New Faces at CBI
- » [page 8](#) News: CBI in Action

possible solutions, rather than a chance to convince others of the “rightness” of their position.

- **Rotating facilitation by top agency staff.** Unlike most dialogues, this discussion was chaired monthly by senior leadership within each of the three transportation departments. This revolving chair model impacted the deliberations in several key ways. For one, senior leadership was keenly engaged. Additionally, it demonstrated to stakeholders the import of the SAC process. Finally, it created a monthly opportunity for each agency to speak candidly about its interests and assessment of the evolving analysis.
- **Transparent analysis in the raw.** More often than not, the various analyses presented to the SAC were “hot off the presses.” Part of this was by design; the intent was to invite stakeholders to “learn along with the decision-making agencies.” Part of this was also driven by the tight timeframe; there was little opportunity to polish presentations before bringing the latest data to the SAC. This “in the raw” style helped to build credibility in the process and created an opportunity for real-time joint fact finding, as stakeholders and agency staff alike struggled to interpret the ramifications of the latest findings. “Stakeholders were able to see the complexity of it all,” said one participant.
- **SAC as forcing function.** The SAC served as a critical forcing function – both for getting the analysis done and for integrating staff perspectives. Meeting on a monthly basis at the outset (and shifting to bi-weekly or even weekly meetings later), the SAC became a driver for setting and meeting project deadlines. Moreover, with the agencies on tap to jointly – and publicly – present and engage difficult issues at each monthly meeting, SAC planning meetings became the impetus for surfacing and working through agency differences; divergent views were simply not able to fester.
- **Focused sidebars.** On several occasions, there was insufficient time at the SAC’s monthly meetings to adequately engage the thorniest (or most controversial and technically dense) issues. In these instances, rather than push-



ing past the topics with inadequate deliberation and understanding, the agencies set up separate briefings that allowed interested SAC members and others in the community to delve deeper. This approach proved highly effective. As one person put it: “It really did shift some people.”

As the year-long SAC process ground towards a close, city, state and county transportation staff were leaning towards recommending two options to their chief executives: either a new elevated roadway or a hybrid that would rely on transit expansion and improvements to both city streets and the north-south I-5 corridor. SAC members, concerned about limitations associated with the two options, pressed for ongoing consideration of an appealing but costly third option discussed during the process: a bored tunnel. This feedback proved pivotal and it created a potent (and earlier elusive) constituency for implementation of the eventual \$4.2 billion approach selected and endorsed by the three executives: a deep-bored tunnel under downtown Seattle, coupled with significant improvements to current transit service and city streets and the opening up of Seattle’s waterfront. The project – with the help of the world’s largest boring machine – is now under construction, with completion expected in late 2015. ♦

Contact: Bennett Brooks at bbrooks@cbuilding.org,
or Scott McCreary, at scott@concurinc.net.

CBI Reports Volume XVI • Issue 1 • WINTER 2013

The Consensus Building Institute (CBI) is a not-for-profit organization created by leading practitioners and theory builders in the fields of negotiation and dispute resolution. CBI works with leaders, advocates, experts, and communities to promote effective negotiations, build consensus, and resolve conflicts.

Managing Directors
David Fairman
Patrick Field

**Founder and
Chief Knowledge Officer**
Lawrence Susskind

Consensus Building Institute
238 Main Street, Suite 400
Cambridge, MA 02142
Tel: 617.492.1414 • Fax: 617.492.1919
Email: cbi@cbuilding.org

Copyright © 2013. All rights reserved.
Licensing inquiries: sossi@cbuilding.org

Beyond NIMBYism: Exploring Stakeholder Landscape Values and Wind Energy Development

Landscape values around wind energy development can be complex, nuanced, and intertwined with local values and interests.



Patrick Field
Managing Director

Over the past several years, there have been growing concerns about energy independence, climate change and economic development. These concerns have led state governments to enact laws requiring electric utilities to increase renewable energy generation – wind in particular – and both the Federal and state governments have granted incentives to promote renewable energy development.

Yet in communities across the country, local stakeholders hold mixed views about wind energy, especially when it concerns where to build wind turbines. Some welcome wind energy for the potential economic benefits and the possibility of low-carbon electricity production. Others react with strong opposition, citing impacts on local landscapes, community identity and character, wildlife, and health issues related to noise, for instance.

What is driving the opposition to wind energy? Is it simply another case of NIMBYism — the “not in my backyard” syndrome? Or are there other, more complex, factors at play?

Designing Workshops to Answer Questions

CBI assisted a research team led by Principal Investigator Roopali Phadke of Macalester College in designing and leading three intensive one-day stakeholder workshops across the country. The National Science Foundation funded the project with additional support from the Lincoln Institute for Land Policy. The research team, including a group of undergraduate research assistants and external evaluators, held the workshop in three diverse communities across the United States where wind energy development was proposed or underway: western Michigan, western Minnesota, and western Massachusetts.

The team partnered with local “neutral” organizations, used census data to identify and recruit a representative sample of citizens, provided participants with background information, and encouraged participation by paying a stipend of \$100. The team designed the workshops to be highly interactive and engaging, using regional aerial mapping, interactive polling, visual simulations, and alternative analysis tools.

LEARN MORE:

Read the full case study at <http://cbuilding.org/publication/case/beyond-nimbyism-exploring-stakeholder-landscape-values-and-wind-energy-development>

As part of the research team, what did CBI learn from these three diverse communities facing wind energy development?¹

Whether people value the landscape as ‘primarily aesthetic’ versus ‘primarily working’ is a powerful predictor of views toward wind development. If the landscape is primarily valued as aesthetic, wind energy development will be seen not only as an encroachment, but also as threat to deeply held values about home, community, and landscape.

Underlying local cultural and political values drive views about the value, size, and scale of wind energy development. For example, in Minnesota, residents’ questions and responses appeared to be shaped by practical concerns about landscape change and a commitment to local, agricultural, privately-held property. Whereas, in Michigan, a strong commitment to the tourist economy, more skepticism about government, and strong support for free markets led to greater opposition to wind development.

Distrust of both messages and messengers is very high when there is increased opposition to or skepticism of wind energy development. The project team had no particular position or stance on wind energy development in the study areas, yet the team faced skepticism from certain groups. If a neutral study team encountered strong anxiety in some communities, this suggests that proponents and developers of projects in these areas will face far more significant and substantial trust issues.

Landscape values are complex, nuanced, and intertwined with political values, cultural values, and economic interests. The project team found that most participants in all three workshops had strong and detailed views and knowledge of their local landscapes. They identified features and areas important to them for personal, economic, aesthetic, ecological, and community identity reasons.

In conclusion, visual, tangible landscapes are deeply intertwined with residents’ broader cultural and political values – they are not easily separable. In our experience from these workshops, we learned that treating the landscape as a distinct physical feature or treating opposition to wind development as just NIMBYism is to sorely miss the complex social experience that stakeholders bring to the landscape where they live, work, and play. ♦

¹ Please note that these are CBI’s conclusions alone and not the formal findings of the research project. Any errors or omissions are the sole responsibility of CBI.

Contact: Patrick Field at pfield@cbuilding.org.

Facilitating Tribal Input on Indian Land Consolidation

Consultation meetings between Native American Tribes and the U.S. Department of the Interior lead to a settlement implementation plan for one of the largest class action lawsuits in U.S. history.



Stacie Nicole Smith
Senior Mediator
and Director,
Workable Peace

In 1996, Elouise P. Cobell and other Native American representatives charged the U.S. Government with gross mismanagement of Indian trust assets. Now, after fourteen years of litigation and several years awaiting legislative approval and final appeals, the settlement of one of the largest class action lawsuits in U.S. history is nearing its conclusion. The history of the suit stretches back to the Dawes Act of 1887, in which the federal government divided tribal lands into small parcels.

The parcels were to be held in trust by the federal government for 25 years; however,

with changing laws, many of the lands remained permanently in government trust. The highly fragmented tribal lands have lost value and are hampering economic development on reservations.

In December 2010, President Obama signed into law the \$3.4 billion settlement to the Cobell lawsuit, providing \$1.4 billion to the plaintiffs in the suit, and up to \$2 billion to the Trust Land Consolidation Fund, which will primarily be used to buy back fragmented lands, freeing it up for the benefit of tribal communities.

In order to decide how to best conduct the land consolidation program, the Department of the Interior (DOI) arranged for seven consultation meetings with tribes across the U.S. from July to October 2011 and asked CBI to facilitate these meetings.

Soliciting Key Tribal Input

Each consultation was held as a one-day meeting, drawing tribal leaders and other stakeholders from across the country. Because the U.S. Federal Government has a government-to-government relationship with the tribes, the morning sessions at each meeting were reserved for formal consultations with elected tribal officials. However, in order to ensure that the voices of individual landowners and other stakeholders were also heard, the afternoon sessions were open for individuals to share their concerns and opinions.

CBI facilitated the seven consultations, organizing the logistics and agendas, and carrying out the necessary behind-the-scenes planning to ensure that the events were successful. Due to past tensions between tribes and the federal government, it was essential that all of the attendees felt welcomed, respected, and that

they not only had the opportunity speak, but felt confident that their input was received and attended to. CBI also wrote in-depth summaries of each consultation meeting.

One key theme that surfaced during the consultations was the need to clarify the tribal role in the land consolidation process. For instance, when the DOI sought feedback on how to prioritize the funds in the land-buying process – asking attendees whether they should first buy back the land with the greatest fractionation, or the land with the most willing sellers, etc. – the tribes responded with the overwhelming opinion that they, not the federal government, should carry out the land-buying process and decide how to prioritize the funds on their own reservations.

The tribal leadership appreciated that the consultations provided the chance to give their input on the land consolidation process. However, during the consultations, attendees also made it clear that they want to continue to be involved in the process. Attendees asked for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan once it is formulated, as well as ongoing opportunities to evaluate the process over the ten-year implementation period.

Findings of the Consultation

CBI prepared a summary of key themes drawing on specific participant comments for the Department of Interior to incorporate into their plan for implementing the land consolidation program. This plan is entitled “[Cobell Land Consolidation Program Draft Plan](#)”, with a summary of public comments on pages 8 to 13, dated January 31, 2012. As the tribes requested, the draft plan included specific opportunities for the DOI and the tribes to develop collaborative agreements for the land consolidation program. It also included a commitment to work with tribes to identify priority lands and an opportunity for further input and feedback before a final plan is issued.

In November 2012, the Supreme Court dismissed one of the petitions to appeal the settlement of the class-action lawsuit, and all other appeals were withdrawn shortly thereafter. The DOI is building the necessary internal resources of agencies responsible for implementing the land consolidation program while they finalize their implementation plan. Thanks to the culturally sensitive and participatory nature of the consultation process, the Land Consolidation program will be able to better address the needs and requests of tribes. ♦

Errata: An earlier version of this article incorrectly stated that CBI provided recommendations to DOI, which they did not.

Contact: Stacie Nicole Smith at stacie@cbuilding.org.

LEARN MORE:

Read the full case study at <http://cbuilding.org/publication/case/facilitating-tribal-input-indian-land-consolidation>

Designing and Piloting a Global Grievance Mechanism for the United Nations Development Program

Strengthening and building capacity to provide effective grievance recourse and resolution.



David Fairman
Managing Director

The UN Development Program (UNDP) works in partnership with governments and civil society in more than 150 countries to strengthen democratic governance, reduce poverty, prevent and recover from crisis, improve the environment, and fight HIV/AIDS.

UNDP seeks to make people's lives better, and puts a premium on participation and inclusion in its work. Nonetheless, its investments and partnerships can sometimes cause social disruption, with negative impacts on individuals, communities and social groups.

As part of its commitment to accountability and delivery of high quality results, UNDP has decided to create a global grievance mechanism. The mechanism will provide a channel for people and groups who may be adversely affected by UNDP-supported projects and programs to voice their concerns and receive a timely and constructive response from UNDP staff. The grievance mechanism will operate primarily through UNDP Country Offices, with support from a global grievance office.

UNDP has asked CBI to help design the grievance mechanism. To assist UNDP, CBI is drawing on our extensive prior work with other multilateral development agencies on grievance and dispute resolution systems. The key design features for UNDP include:

- Strengthening of national partners' grievance and dispute resolution systems as the "first line" of response to concerns, so that UNDP's grievance mechanism is used only for situations that cannot be effectively resolved by national partners
- Ease of access to UNDP's grievance mechanism for people with low levels of literacy who are not accustomed to voicing concerns to government
- Clear, simple and consistent procedures for UNDP staff to receive, assess, respond to and document grievances
- A high degree of independence and impartiality for the staff at country and headquarters level who are directly responsible for grievance resolution, so that they can balance the concerns of UNDP with those of the people and groups filing grievances
- A headquarters support system for UNDP Country Office staff involved in grievance resolution to ensure that they have adequate guidance and capacity for collaborative problem solving

CBI is currently collaborating with an internal team in UNDP headquarters, and with UNDP regional and Country Office counterparts to draft guidance on how to operate the grievance mechanism.

During 2013, UNDP plans to pilot the mechanism with CBI support in several countries where UNDP is an implementing partner for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). In these countries, changes in forest management and land use to reduce deforestation and land degradation are likely to trigger conflicts with forest-dependent communities, timber companies, and other stakeholders. UNDP is required to establish its own grievance mechanisms in each country, and to strengthen the grievance mechanisms of national forestry, environmental and land management agencies involved in FCPF.

UNDP and CBI expect to learn a substantial amount from the pilot process about what kind of written guidance, headquarters and regional support, and local capacity building UNDP Country Offices need to be effective in grievance resolution. The design process and the dialogue with headquarters and field colleagues has already yielded important insights on how UNDP can provide effective recourse to people affected by its projects, while strengthening national capacities for effective grievance resolution. ♦

Contact: David Fairman at dfairman@cbuilding.org.

CBI ANNOUNCES...



CBI is pleased to announce the promotion of **Stacie Nicole Smith** to Senior Mediator. Stacie leads CBI's Social Policy and Cultural Resources practice and is the Director of Work-

able Peace. This promotion recognizes her leadership in developing and fostering new practice areas around education, cultural resources, and community-based disputes; her successful management of highly complex and contentious cases; and her organizational leadership in supervising associates and spearheading internal initiatives. Stacie holds a B.A. from Brown University and an M.A. from Columbia University Teachers College.

Improving Development Outcomes by Including Women in Community Dialogues

A pathway to better decision making, increased social license to operate, and gains in education, health, and economic development.



Mil Niepold
Senior Mediator

Civil society organizations, corporations, and governments are increasingly making policy and program decisions based on the tacit recognition that addressing gender equality plays a central role in achieving numerous societal objectives (ranging from reducing poverty to improving public health). Likewise, the unique role that women play in strengthening post-conflict reconstruction has been widely documented.¹ However, less well documented is the important role that engaging women at the community level plays in improving human development outcomes.



Rachel Milner Gillers
Senior Associate

While not limited to these examples, organizations ranging from the World Bank to Oxfam America's Extractive Industries program have noted that when women are initially included as part of community consultations this leads, over time, to an increase in women's political participation. Such increases in women's political engage-

ment in turn lead to improved human development outcomes in areas such as education, health, and infrastructure.²

While conflicts over resources are not new, climate change and population growth are combining to drive an increase in the number of resource conflicts.³ As conflict has shifted from traditional inter-state warfare to intra-state hostilities, smaller more localized conflicts are increasing due to competition for limited natural resources. Water is a prime example of this problem. A recent Intelligence Community Assessment of Global Water Security released by the U.S. government, suggests that "use of water as a weapon will become more common during the next 10 years with more powerful upstream nations impeding or cutting off downstream flow".⁴ Communities are on the frontlines of these tensions that flare over the competition between resources needed

for human survival (food, land and water) and those required for economic development and job creation (e.g. land used for forestry rather than farming). For example, in Kerala, India, communities suffered when groundwater was overly depleted by Coca-Cola for the purpose of manufacturing soft drinks.⁵ Resolving, and ideally, preventing such conflicts requires the inclusive engagement and negotiating skills of all members of a community, particularly women.

Drawing on CBI's extensive work with corporations, governments, and civil society organizations, particularly on community stakeholder engagement, we will continue to document the unique role that engaging women plays in improving sustainable supply chains, negotiating durable agreements, reducing community conflict, and improving human development outcomes. In the meantime, the following recent CBI activities in this area represent important first steps in this process.

In September and November 2012 and continuing into Spring 2013, we conducted workshops in Political Astuteness and Strategic Thinking for UN Women leaders worldwide through the United Nations System Staff College in Turin. CBI's sessions focused on strategic priority setting, stakeholder mapping, and consensus building within the agency's larger leadership framework. With CBI's help, men and women from the UN's entity for gender equality and the empowerment of women will be better positioned to navigate complex relationships with peer agencies, host governments, donors, and other key stakeholders.

From May through October 2013, Oxfam America (OA) engaged CBI in an effort to further integrate gender into OA's Extractive Industries (EI) program. Through preparatory webinars and a highly participatory three-day workshop, Mil Niepold and Rachel Milner Gillers assisted EI regional program leaders and gender advisors, U.S.-based policy staff, and selected senior leadership with envisioning how to implement OA's gender policy at various stages in the project life cycle. During this hands-on workshop, participants learned best practices from key industry and multilateral development bank gender experts; analyzed gender dynamics through hypothetical case studies; and began to design a specialized plan for monitoring, evaluating and learning from gender integration in selected EI projects.

What CBI has learned from our work with UN Women, Oxfam

1 <http://www.ndi.org/womens-political-participation>.

2 Ibid.

3 "But it is also evident that resource conflict is becoming more frequent and more pronounced in some areas as the demand for certain materials comes to exceed the available supply. For example, an acute shortage of arable land and fresh water seems to have been a significant factor in several conflicts, including those in Chiapas, Rwanda, and Zimbabwe. The same conditions appear to be developing in other areas of scarcity". <http://www.hampshire.edu/academics/22148.htm>

4 Global Water Security" Intelligence Community Assessment, February 2, 2012 http://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Press%20Releases/ICA_Global%20Water%20Security.pdf

5 http://www.ecolex.org/ecolex/ledge/view/RecordDetails;document_Peumatty%20Grama%20Panchayat%20vs%20State%20Of%20Kerala..html?DIDPFDSIjsessionid=11BFD9E7C249B9BE4B72EA8DEB50BDBC?id=COU-156025&index=courtdecisions



America and corporate stakeholder engagement initiatives is that achieving robust international development goals begins with the inclusion of multiple perspectives during community based negotiations. By specifically targeting women and creating the appropriate mechanisms for ensuring that their voices are heard, you improve the quality and durability of negotiated agreements. Sound and durable agreements, reached with consent of a fuller array of community perspectives, in turn helps stem the cycle of violence (for an example of this, see Chevron's work with communities in Nigeria).⁶ Other lessons from recent engagements highlight considerations in the design, facilitation, and implementation of gender-equitable agreement building in the international development context.

- Women tend to lean toward practical, more durable solutions in discussions about community development funding. Firstly, women bring to the table issues of concern to women and children, and, secondly, a more gender inclusive process leads to a more practical community development approach overall.⁷
- Some consensus building efforts need women-only processes up front to build confidence in sharing voices at the table. Though the goal is to have an integrated, gen-

der-balanced approach to participation, traditional gender norms may render this impossible at the outset. Initially segregated engagement efforts can position women stakeholders to enter negotiations with more agency and trust in the process.

- Involvement of women in consensus building processes increases the likelihood that results of a negotiation will be accepted by a wider array of stakeholders. The World Bank Institute cites incorporation of gender issues as among the most critical factors determining success of a given development policy.⁸ Likewise, policies crafted with the input of the stakeholders they are designed to help are often most effective.
- Over time, as more women are included in community based negotiations, evidence shows that women's political participation increases, whether intended or not. As demonstrated in Papua New Guinea, efforts to involve women from mining communities in development funding negotiations had a direct impact on women's participation in government.

In a time of increasing conflict, all stakeholders stand to gain from engaging women early and often. Our research and experience have shown that including women as part of activities from policymaking to business planning or post-conflict reconstruction will result in better decision making, more durable agreements, increased social license to operate, to say nothing of gains in education, health, and economic development.⁹ ♦

8 World Bank Institute, "What is the Most Important Feature Key Success Factor That will Make a Development Policy Succeed or Fail?" <http://wbi.worldbank.org/wbi/devoutreach/article/1078/what-most-important-feature-key-success-factor-tha-will-make-development-po>

9 Presentation by Adriana Eftimie, formerly of the World Bank Group, to Oxfam America, October 17, 2012.

6 <http://www.cbbuilding.org/publication/case/negotiating-community-agreements-between-chevron-and-niger-delta-stakeholders>

7 Comments by Chris Anderson of Rio Tinto, IFC Sustainability Exchange, May 2012, <http://commdev.org/ifc-2012-sustainability-exchange-1>

Contact: Mil Niepold at mniepold@cbbuilding.org, or Rachel Milner-Gillers at rmilnergillers@cbbuilding.org.

New Faces at CBI



Institute of Technology and a B.A. from Wesleyan University.

CBI is pleased to welcome **Tushar Kansal**, Associate. Based in Washington, D.C., Tushar specializes in energy development and regulation, international development, and corporate stakeholder engagement. He holds a Master in City Planning degree from the Massachusetts



Michigan School of Natural Resources and Environment and a B.S. from Indiana University.

CBI also welcomes Associate **Eric Roberts** to our Cambridge office. Eric has a strong background in domestic and international natural resource and environmental management issues with emphasis on water and energy resources and agroforestry systems. He holds a Master of Science from the University of

CBI in Action || *A snapshot of recent and ongoing work*

COMMERCIAL AGREEMENTS PRACTICE

More information: David Fairman, dfairman@cbuilding.org.

The past six months have seen three important developments in CBI's Commercial Negotiations practice. The practice uses the approach we laid out in *Built to Win: Building a World Class Negotiating Organization*.

Working with senior business managers, we identify core negotiation processes with high potential for additional value creation, and clarify strategy and skill building opportunities. We then design and deliver a highly tailored package of training, coaching and organizational learning services to produce better bottom line results, while building and maintaining strong relationships with vendors, customers and partners.

In 2012, we expanded our reach by creating new partnerships with Movius Consulting Inc. (MCI, led by CBI's former Director of Training, Assessment and Coaching, Hal Movius), and with CorpU Academy. Our MCI partnership combines CBI's assessment, design and training expertise with MCI's focus on executive negotiation and leadership coaching. Our CorpU partnership enables CBI to offer a state-of-the art on-line program, the Art of Negotiation, to a global audience of corporations interested in maximizing staff learning through a cost-effective investment. After a set of highly successful pilots, CBI and CorpU are making the Art of Negotiation broadly available to interested organizations.



In parallel, we have deepened our work in the pharmaceutical sector. We collaborate with market access and commercial leaders to produce mutual gains from market access and reimbursement negotiations, in highly regulated public payer

contexts. We are currently working with two leading global pharmaceutical manufacturers to link product-specific negotiations to broader public health needs and concerns. Through training and coaching for market access teams, we are enabling more effective health partnerships with public payers, governmental health agencies, and private and non-profit health providers and advocates.

CORPORATE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PRACTICE

More information: Merrick Hoben, mhoben@cbuilding.org.

>> Merrick Hoben and David Plumb release in-depth case study on lessons learned from our corporate community engagement work with Chevron and Niger Delta communities.



>> CBI completes a Mediation Manual to help OECD member governments more effectively use mediation to resolve concerns and complaints around corporate-community disputes. (left)

>> Merrick Hoben chairs Ethical

Corporation's 2nd Annual CSR Extractives North America Meeting: How To Manage Social & Environmental Risk for Oil, Gas & Mining North America, held in November in New Orleans.

ENERGY, ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE PRACTICE

More information: Patrick Field, pfield@cbuilding.org.

>> CBI and MIT are jointly awarded a two-year grant from the National Estuarine Research Reserve System to study how tailored role-play simulations can enhance collaborative climate adaptation measures. (right)



Innovative Climate Change Education Tool Being Tested

Photo from "OCRM Weekly"

>> Rachel Milner Gillers and Pat Field convene a multi-stakeholder group for U.S. Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative.

>> Ona Ferguson and Todd Schenk release a working paper through the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, exploring coastal states and municipalities' climate adaptation initiatives.

>> CBI launches a Nutrition and Wellness dialogue among major industry, foundation, academic and other sectors with Convergence Center for Policy Resolution.

>> Bennett Brooks works with CONCUR, Inc. to co-facilitate a strategic planning effort for the National Marine Fisheries Service around reducing marine mammal takes in commercial fisheries.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE

More information: David Fairman, dfairman@cbuilding.org.

>> CBI delivers Conflict Resolution Training for the International Monetary Fund.

>> David Fairman facilitates Oxfam International Global Campaign Collaboration.

>> CBI provides strategic planning facilitation and outreach to support The Nature Conservancy's Great Rivers Partnership.

>> CBI helps to facilitate the World Wildlife Fund's aviation carbon management efforts.

SOCIAL POLICY AND CULTURAL RESOURCES PRACTICE

More information: Stacie Smith, stacie@cbuilding.org.

>> Stacie Smith helps the First Nations Tax Commission and First Nations Financial Management Board work together in responding to disputes. (right)



>> Stacie Smith plans and delivers courses on integrating consensus building practices into cultural heritage management.

>> CBI delivers an online negotiation training course to AWARD: African Women in Agricultural Research and Development.