

# **Ground-Level Ozone**

A Negotiated Rule-Making Process on Varara's Air Pollution Crisis

## **Instructions for Fortuna Gomez, the Technical Secretary**

From the MEC's Senior Staff

Since the Metropolitan Environmental Commission (MEC) was established four years ago, its coordinating role in environmental matters has never been more important. As Technical Secretary of the MEC, it is up to you today to help facilitate the discussion of this diverse group of stakeholders. You are recognized as the catalyst behind the dialogue, so all eyes will be on you. Clearly, the outcome of the discussions will affect your reputation, for better or worse. Your boss, who is the MEC Commissioner as well as the Governor of Mola, very much wants to see this dialogue process succeed. He wants the outcome to be good for the state of Mola, of course, but he has told you that any agreement is better than no agreement. So, your task today is to help the group reach a consensus.

### **Position on the Reduction of Ground-Level Ozone**

Although you are not advocating for any specific positions, it is important that policy options be selected at realistically attainable levels, given the prevailing national, technical, social, economic, and political conditions, even though these realistic levels may not fully protect human health or the environment. It is important to gain public acceptance of the consensus policy option package. In addition, we should not ignore the importance of policy implementation; think about who bears the costs and who receives the benefits. Try to strive for a broad base of funding for implementation. The one item you *should* advocate for is an additional US\$1 billion from the Environmental Trust Fund (ETF), to help cover implementation costs. The group should not ignore any of the individual decisions, because any missing decision item will mean a far less-effective package.

### **Primary Concerns**

- 1) Reaching agreement, with the best emission-reduction outcome at the least cost and least political fragmentation.
- 2) Getting everybody "on board" in the stakeholder dialogue.
- 3) Securing a range of financing sources for the projects.

- 4) Requesting an additional US\$1 billion from the Environmental Trust Fund (managed by the Ministry of Finance (MOF)) to cover policy implementation and research.

## Tips for Facilitating the Meeting

### 1) As a Process Manager

- Present a roadmap of the dialogue at the outset of the discussions, and seek agreement on it. You might propose the following agenda:
  - Introduce participants*
  - Set ground rules for discussion and making decisions*
  - Discuss and brainstorm, decision by decision*
  - Meet in small caucuses*
  - Package the options*
- Adhere to the meeting timetable.
- Keep records on a flipchart in order to bring the views, values, feelings, and concerns to the table for dialogue and to find common ground.
- Ask meaningful questions that encourage deep thinking.
- Periodically summarize where the group has been, and where they are going.
- Help to link among different but relevant decisions in creating a package of options.
- Keep the discussion focused on the objective of the group.
- Encourage stakeholders to meet in small caucuses if they are stuck; this will give them an opportunity to build coalitions as needed.
- Use the attached worksheet to record the final package.

### 2) As a Leader

- Encourage constructive debate among participants.
- Draw out the introverted participants.
- Maintain a positive mental attitude. Some people are quite ready to pronounce failure before an effort has had a chance to succeed.
- Keep the momentum going.

### 3) As a Referee

- Make sure that everyone has an equal voice and no one is rebuffed for their input, especially while brainstorming.
- Discourage participants from talking at the same time or dominating the floor.
- Be a good listener.
- Try to look neutral and trustworthy.
- Don't ask, "Are you OK with this proposal?" Instead, ask, "Is anybody *not* OK with this proposal?"

- 4) **One more important thing:** Encourage parties to refer to the research team's analysis of the better packages of options, to facilitate their decision making.

## Decision Options

You will need to refer to the General Information for details about the costs and benefits of the various decision options. But below is a shorthand list of all the options, for easy referral. Remember, you do not need to advocate for any of these positions (except the extra US\$1 billion from the ETF); rather, you need to help the group determine what package of options best meets all of their needs.

### **Decision 1: Sulfur Content in Regular Unleaded Gasoline**

Option 1: 300 ppm in 2008 and 30 ppm in 2015 (slow phase-in)

Option 2: 300 ppm in 2006 and 30 ppm in 2011 (moderate phase-in)

Option 3: 300 ppm in 2004 and 30 ppm in 2008 (fast phase-in)

### **Decision 2: Emission Standards for New Vehicles**

Option 1: MES 2 in 2016 (slow phase-in)

Option 2: MES 2 in 2013 (moderate phase-in)

Option 3: MES 2 in 2011 (fast phase-in)

### **Decision 3: Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program**

Option 1: Harmonization of the I&M Programs

Option 2: Public Audits

Option 3: Integration of the Inspection and Registration Databases

Option 4: Differential Treatment in Inspections

Option 5: OBD Systems and Emission Warranties

### **Decision 4: Public Transportation**

Option 1: Metro Extension to Sandoa

Option 2: Ring Road Construction

Option 3: Bicycle Lanes

Option 4: Congestion Pricing

Option 5: Regulated Competition for Microbuses

Option 6: Subsidy for Microbuses

### **Decision 5: Assigning Enforcement Responsibility and Financing**

This decision is the most critical in terms of implementing any recommended policy option package. Without this decision, the future of the package is doomed. As you know, the Environmental Trust Fund, managed by the MOF, has earmarked US\$1 billion for the MEC. But, our analysis says that we need an additional US\$1 billion from the MOF. This money will be used to implement the recommended policy options and conduct relevant research.

**GROUP #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Facilitator's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Final Package

Please fill the table according to data about reductions and costs in your general information.

Decision Item	Name of Selected Options	Number of YES votes
Decision 1 (Sulfur) + <b>Decision 2</b> (Emission Standard)	Option #( ) + Option #( )	
Decision 3 (I&M)		
Decision 4 (Public Transport)		

**Number of Votes for the final package:**

**Number of Votes against the final package:**

**Cost Distribution and Implementation Responsibility:**

Who pays how much money for what?

