



**REPORT OF THE CAO EXPERT MISSION
TO CAJAMARCA:
FEBRUARY/MARCH MEETINGS**

April 2002

**Office of Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman
of the International Finance Corporation and
the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	BACKGROUND EVENTS.....	3
II.	The MESA.....	4
	Coordinating Committee Report	4
	Capacity-Building Workshops.....	5
	Independent Water Study,,.....,,	6
	Future of the Mesa ,,.....,,	6
	Review and Discussion of Issues.....	9
	Draft Schedule.....	12
III	CAPACITY BUILDING	12
IV.	SAN JUAN, CHOROPAMPA, AND MAGDALENA	16
V.	CONCLUSION.....	16
VI.	PHOTOS	
	<i>Graduation</i>	
	<i>Los Veedores</i>	
	APPENDIX.....	17

I. BACKGROUND EVENTS

The origin of the Mesa de Dialogo y Consenso CAO-Cajamarca stems from two formal complaints submitted to the CAO. The first of these complaints was filed by community leaders concerning the aftermath of the mercury spill that occurred on June 2, 2000 affecting the communities of San Juan, Choropampa and Magdalena. A second complaint was submitted by a local group of the Rondas Campesinas in Cajamarca. It detailed concerns related to environmental, social, and economic impacts from Minera Yanacocha's operations, as well as concerns regarding consultation and outreach, and compliance with a number of IFC Safeguard Policies.

In response to these complaints, the CAO convened a mission to understand and address the problems in a more comprehensive manner through the creation of a multiparty dispute resolution and dialogue process. During the course of the past eight months CAO facilitators have made six visits to Cajamarca. These visits began in July 2001, with an assessment of the situation and an appraisal of the suitability for using dispute resolution and dialogue techniques. Based upon the situation assessment and with the support of the community and the mine, the CAO initiated a dialogue process to address concerns related to the environment, employment matters, health concerns, etc.

In September 2001, representatives from rural communities, private and public institutions and Minera Yanacocha assembled to open up communication channels, and scope and prioritize issues to be considered during the dialogue process. Participants raised concerns about water quality and quantity, air quality, environmental impacts on frogs, birds, fish and other fauna and flora, issues related to jobs and other socioeconomic matters. They specified water as their highest priority and by consensus, agreed to an independent study evaluating conditions of water quality and quantity in the city of Cajamarca and affected villages.

Since September there have been four meetings of the Mesa—October 2001, November 2001, January 2002 and March 2002. In addition, representatives from each sector at the Mesa have attended a series of skill-building workshops in problem solving and conflict resolution. Other accomplishments include:

- initiation of an independent water study, including a statement of work
- creation of the Coordinating Committee to provide local leadership to the process
- a field trip to Minera Yanacocha
- agreement on a set of protocols that establishes the framework for how the Mesa will operate
- review and discussion of the scoping document developed at the September meeting

II. The MESA

The CAO team convened and facilitated a meeting of the Mesa de Dialogo y Consenso CAO-Cajamarca on March 5, 2002, from 9:00 a.m.- 6:30 p.m., at the Hostal Los Pinos. Approximate 60 representatives and 26 observers from key interest groups attended the session. Representatives participated from the following organizations: Federacion de Rondas Campesinas Femeninas del Norte Del Peru (FEROCAPROCAJ), Federacion de Rondas Campesinas de La Provincia de Cajamarca (FEROCAPROCAJ), Federacion de Rondas Campesinas Femeninas de la Provincia de Cajamarca (FEROCAPROCAJ), Coordinadora Regional de Cuencas Afectadas Por La Minería en Cajamarca (CORECAMIC), Coordinadora Provincial de Caserios Afectados por la

Mineria en Cajamarca (COPROCAMIC), Minera Yanacocha, Provincial Municipality of Cajamarca, Alcaldes of the Pueblos Menores of the Districts of La Encanada and Banos del Inca, Cajamarca Chamber of Commerce, CARE, SEDACAJ, ITDG, PRO AGUA, National University of Cajamarca, Ministry of Energy and Mines, Obispado de Cajamarca, ASPADERUC and Valle y Vida.

Report on the Activities of the Coordinating Committee

At the November Mesa, dialogue participants established a Coordinating Committee to provide guidance and local leadership for a uniquely Cajamarcan dispute resolution process. The Committee is charged with organizing upcoming dialogue meetings; participating in the development of Mesa agendas; advising CAO facilitators on meeting goals and strategy; arranging logistics; developing an effective working group; building credibility and support for the Mesa within the broader community; etc. Each sector represented in the MESA appointed a representative to serve on the Committee.

Professor M.G. Elfer Miranda, the General Coordinator of the Committee, reported the following Committee activities that have occurred since the January Mesa:

1. On February 22 and 23, 2002, participants from Group A completed the final session of a three-part workshop dedicated to skills for promoting harmony and consensus. 16 of the original 36 participants graduated and received certificates of participation. Those who missed the third session are eligible to participate in the April workshop that will be conducted for Group B.
2. Group B participated in the second of three consensus-building workshops March 1 and 2, 2002. Participants of both Group A and B suggested that a training for trainers be conducted in the future in order to continue local capacity building in skills and abilities to promote harmony and consensus.
3. The Committee prepared the draft agenda for the March Mesa de Diálogo.
4. The Committee agreed to increase their contacts with the press in order to expand awareness within the community about the work of the Mesa as well as to promote greater participation.
5. The Committee member from Minera Yanacocha has offered to publish the progress of the Mesa in their newsletter.
6. Several institutions have requested to participate in the Mesa including ADEFOR and la Ventana Pública de la PUCP-MUNICIPIO PROVINCIAL DE CAJAMARCA.
7. The Committee supported the idea of creating a more permanent local office or center, staffed by a small team of two people, to support the ongoing work of the Mesa. The mission of the office, like the Mesa, would be to prevent and resolve problems between the Mine and the community as early as possible, before they escalate into extremely tense or conflictual situations. The Committee will participate in a strategic planning session in April and will present a more detailed proposal for discussion at the April 30th Mesa.
8. The Committee recommended the formation of several working groups, based upon the prioritized list of issues scoped during the September 2001 Mesa. Possibilities include a work group to address socio-economic issues and another to focus on natural resource concerns.

9. The Committee is concerned that most people in the community of Cajamarca are unaware of the efforts undertaken by the Mesa de Diálogo de la CAO. They have discussed the need to have Minera Yanacocha as well as the other participating institutions comprehensively disseminate the activities that the Mesa is undertaking.
10. The Committee recommended that MYSRL inquire into how MYSRL contractors and suppliers are treating their workforce with the goal that contractors and suppliers become reasonable, fair-minded employers.
11. The Committee agreed upon the need to convene a meeting of the representatives of the CAO, the Committee and the General Manager from MYSRL to jointly and publicly sign the Mesa Protocols. (Subsequent to this recommendation, the protocols were signed by both the CAO and MYSRL at the inception of the March Mesa. The final protocol document now contains the signatures of all participating organizations.)

Capacity-Building Workshops

Participants who took part in the capacity-building workshops were asked to share their impressions, concerns and doubts regarding the training, as well as what benefit the workshops provided. While there was broad-based support for the training, several expressed their disappointment in Minera Yanacocha's attendance. Here is the flavor of their comments:

"The training has been important for us, because it has improved the way we deal with things. There may be a few problems in that we wish there had been more members attending from the Yanacocha team. In our group one Yanacocha colleague participated. We had hoped for a broader participation from Yanacocha so that we can work from a similar framework, set of concepts and language when we try to solve problems together. Another point...we shouldn't just keep it for us. Lots of young people want to have the training as well and this is something we should try to do in the future."

"We have learned so much and even changed our attitudes, changed our persons, learned to live a new life, thanks to the people who came from far away to present the training. The training should be extended to all institutions and participants at the Mesa."

"The training is a process where we need the willingness to learn and also practice the skills. I am discovering a whole new facet of concepts and strategies that are important for me, especially the need to be well informed in elements of communication and to solve problems...especially the ones we face here at the Mesa. We have sacrificed several Fridays and Saturdays to demonstrate our willingness and dedication to learn ways to find solutions to our problems."

"The training was important. It gave me a new way to solve problems. The paraphrasing has helped me a lot because we resolve conflicts on a regular basis. It also helps us in the consultations we do with our communities."

"Thanks for your (CAO's) help. I have taken away several key ideas:

1. Hard on the problem, soft on the person. We need this in our own dialogue process at the Mesa.
2. How to take decisions by consensus and what consensus means.
3. The difference between dialogue and debate."

“I also participated. The training was really interesting and fundamental to solving problems. We can replicate what we learned and apply it. We can manage how we work together in a way where each time the tensions between us are reduced”

Independent Water Study

Statement of Work

David Atkins, Ann Maest and Kate LeJeune from Stratus Consulting presented their draft statement of work (SOW) that outlined the objectives, tasks and approaches for an independent scientific investigation of water quality and quantity. The draft SOW was presented to the Mesa for their review and to confirm that Stratus consultants understand the issues and that Mesa participants understand the approach.

The investigation will address the following questions:

1. Have mine operations resulted in changes in water quality that have made the water unsafe for:
 - human consumption?
 - dermal contact/clothes washing?
 - livestock?
 - irrigation and agricultural uses?
 - aquatic biota (invertebrates, fish, frogs) in areas that historically supported fauna?
 - human consumption of fauna that live in or consume the water?
2. Have mine operations resulted in changes in water flow that would adversely affect:
 - the quantity of water available for irrigation and agricultural use?
 - the quantity of water available for rural potable use (e.g. springs, streams)?
 - the quantity of water available for potable water treatment for the city of Cajamarca?
 - the frequency or magnitude of droughts or floods?

To address these questions, the investigation will include the following tasks:

- Task 1. Evaluation of Existing Data and Studies
- Task 2. Evaluation of Water Quality Conditions
- Task 3. Evaluation of Water Quantity Conditions
- Task 4. Presentation of Results and Reporting Procedures

Stratus Consulting reaffirmed that it and its representatives have no connection with any of the parties of the Mesa. They will conduct the water quality and quantity investigation for the sole purpose of answering the questions identified above. They are not working on behalf of any of the parties of the Mesa individually or in combination, and have no bias regarding the outcome of the investigation.

Schedule

Stratus Consulting explained that their current visit included 1-2 days at the Mine. (To conduct a technically rigorous study, Stratus needs as much information as possible and the best database for hydrological and geological conditions is at Minera Yanacocha.) The team will also visit villages and cuencas to gain a better understanding to design the study and identify information that will assist them in developing a water-sampling plan.

They indicated the timeframe for the sampling plan would depend upon how quickly they were able to access existing data and studies. Assuming this task happens relatively quickly, the team

estimated the sampling plan would be ready to present to the Mesa in approximately two months (June 2002). Water sampling will begin approximately one month after that. They expect a draft report to be available in one year.

“Veedores”

As part of the study, representatives of the Mesa will accompany the water study team on field trips and will observe field sample collection and handling, and field measurements. As witnesses to the water study investigation, the “veedores” will ensure that the study and the sampling is conducted pursuant to designated protocols and accepted sampling methods as described in the Sampling and Analysis plan, and as agreed upon by the Mesa participants. Through the important work of the “veedores” it is hoped that confidence in the independence and quality of this study will be sustained and communicated to the Mesa and to the interested communities.

Each sector was asked to designate a representative to serve as a “veedor” Sectors were encouraged to select people who were well respected within their group and who were able to work effectively with representatives from other groups. A list of “Veedores” appears below.

Name	Organization
Ing. Hernán Flores	Ministry of Energy and Mines
Francisco Soto (Originally Nilton Deza was designated as the ONG’s representative but was replaced due to a scheduling conflict.)	CARE/ONGs
María Perseveranda Huatay Herrera	Rondas Campesinas
Aurelia Cabanillas Romero	Rondas Campesinas
Alfonso Tasilla Flores	CORECAMIC
Wilsón Marín Rodríguez	CORECAMIC
Gil Paisic	Centros Poblados Menores
Alejandro Cruzado Coronado	COPRECAMI
Alberto Herrera	Minera Yanacocha
Ing. Gilberto Cruzado	Universidad Nacional de Cajamarca
Ing. Alfredo Chávez	SEDACAJ
Ing. Tulio Guillén	Municipalidad de Cajamarca

In order to allow others who have an interest to participate as a “veedor”, some groups may decide to rotate their representatives. Given the logistics and nature of the work, the number of people who can serve in the role of a “veedor” at any one time is limited.

Future of the Mesa

The Coordinating Committee and CAO facilitation team have begun to discuss the possibility of creating a two-year special project of the CAO. The purpose of the project is to:

- provide ongoing support to the dialogue process between Minera Yanacocha and the communities of Cajamarca.
- put in place a more permanent dispute resolution system that will be self sustaining and locally owned so that issues that arise from the further development of the mine and of Cajamarca and their relationship can be worked through in a positive and respectful manner.
- serve as a transition mechanism with the aim of placing the Mesa on a secure and self-sustaining footing—increasing further local ownership of dispute resolution centered on the relationships between the Mine and the community.

The objectives at the end of the two-year project (which is to serve as a transition period) is to have:

- secured an institutional home in Cajamarca for the dispute resolution system
- secured the local resources to support the continuation of the dispute resolution system

The CAO will contract with a Peruvian project manager. The project manager will recruit a director to be based in Cajamarca full time, with one assistant. They will report to the project manager and the project manager will be responsible for ensuring the director fulfills the tasks as laid out in the program plan as agreed with the CAO and the Coordinating Committee of the Mesa.

Throughout the two-year period of the project, the CAO will ensure an effective monitoring and evaluation process that will offer guidance to the project manager and director, ensure quality control and assess the work of the project against expected and desired outcomes.

The Coordinating Committee and the CAO will develop a more specific proposal to present to the Mesa at the April meeting.

Review and Discussion of the List of Issues Generated in the September 2001 Mesa

Issue	Progress	Suggestions (not decisions)	Comments
<p>Water Quality</p>	<p>In process—independent team of water experts are in the process of designing and conducting water quality and quantity study</p> <p>Potable water in the caserios</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1993, 12 percent of caserios had potable water • Currently, 72% have potable water • By end of 2002, 100% of caserios will have potable water 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greater participation from the community 2. Increased communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform the community about the water study—radio, television, press • Encourage the Minera to send the quarterly water quality reports to the municipality • Yanacocha should share the information (water data) with the mesa • Alcaldes will inform their people about results of water data. Now there is something to communicate. 3. Ensure an integrated approach to watershed management that includes community responsibility, environmental education, etc. 	<p>”In the past no one believed in any studies but as the CAO is bringing expert teams and will utilize <i>veedores</i>—these elements will help to reconcile discrepancies and ensure credibility and independence of the study.”</p> <p>“There has been progress and improvements. Both the company and also the campesinos have advanced in trying to reach an objective.</p> <p>“This is a positive advance because we have a team of international experts and they are starting the study—so the first point (on our list of issues) we are accomplishing.”</p> <p>“Although we are seeing some results , including having some trust in the team, there is something missing. More information needs to go out to the population. There is a weakness in getting information out to the campesinos and to the general public. Most don’t know the hydrologists exist.”</p>

Issue	Progress	Suggestions (not decisions)	Comments
Water Quantity	Study in process		
Soil, Land and Air	CTAR Mesa—environmental audit (Ministry of Energy and Mines)		
Fauna and Flora	Remains on the CAO and CTAR agendas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinating Committee needs to inquire about whether other studies in the area exist that have investigated flora and fauna. 2. We recognize that CAO has limited resources. Leave the issue on the list but give other groups (i.e., CTAR Mesa, the University, IRENA) a chance to address the issue. 	
Hazardous Materials/ Emergency Response	<p>Emergency plans exist but community is not aware of them. Information in plans needs to be disseminated in a form that people can understand</p> <p>Safety check of trucks before leaving Yanacocha premises</p> <p>Caravans of trucks with special trucks in front and in back avoid excessive speed</p> <p>Improving the roads</p>		

Issue	Progress	Suggestions (not decisions)	Comments
Cerro Quilish	Remains on the agenda		
Work at the Mine	<p>1993—10% of employees were from Cajamarca (92 employees)</p> <p>2001—60% of employees were from Cajamarca (1100 employees)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When the Mine is doing training of whatever type, like training truck operators, could they open the training up to others, especially young people in the broader community? 2. Jobs for women (Yanacocha goal is 1000 jobs for women but little by little) 	“We are asking for everything but what are we willing to contribute? We shouldn’t be waiting for everything to come to us without also taking responsibility.”
Treatment of Personnel by Yanacocha and its Contractors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment • Mistreatment • Unequal benefits for permanent versus sub-contractor personnel 	<p>Office of administration and contractors to deal with complaints functioning for past 8 months</p> <p>Change in behavior and attitudes by Yanacocha personnel (in progress)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -educational programs to change attitudes and behaviors -relationship with the community -behavior code for employees 		
Employment and Sub-Contracting Job Opportunities	<p>Yanacocha has reviewed all the opportunities to contract with local businesses</p> <p>Yanacocha will be working with the Chamber of Commerce in April 2002 to strengthen capacity of medium and small enterprises to provide services to Yanacocha and other companies</p>		

Draft Schedule of Future Training Workshops and Dialogue Tables

April	<p><u>Group B, Workshop III: Promoting Harmony and Consensus, Part III</u>—April 19-20, 2002 at Hostal los Pinos from 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.</p> <p><u>Dialogue Table</u>—April 30, 2002 at Hostal los Pinos from 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m.</p>
May	<p><u>Possible Training for Trainers Workshop:</u> May 24-25, 2002 and May 31-June 1.</p>
June	<p><u>Dialogue Table</u>—June 4, 2002 at Hostal los Pinos from 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m.</p>

III. CONFLICT RESOLUTION CAPACITY BUILDING: TRAINING DIALOGUE PARTICIPANTS IN SKILLS AND APPROACHES FOR PROMOTING HARMONY AND CONSENSUS

Workshop Session III: Promoting Harmony and Consensus (Group A)

On February 22-23, 2002, a group of approximately 16 participants who had attended the first two conflict resolution workshops (November 2001 and January 2002) reconvened for their third and final 16-hour training session. This workshop, building on skills and concepts introduced earlier, focused specifically on the role of a third party commonly referred to as a group coordinator or facilitator in a dialogue process and how a neutral impartial person can help in the resolution of conflict. Some of the tasks of a coordinator include:

- Assuring that all members of a group have the opportunity to participate
- Encouraging discussion
- Being clear and mindful regarding the goals of a meeting and managing the meeting so that the objectives met
- Exercising the role in a democratic manner, without rudely interrupting or imposing their own views
- Synthesizing ideas
- Recognizing and stating consensus

The facilitators also introduced the role of the *relator* or reporter. The *relator* is the voice of the group. He or she presents highlights from his or her group, strategically selecting those comments that will advance the progress of the group while avoiding comments that are redundant.

Participants next tackled a communication model composed of three strategies for effective dialogue: active listening, open-ended questions to uncover critical interests and needs, and paraphrasing. They applied these skills to a series of difficult situations.

The difference between debate and dialogue challenged participants to compare the characteristics, attitudes and consequences of the two approaches. The facilitators emphasized the importance of using these skill sets strategically, based on the outcomes (both substantive and with regards to the relationship) they are trying to achieve rather than unintentionally.

In the final activity, participants applied concepts and skills from all three workshop sessions, including the role of a third party, in a comprehensive application exercise that simulated a multi-party environmental conflict. Facilitators utilized a stop-action methodology during the role-play to provide feedback and elicit participants' insights about their negotiation strategy.

In a moving graduation participants revealed what the training event had met to them, personally. After receiving their certificate of participation, all took part in the concluding festivities, with music and dancing, to celebrate their success.

Workshop Session II: Promoting Harmony and Consensus (Group B)

On February 19-20, 2002, Group B advanced to the second level of the skill-building training series to promote harmony and consensus.

The workshop opened energetically with a review of material presented in the first workshop. Together with participants, the facilitators built a technical dictionary of terms commonly used in dispute resolution so everyone shared a common understanding of the technical language of conflict resolution. The dictionary is a work in progress and new terminology will be added throughout the duration of the workshops.

Using icebergs and mini-cases, the CAO facilitators further expanded people's understanding of interests and positions and launched into a lively discussion about creative brainstorming and how the technique can be used to discover options that satisfy many diverse interests and needs. To make the practice sessions more realistic, the facilitators suggested that participants work in larger groups rather than in only a two-party conflict. For those unable to read or write, the facilitators developed a homework assignment involving analysis of conflict and interpreting interactions and communication utilizing drawings instead of the written word.

A spirited group activity underscored several pitfalls to avoid in effective communication such as rumors, distortions, incomplete information, ambiguity, etc., and highlighted several current examples in Cajamarca fraught with communication obstacles. The workshop finale featured a multi-party environmental role-play. In a fish bowl format, negotiators represented the interests of ecological groups, hotel owners, agricultural groups, sporting clubs and industry. During the both the preparation and the dialogue phase of the simulation, group members practiced communication skills, defined issues to be solved, identified their interests, utilized behaviors to improve working relationships, and de-escalated conflict. They also struggled against the urge to rush to solutions before fully grasping the critical concerns and needs of others. The facilitators utilized a stop-action approach to enable the parties to obtain advice and strategy assistance from their colleagues and to assess their effectiveness as negotiators.

The same case will form the basis for one of the skill practice sessions in the upcoming April workshop whose objective is to explore the role of third parties in promoting harmony and consensus.

In the closing activity, CAO facilitators joined with participants to form a circle. In its center, the facilitators encouraged people to imagine a large, straw, hand-woven basket, packed with the experiences, feelings and values shared by participants during the two-day workshop. Each individual was invited into the circle to express what quality or feeling they wished to leave in the basket and in exchange, what experience from the course they hoped to take as a support or positive force to accompany them in their lives outside. Examples: " I take away skills practice and

leave behind my concerns; I take with me tranquility and leave behind some of my serenity to share with others.”

Participants from both groups have requested that the facilitators consider providing a training for trainers in order to create the capacity to train additional colleagues throughout the community in consensus-building and problem-solving skills.

IV. SAN JUAN, CHOROPAMPA and MAGDALENA

In response to continuing concerns regarding the health situation in the area affected by the mercury spill that occurred on June 2, 2000, the CAO has agreed to convene and organize a team of medical experts, with international standing, to conduct a medical review. The CAO is exploring the possibility of selecting a team of specialists based in Argentina. In addition to reviewing their experience, the CAO is concerned about the time frame and the availability of this team to conduct the assessment.

IV. CONCLUSION

Although the Mesa de Diálogo y Consensus CAO-Cajamarca is advancing slowly, the progress is steady and solidly rooted in tangible actions. The hydrology study is firmly underway and the capacity-building workshops have effectively prepared the first group of graduates to solve problems and build consensus in their activities inside and away from the Mesa.

In addition, there are other advances between Minera Yanacocha and diverse groups of Cajamarca society that are not explicitly related to the Mesa, but indirectly the Mesa has played a role in stimulating and nourishing these activities.

Equally important is the issue of identity. The Mesa is beginning to establish itself as a serious group of people committed to technical approaches to solving problems that promote dialogue and mutual respect as opposed to polarization and debate.

Nevertheless, for the Mesa to become a sustainable, efficient collaborative that includes representatives from government, civil society and Minera Yanacocha who are engaged in meaningful work, all three sectors must breathe life and energy into the Mesa. This means investing in the Mesa as a space for joint problem solving.

This level of investment and commitment is challenging because it will require changing some behaviors and attitudes deeply rooted in parties' respective cultures. On the community side, the “indifference of the pueblo” is a formidable obstacle to action and participation as related by Group B in their March workshop. On Minera Yanacocha's part, the tradition of unilateral and bi-lateral social assistance reinforces the indifference of the pueblo and prevents a more reciprocal relationship between the Mine and the community from taking shape.

The result of this ongoing cycle perpetuated by all sectors is that the level of benefit from the Mine's presence that is experienced by the community as well as the quality and ownership of solutions to problems of mutual concern, may be less than what they might be otherwise. Sometimes problems cannot really be solved using bilateral or unilateral strategies. In certain cases where many sectors have an interest in a complex environmental or socioeconomic problem, participation must be expanded beyond one or two groups. When representatives from several sectors have a clear interest in an issue or problem, or where they can undermine a

solution if they are not included in the process—in these cases it may make sense to utilize an expanded process of participation. Bringing interested parties together into a Mesa process or working group structure may be preferable because it increases acceptability of the decision, enhances the quality of solutions, and contributes to a sense of reciprocity and mutual benefit. Both Minera Yanacocha and the community need to look for opportunities where it makes sense to use community engagement and participatory processes because there is the possibility for highly creative solutions, improved relationships and positive change for the community of Cajamarca and Minera Yanacocha.

To move toward an approach of participation and community engagement is not a simple matter. The status quo is powerful, change is risky, democracy is messy, and results are not predictable. For change to occur all sides must see benefit for their group and/or be motivated because the current situation is painful or not yielding results. The question for the community is whether there is enough will to overcome indifference and risk participation and engagement. The question for the mine is whether there is enough will to move beyond a culture of working unilaterally and bilaterally.

The will to change is one critical element. The practical reality of how to create meaningful community engagement is another. Community participation is hard, intensive, frustrating, and time-consuming and should never be initiated without serious consideration. It is the exception, rather than the rule for how to solve problems. The Mesa is not the place to take on every issue between the Mine and the community. Therefore, it must develop the ability to determine which issues are most appropriate for a multi-party problem solving approach as well as an understanding of when to expand consultation and participation on particular issues. Obviously, only certain issues are suitable for dialogue processes and community engagement. One of the continuing challenges for the Mesa will be to strategically select the kind of issues that are ripe for a larger participatory process, determine at what stage a broader involvement is fruitful, and along the way, how to effectively manage the expectations of all sides.