

**Mining Association of Canada
Towards Sustainable Mining**

Summary Report

**19th Meeting of the
Community of Interest Advisory Panel**

**March 6, 2013
Toronto, ON**



Prepared by:



Stratos Inc.
1404-1 Nicholas Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
Tel: 613 241 1001
Fax: 613 241 4758
www.stratos-sts.com



100% Post-consumer content
Acid-free

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS 1

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION 2

2 BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT 3

3 INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY 6

4 TSM IMPLEMENTATION 9

5 CLOSING 11

6 MEETING EVALUATION 11

APPENDIX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 13

Introduction

This report presents a summary of discussions from the March 6, 2013 meeting of the TSM Community of Interest (COI) Advisory Panel ("the Panel"), including decisions on the work of the Panel and recommendations to the Mining Association of Canada (MAC). Any dissenting views have been identified and recorded. Meeting presentations are appended to this report; content contained in meeting presentations is not duplicated in the body of this report. The report was approved by the Panel on October 16, 2013 at the COI Panel Meeting in Sudbury, Ontario.

Summary of Action Items

Below is a summary of new and outstanding action items. New action items are underlined throughout the report. Action items are documented until they have been reported "complete".

Note: This table was updated on October 28, 2013.

ACTION ITEMS					
#	ITEM	LINK TO REPORT	RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	STATUS
#5 March-12	Ensure new MAC TSM communications materials are designed in such a way as to engage with non-MAC members in regional hot spots and to support these companies in improving their environmental and social performance.	Section 2 (March 2012 report)	MAC	2012	In progress
#1 March-13	Review the process for Post-Verification Review to allow more time for the COI Panel to engage in meaningful dialogue.	Section 1.3	Stratos/MAC	2013	Complete
#2 March-13	Fill the PDAC position and Labour position on the Panel.	Section 1.4	MAC	2013	Complete
#3 March-13	Circulate TSM elevator pitch to seek feedback.	Section 4.2	MAC	2013	Complete
#4 March-13	Inform Teck and Vale that they have been selected for post-verification review at the fall 2013 meeting.	Section 4.3	Stratos	March 2013	Complete
#5 March-13	Organize webinar on the impact of regulatory changes (specifically to CEAA) on the mining industry.	Section 5.1	MAC	2013	In progress
#6 March-13	Engage COI Panel members to help scope the agenda, discussion topics and duration for the fall 2013 meeting	Section 5.1	Stratos/MAC	2013	Complete
#7 March-13	MAC and Stratos will email the COI Panel to inform them of possible Working Group Opportunities.	Section 5.2	Stratos	Spring 2013	Complete

1 Welcome and Introduction

1.1 Introductions

Ben Chalmers, Vice President of Sustainable Development at the Mining Association of Canada (MAC) welcomed everyone to the March 2013 COI Panel Meeting and expressed the importance of getting the Panel's feedback, particularly, on the two substantive topics on the agenda: biodiversity and international social responsibility (ISR).

Before doing a roundtable of introductions, the Panel facilitator introduced Jane Porter, Consultant at Stratos. Jane will be taking over Vicky Weekes' role supporting the COI Panel.

Each Panel member introduced themselves. New members on the Panel include Joy Kennedy, Claudine Renaud, and industry representative, Louise Grondin. Maya Stano participated as an alternate for Alan Young. Members that were unable to attend the meeting were: Barrie Ford, Philip Oxhorn (as well as his alternate, Luc Zandvliet) and Alan Young as noted.

1.2 Review of Agenda

Responding to feedback from the previous meeting, efforts were made to create adequate space for deeper conversations on fewer topics. The new agenda setting process leading up to the meeting included seeking the Panel's input on the agenda topics, as well as more engagement and information-sharing with the Panel, including two teleconference calls in early 2013. The Panel facilitator walked through the objectives and agenda for the day and expressed his commitment to meaningful dialogue by listening to the group and remaining flexible and adaptable with the proposed agenda.

1.3 Approval of October 2012 Report

The Panel approved the September 2012 meeting report and the post-verification review (PVR) report without additional amendments. One industry member noted her surprise that "discussion was limited" during the Post-Verification Review (PVR) presentations and suggested that we review the process to ensure more dialogue. The Panel shared ideas such as limiting it to only one company presentation instead of two or extending the meeting to allow for more discussion time. MAC welcomed ideas and committed to reviewing this process.

1.4 COI Panel Renewal Updates

There are still a few vacancies on the COI Panel. United Steelworkers of America have yet to identify a person to join the Panel and the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC) have been occupied with the PDAC convention, however, they have agreed to nominate someone to join the Panel in due course. MAC will continue to work on filling these positions.

The Panel facilitator reminded everyone that there are two expert categories available should the Panel feel that specific expertise is missing from the group.

2 Biodiversity Conservation Management

Biodiversity conservation management was chosen as a priority area for MAC and the COI Panel in 2012. The Panel facilitator recapped the agenda setting process and how the Panel had the opportunity to help design and frame the session. Based on this process, two key discussion topics emerged: biodiversity across the mining life cycle and providing critical feedback on how the Biodiversity Conservation Management TSM Protocol is being applied by the MAC membership.

In addition to the briefing note included in the meeting materials, Pierre Gratton provided additional context for why biodiversity has become an important issue in the mining industry. Over the last ten years, several new national and international policies, standards and protocols have emerged, driving companies to adopt new practices and implement biodiversity management systems. While MAC now has a *Mining and Biodiversity Policy Framework*, and a *Biodiversity Conservation Management Assessment Protocol*, challenges remain for companies on how to navigate the issue, hence it continues to be discussed with the COI Panel.

2.1 Inmet presentation on Biodiversity Programs and the Role of TSM

Christopher Scholl, Director of Environmental Affairs at Inmet Mining presented on Biodiversity Programs and the Role of TSM (see presentation included in Appendix B). Chris described how Inmet uses TSM to drive biodiversity performance for operations in all stages of the mine life, including: exploration, development, operations and closure.

Exploration

Chris described Inmet's approach to incorporating biodiversity considerations into exploration operations. He explained that these operations do not report under TSM, mainly due to the scale of the operations and less formal management systems than at operating properties. At this point, Craig Ford made the commitment that Inmet will report on their exploration activities, and that these activities will not be exempt from corporate responsibility management practices. This led to an enriching discussion which set the tone for the rest of the day. Panel members offered the following comments and questions:

- *To what extent is biodiversity taken into consideration during the exploration phase?* While exploration teams often bring in biologists to study the area and talk with communities, junior and exploration companies often do not understand the issues, nor do they have the systems in place to manage these issues. As a result, the environment, community, and reputation of all future mining development may be negatively impacted if this is not appropriately managed. Several Panel members agreed that there is a strong need to understand biodiversity issues at the earliest stages.
- *Could biodiversity requirements be used when mining stakes are claimed, similar to how environmental requirements are used in the oil and gas sector?* While there are merits in exploring this further, an industry representative noted that there are major differences between the two sectors (e.g. costs for staking a mining claim and upfront investments are low and the number of claims is higher than in the oil and gas sector).
- *How would biodiversity conservation management be impacted by changes to the federal legislation and the Environmental Assessment process?* Would more responsibility fall to industry and the provincial government? Contrary to the common perception, MAC explained that the mining sector has not been affected by any changes to CEAA. Panel members

wanted to learn more about the impact of regulatory changes (specifically to CEAA) on the mining industry and the facilitator captured the note for future discussion.

- *What baseline information is available?* Several Panel members discussed the importance of access to baseline information. Unfortunately, government's role in providing this service is diminishing and exploration companies have limited funds to conduct the studies required. As exploration is happening in remote areas where this information is not yet available, the Panel expressed interest in continuing the conversation of how mining relates to the broader issue of regional land use planning.
- *What would the application of TSM on exploration companies mean in practice?* From Inmet's perspective, most of the TSM protocols could be applied to exploration operations, with the exception of the Tailings Management Protocol. The main challenge is the upfront costs given that there is no revenue being generated by the mine at this early stage. Other Panel members commented that a phased approach is necessary for applying TSM as the program would likely be too heavy for a small company. Instead, a few Panel members suggested that a framework of good practice could be shared and marketed to exploration companies.
- *What is PDAC doing for biodiversity and how can they be engaged in this conversation?* Noting the relevance of exploration companies on this topic, Panel members wanted to know more about the PDAC's involvement. Ben noted that the PDAC developed e3Plus, a Framework for Responsible Exploration for the exploration industry which provides principles, guidance notes and toolkits on environmental stewardship. While it is an important tool for the industry, it is not clear who uses the programs and what performance is achieved. The Panel noted the importance of engaging the PDAC and filling the PDAC vacancy on the COI panel.
- *How do mining companies adapt to biodiversity's changing needs?* One Panel member expressed the importance of understanding that biodiversity is a moving target and that ongoing learning and adaptation must be considered as the process evolves at the site.

Development

For Inmet, the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) process drives its biodiversity programs during this stage of the mining life cycle. In addition, voluntary standards such as the International Finance Corporation Performance Standard 6 (Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources) help improve biodiversity performance and were applied at Inmet's Cobre Panama site. The Panel's comments and discussions of biodiversity at this stage of the mining life were briefer, focusing on the importance of accessing baseline information before the development stage.

Operations

TSM requirements on biodiversity for operating mines are integrated into Inmet's corporate procedures. Doing so has enabled Inmet to dramatically improve its performance on biodiversity at the operations stage. Below is a summary of the key discussion points raised by the Panel:

- *Where does biodiversity fit amongst mixed land use and other community needs?* Several Panel members commented on the fact that a mining company's commitment to biodiversity can encroach on the local community's or surrounding industries' land use plans. As one Panel member noted, mining is rarely separate from the forestry industry. Similarly, the relationship between biodiversity plans and community needs must be addressed to accommodate, for example, traditional hunting and fishing activities. While this issue is not directly covered in the TSM protocol, Ben noted that it is covered through the Level AAA

rating under of the TSM Biodiversity Protocol which requires a "commitment to actively partner with other organizations for biodiversity conservation".

- *Could MAC look to the oil sands for how to design a biodiversity monitoring program?* One Panel member noted that monitoring programs are critical for gaining a social license to operate. He suggested MAC look at the Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute as it could be a useful benchmark for a sound scientific approach with a solid governance structure.
- *Are climate change impacts included in the Biodiversity Conservation Management protocol?* Several Panel members were interested in this question since climate change is associated with biodiversity such as increases in droughts, flooding, changing permafrost, etc. Ben stated that the Initiative Leaders have identified a need to work towards incorporating consideration of climate change in all TSM protocols.

Closure

Chris noted that while there is less opportunity to effect change on biodiversity during the mine closure phase due to smaller budgets, defined plans and the fact that most land changes are already complete, TSM still has the opportunity to drive performance through management system improvements. The Panel had several questions and comments on the topic of biodiversity at the mine closure phase, including:

- *When do mines start working on the mine closure plan?* Industry representatives responded that closure plans are most often started before the mine is built.
- *Is biodiversity a material issue at the mine closure phase?* One industry representative noted that generally, the impact of mine closure on the local economy (i.e. impact of job losses) is a more material issue than biodiversity.
- *How can Traditional Knowledge be used to bring land back to its original state?* One Panel member expressed the win-win situation when mining companies engage the local community to understand the original baseline. He also explained that mining companies should understand that when Aboriginal communities agree to a mine development, they are making a commitment to their community to bring the environment back to what it was. Even if the baseline is not known, the communities understand what it was and will strive to bring it back to its original state.
- *Do mine companies see biodiversity conservation management at the closure phase as an expense or as opportunity to decrease liabilities?* Industry representatives explained that since there are no revenue streams to at this stage, mining companies are generally focused on saving money at this phase; however, well managed mine closure is of utmost importance to mining companies considering the risks involved if not done right. Mining companies often hold the liabilities for decades after a mine closes. While stabilizing the land is relatively easy to do, water quality is difficult to predict and poses the highest threat. TSM's value is in helping companies manage the risks involved in mine closure and improve transparency.
- *The importance of engaging civil society.* One Panel member expressed the difficulty in engaging on a related topic as a member of civil society in the oil and gas industry. He mentioned the importance of having industry members collaborate with civil society as their voices are becoming increasingly more difficult to hear in today's environment.

General Panel comments on biodiversity

Since the COI Panel spent longer than anticipated on Part 1 of the biodiversity agenda, it was suggested that the Panel continue the meaningful dialogue and skip "Part 2: Probing the effectiveness of the Biodiversity Conservation Protocol" altogether.

The main theme of the discussion was on how TSM could be pushed upstream towards the junior mining companies. Juniors generally have an environmental management plan before disturbing land but there is room for major mining companies to demand higher performance throughout the industry. Several Panel members commented that it should not only be the responsibility of the major mining operators – communities and the financial community should also play a role. From the communities' standpoint, some Panel members suggested that First Nations could be proactive by becoming more aware of TSM and demanding TSM from the junior companies. From the financial market perspective, several Panel members explained that there is a role for investors to become more aware of the program since it is in the investors' interest that companies have enough money to cover liabilities. Most Panel members agreed that the only way for this issue to be addressed is through the capital markets and some Panel members wondered if investors could use TSM results from junior companies as a way to assess and value risks. One issue to overcome, however, is that if the Toronto Stock Exchange begins to play a larger role in demanding this type of performance, the capital could shift to other capital markets where there are fewer requirements.

The Panel facilitator thanked the Panel for the excellent discussion and their feedback and noted that there could be a possibility to return to this subject at a future meeting.

3 International Social Responsibility

After lunch, Ben introduced the afternoon topic of ISR. As noted in the ISR Committee Briefing Note, the ISR Committee's thoughts around measuring social impact and the concept of mining companies as human rights defenders are at very early stages. In the past, MAC has found it valuable to have conversations with the Panel when ideas are not fully formed as it helps MAC to better scope the issues. Moreover, these issues combine community development and international social responsibility - two topics that Panel members have expressed as priority issues.

3.1 Social impact assessment and community development

Bob Carreau, Senior Vice President, Health, Safety & Sustainability at IAMGOLD presented a concept proposal to the COI Panel on IAMGOLD's Net Positive Impact Framework. (See presentation in Appendix B). The presentation included critical observations on community investment in mining; key questions on how to move forward; and a proposal for how to develop a Social Net Positive Impact Framework or Community Health Framework for the mining industry to measure and report on impacted communities.

Members of the Panel stated it was refreshing to hear the challenges and questions facing the mining industry on this topic. While the Panel touched on what indicators and measurements could be used, they generally centered on the philosophy, models and frameworks around measuring social impact and international development, ultimately leading to more questions.

The Panel shared the following views, questions and comments:

- One Panel member pondered the philosophical understanding on the meaning of development and stated that we are at a shift in the paradigm of development. She expressed the need to address our underlying assumptions (What is good? What is restorative? What is equitable?) and perhaps even look to other models of development, aside from the industrial model, to better understand the components and values that are driving this shift.
- Several Panel members and industry representatives shared their opinions on the impact mining companies have on communities and how they can be judged as either positive or negative. For example, one industry representative shared a story of how a woman was hired to work for the mining company in a remote subsistence community but was afraid to tell her family that she is employed because it would be frowned upon. Is this a positive impact or a negative impact? Who should be the judge? In response, another industry representative stated that mining companies need to be sure that they are having a positive impact at the end of the day, or else they should all consider why they are doing it in the first place. In terms of who should judge what the impact is, several Panel members stated that it should be the stakeholders who make that call, or, in other words, it needs to be self-determining not industry-determining. Similarly, indicators should be defined at the local level and a “cookie cutter approach” cannot be used. One Panel member mentioned how Impact Benefit Agreements (IBAs) tend to use the “cookie cutter” approach and it leads to a lack of transparency and trust.
- One Panel member offered that the concept of Creating Shared Value (CSV) by business strategy guru Michael Porter would be a useful framework for the discussion on measuring social impact. In short, the concept of CSV is about creating mutual benefit between the corporation and the communities around it. Several Panel members agreed that this was a useful framework.
- Some Panel members expressed the challenge of measuring social impact and noted that it may be too subjective to do with metrics. Other Panel members, particularly industry representatives noted that just because it was hard to measure does not mean that it is not worth trying as the industry must continue to measure, improve performance and defend itself. The facilitator noted that the mining industry has been in this situation before on other issues, and previous experience would suggest that it is by making a good faith effort to engage, measure and report in a transparent way, that trust and credibility can be gained allowing for meaningful dialogue. It was suggested that industry needs to recognize that it is in the early stage and continue down this path of measuring social impact.
- There was plenty of discussion around the timeframe in which development is occurring. The concept of “evolution vs. revolution” was shared by several Panel members – mining companies need to move fast to keep up with the economy, while government is slow to react and communities often slower. An industry representative noted that the industry cannot develop on evolution timescale – it requires revolution. Nevertheless, one Panel member expressed the need to use long-term thinking, even if the pace is accelerating.
- One Panel member commented on the need for institutional capacity, asking what it would take internally to help change our perspective.
- One Panel member shared his views on the issue from an economic development perspective. He noted that development can be seen as generational economic development and that mining companies should find ways to build capacity and foster entrepreneurship to demonstrate long term benefits to the community.

- It was noted that mining companies need to know and accept when development is off limits. One Panel member expressed that sometimes communities do not want development and will not change – and mining companies may need to accept it. Particularly in the case of Aboriginal communities, if not engaged in the process, the consequence may be constant interruptions to development.

3.2 Human Rights Defenders

Ben explained that MAC members were considering leading edge practices in ISR and thought that the concept of mining companies as human rights defenders would be an interesting place to start the conversation. "Human rights defenders" is a term used by the United Nations (See "[Who is a defender?](#)") to describe people who, individually or with others, act to promote or protect human rights. When first reviewed by industry representatives, the concept seemed attainable. Ben asked the Panel for feedback on whether or not this topic was a non-starter or if it was a viable stretch goal for the industry that would lead to transformational changes in the industry.

Instead of a regular panel discussion, the Panel split into small groups and reported back on the following two discussion questions:

1. Is it possible for mining companies to be Human Rights defenders?
2. Are mining companies doing enough in this regard? Are these actually best practices? Have all of the important issues been addressed?

While several groups mentioned that it was difficult to come to a conclusion on the two questions posed, the Panel shared the following comments from their group discussions.

In general, many Panel members thought that the concept of mining companies as Human Rights defenders, as per the United Nations' definition, was something that the mining industry could work towards. One Panel member noted how it was about raising the bar to an international standard that would help mining companies take a stand when governments were failing on human rights. Other Panel members commented on the importance of taking this approach for attracting values-driven talent, notably, attracting young leaders and women into the industry. One group noted that what "human rights defender" means today will be different tomorrow.

Several questions arose regarding the understanding and interpretation of rights. For instance, human rights include cultural, economic and environmental rights and there is a difference between individual rights and group rights. Oftentimes, indigenous rights tend to be collective rights. There is a hierarchy of rights that can conflict with one another.

The question of "how far do you go" raised interesting implications. For example, one group asked what would happen if there was a coup in the operating country and sharia law was imposed on the community. Do you stay in the country? Do you defend human rights? Do you forgo opportunities when human rights are violated? What is the mining companies' sphere of influence?

Is being a good corporate citizen the same as being a defender of Human Rights? In some case it may not be.

Whether or not mining companies are currently doing enough was difficult to answer for most groups. Several groups commented that mining companies can always do more through due diligence, grievance mechanisms, training and understanding that rights issues vary in different

parts of the world. As one group responded, it is not just “is it enough?”; the question is, “is it the right thing?”

Several groups suggested that MAC think about developing a protocol on human rights. To improve the understanding and commitment to human rights, training the industry on how to handle human rights will be important. Panel members commented that this may be a challenge and will take time, noting that a phased in approach will be necessary. MAC mentioned that it has floated the idea of developing another protocol for addressing human rights. While MAC noted that there may be pushback from MAC members about making TSM too heavy, they also understood that the protocol may be of particular benefit to companies operating abroad.

4 TSM Implementation

4.1 Update on 2013 TSM Work Plan

Ben presented an overview of the 2013 TSM work plan. Key activities include:

- **Strengthening investor outreach:** MAC realizes that TSM can play an important role in providing financial analysts with the right tool to demonstrate how mining companies are managing sustainability issues at the facilities level – something that is sought after, yet rarely provided through annual and sustainability reports. MAC is currently meeting with investors and developing a strategy to inform investors on how they can use TSM to assess social and environmental performance.
- **Training and workshops:** MAC has and continues to provide training and workshops to support the various elements of TSM. These include:
 - In January, it held its first re-certification workshop for Verification-Service Providers (VSPs) who provide external verification services for the TSM program. Since the original program did not specify re-qualification requirements, MAC is revising the Terms of Reference for its VSPs, requiring recertification on TSM if they have not completed a TSM verification within the last three years. Therefore, attending this workshop was mandatory for VSPs to maintain their qualifications. While the workshop will be conducted again later in the year, the number of VSPs has dropped from 80 VSPs to 40.
 - MAC is currently planning workshops to support the implementation of two Protocols: Energy and GHG Emissions Management and Crisis Management Planning.
 - TSM self-assessment workshops will continue on demand.
- **Protocol/Framework Development:** MAC currently has two gaps in TSM that have been flagged to address by future protocols, mine closure and water. As previously addressed in this report, human rights has also come up recently as an area requiring attention. The Mine Closure Protocol was recently discussed with the Initiative Leaders (IL) and it has proven to be a challenge. Mine closure is already well regulated and MAC is finding it difficult to determine how the Protocol can add value. It was noted that this is an area where the Panel may be able to provide further input. Work on a Water and Mining framework (a precursor to a protocol) is in the TSM work-plan to commence after Mine Closure is addressed

4.2 TSM Communications

A MAC sub-committee made up of members of the Public Affairs Committee and the TSM Initiative Leaders developed a set of recommendations for enhanced TSM communications. Ben shared the TSM elevator pitch with the Panel (see text box below) and noted that the pitch has gone through several iterations. Due to lack of time for discussion, Ben committed to sharing the pitch by email for additional feedback.

TSM Elevator Pitch

TSM is MAC's commitment to responsible mining. It is a set of tools and indicators to drive performance and ensure that key mining risks are managed responsibly at our facilities.

Adhering to the principles of TSM, our members demonstrate leadership by:

- *Engaging with communities*
- *Driving world-leading environmental practices*
- *Committing to the safety and health of employees and surrounding communities.*

Ben then sought initial thoughts from the Panel on the revised Awards structure. Specifically, on two questions:

1. Are members of the COI Panel interested in being involved in the design of TSM award selection criteria?
2. Are members of the Panel interested in assessing submissions from MAC members and selecting award recipients?

Panel members were generally supportive of the COI Panel's involvement in the Awards process, offering the following suggestions and comments:

- Several Panel members commented that the design of the TSM award selection criteria will be demanding, however, once it is designed, it can be used again and again.
- One Panel member noted that he would prefer to assist with the adjudication of the award versus help with the design of the award criteria.
- One Panel member wondered if it would divert the Panel from its main functions. Pierre noted that the process would likely involve a mix of civil society, media and other experts, requiring only 1 or 2 COI Panel members; however he agreed that there was a lot of work to ask of from the COI Panel.
- One Panel member cautioned that the categories must be chosen well at the onset as adding additional categories later on would be poorly received.
- One Panel member suggested that there be few awards to increase competition and prestige.
- A few Panel members suggested that there is potential for peer voting within the process (e.g. voted for by industry peers or issue specific, such as an ENGO voting for the environment award).
- One Panel member suggested that the application forms of the award be used as case studies.

Ben thanked the Panel members for their advice and agreed to update the COI Panel at the fall meeting.

4.3 Company Selection for Post-Verification Review

The Panel reviewed the list of companies undergoing external verification in 2013 and selected Vale and Teck to participate in post-verification reviews at the fall 2013 COI Panel meeting.

5 Closing

5.1 Future Panel Meetings

The date of the next COI Panel meeting was tentatively set for October 16–17, 2013 in Sudbury. Ian Pearce offered that Xstrata Nickel could host the next meeting.

There were two items that the Panel facilitator captured to discuss at a later point: the impact of regulatory changes (specifically to CEAA) on the mining industry, and future discussions on mine closure. Ben indicated that MAC could possibly set up a webinar to share information on the first topic.

Following the same agenda setting process, Stratos and MAC will engage the COI Panel in the coming months via teleconference to help scope the agenda and discussion topics. The issue of whether the meeting should be one day or two will also be raised during the teleconference.

5.2 Working Group Opportunities

Due to limited time, the Panel facilitator simply noted the following Working Group Opportunities and informed the Panel that more information would be provided via email.

1. Annual Panel Statement Working Group (March-May pending completion of TSM Results)
2. Post-Verification Review Working Group (March-September)
3. Nominating Committee (Ongoing)

6 Meeting Evaluation

Panel members evaluated the Panel Meeting through three mechanisms:

- Completion of meeting evaluation forms (14 members)
- Submission of post-meeting written comments (1 member); and
- Provision of comments during the COI Panel meeting (as required).

Comments specific to various components of the meeting include:

- **Meeting expectations:** All respondents indicated that the meeting met their expectations. Many commented that there was excellent dialogue, particularly with new members, and

that they were pleased with the pace of the dialogue, noting an improvement from previous meetings where there was a tendency to pack too many topics into the agenda. Several commented that the agenda and objectives were clear and the topics were well suited. Even though there were sensitive subjects, one panel member noted that the discussions were respectful and that there was a balance of perspectives.

- **Meeting organization:** All respondents felt that the meeting was well organized although some Panel members expressed interest in making it longer to engage in more dialogue and another suggested that a dinner before the meeting would help break the ice, particularly with new members.
- **Meeting facilitation:** All respondents rated the quality of the facilitation between "good" and "excellent". One Panel member commented that the facilitator must ensure more COI members have the opportunity to speak, versus the MAC members, whose priority is to listen. Another commented that they enjoyed the flexibility and small group discussions.
- **Meeting materials:** Respondents rated the quality of the materials received between "good" and "excellent". A few members commented on the length of the pre-reads, and one suggested the possibility of colour coding priority reading.
- **Expressing interests:** The large majority of respondents felt that they had adequate opportunity to express their interests, however, some commented that the facilitator could call upon the quieter Panel members more often, or provide more time for others to respond.
- **Most enjoyable parts of the meeting:** Several respondents indicated that the discussions were the most enjoyable. While some enjoyed the biodiversity conversations, others noted that they preferred the ISR discussions, both in plenary and in groups. Many noted that they enjoyed the social time as it allowed them to engage with their peers and build relationships.
- **Areas for improvement:** While several respondents enjoyed the meeting and could not think of what to add for this question, a few Panel members provided comments for suggestions. For the biodiversity discussions, one member noted that the topic still requires more focus and an operational definition. To deal realistically with biodiversity and related issues, companies would need to bring in people, at least on an issue-selective basis, to provide advice. This would help answer more practical questions such as what can companies do in practice, and what should they be expected to do to report their activities. On a similar level, one Panel member also noted difficulties in engaging in the human rights discussions due to issues of definition and context. Discussions should be grounded in specific, clearly identified national or regional settings. For instance, in the context of references to Aboriginal peoples there are layers of cultural, economic and political diversity which escape most of us until we are actually confronted which the need to try and understand these settings for ourselves.

Practical issues which participants raised could be improved included: small group discussions being dominated by industry voices; TSM Awards discussion was too late in the day for meaningful discussion; and the lack of natural light in the room.

- **Overall opinion:** All respondents enjoyed the meeting overall, rating it between good and excellent. As one Panel member wrote: "Both MAC and Stratos should be pleased with the overall composition of the panel and a growing level of comfort and engagement in the exchanges between members, regardless of affiliation." However, he also commented that MAC (and the panel as a whole) still face some challenges in the structuring and orchestration of the meetings in such a way as to give MAC reasonably clear 'take home messages' or guidance on firm steps which can be taken to follow up on the issues discussed.

Appendix A: List of Participants

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Dan Benoit	Métis National Council
Victor Goodman	Campbell River Economic Development Corp.
Joy Kennedy	The United Church of Canada
Stephen Kibsey	Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec
Chief Earl Klyne	Seine River First Nation
Nathan Lemphers	Pembina Institute
Alan Penn	Cree Regional Authority
Mark Podasly	Brookmere Management Group
Claudine Renauld	Sandoz Canada Inc.
Maya Stano (Alternate)	My Sustainable Canada
Craig Ford	INMET Mining Corporation
Pierre Gratton	Mining Association of Canada
Louise Grondin	Agnico-Eagle Mines Limited
Ian Pearce	Xstrata Nickel
Anne Marie Toutant	Suncor Energy Inc.
REGRETS	
Barrie Ford	Makivik Corporation
Philip Oxhorn	Institute for the Study of International Development, McGill University
Alan Young	Canadian Boreal Initiative
Luc Zandvliet (Alternate)	Triple R Alliance Inc.
OTHER ATTENDEES	
Chris Scholl (in part)	Inmet Mining
Bob Carreau (in part)	IAMGOLD
Ben Chalmers	Mining Association of Canada
Tara Shea	Mining Association of Canada
Michael van Aanhout	Stratos Inc. (facilitator)
Jane Porter	Stratos Inc. (rapporteur)