

**Mining Association of Canada  
Towards Sustainable Mining**

**Summary Report**

**10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Community of Interest Advisory Panel**

**September 8-9, 2008  
Saskatoon, SK**

Prepared by:



**Stratos Inc.**

1404-1 Nicholas Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1N 7B7

tel: 613 241 1001

fax: 613 241 4758

[www.stratos-sts.com](http://www.stratos-sts.com)



100% Post-consumer content  
Acid-free

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1 INTRODUCTION ..... 1

2 SUMMARY OF ITEMS FOR FOLLOW-UP..... 1

3 WELCOME AND APPROVAL OF MARCH 2008 PANEL MEETING REPORT.....2

    3.1 Welcome..... 2

    3.2 Approval of September Panel Meeting Report ..... 2

4 FOLLOW-UP FROM MARCH 2008 COI PANEL MEETING .....2

    4.1 Metal Mining Effluent Regulations (MMER) ..... 2

    4.2 MAC's Position Statement on the Use of Lakes for Tailings Deposition..... 3

5 TSM IMPLEMENTATION .....3

6 REVIEW OF 2007 TSM PROGRESS REPORT .....6

7 ABORIGINAL RELATIONS.....7

8 PANEL RENEWAL.....9

9 COI PANEL 2008 POST VERIFICATION REVIEW ..... 11

10 INFORMATION ITEMS..... 11

11 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS ..... 11

12 NEXT PANEL MEETING ..... 11

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS ..... 12

## 1 Introduction

This report presents a summary of discussions from the September 8-9, 2008 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.

## 2 Summary of Items for Follow-up

| ITEM  | RESPONSIBILITY                 |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Update the March 2008 report with the comment from Chief Darren Taylor and have the updated report posted on MAC's website.   | Stratos/MAC                    |
| Edits to the MMER letter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change the word "muddy" in the third-last paragraph to "unclear"</li> <li>Add signatures of Gordon Peeling and Brenda Kelley</li> <li>Append list of Panel members</li> <li>Add the Federal Minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs to the cc: list.</li> </ul>   | Stratos                        |
| COI Panel members to submit comments on biodiversity protocol to MAC (Elizabeth Gardiner).  | COI Panel                      |
| MAC (Elizabeth Gardiner) to discuss with the biodiversity working group chair the possibility of inviting a small number of Panel members to the task group meeting in October.   | MAC (Elizabeth)                |
| Edits to the Closure Framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing the bullet "Plans will, at a minimum, fully comply with applicable regulatory requirements", since it is assumed that all MAC members will meet regulatory closure requirements, and that the framework is about going beyond these requirements.</li> <li>Make the following addition to point #3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAC members will work with communities <b><u>to develop the closure plan and</u></b> to develop strategies to mitigate the socio-economic impacts of mine closure and to help them develop plans for long-term, economic development.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | MAC                            |
| Ongoing work on Panel renewal by the Panel Renewal Subgroup on developing recommendations for Panel renewal.  | Panel Renewal Subgroup/Stratos |

---

### **3 Welcome and Approval of March 2008 Panel Meeting Report**

---

#### **3.1 Welcome**

The facilitator welcomed Panel members to the 10<sup>th</sup> Panel meeting. Dan Benoit attended the meeting as the new representative of the Métis National Council replacing Allan Morin. A list of participants, as well as those Panel members who sent their regrets, is provided in **Appendix 1**.

#### **3.2 Approval of September Panel Meeting Report**

Chief Darren Taylor indicated that reference to Aboriginal communities and organizations in the Yukon and NWT should include explicit reference to First Nations governments, since many of the communities in these regions are no longer Indian Act Bands but are a level of government. The Panel agreed that references to First Nation and Aboriginal organizations should be changed to "Aboriginal Governments and Organizations".

Panel members approved the March 2008 report without additional amendments.

---

### **4 Follow-Up From March 2008 COI Panel Meeting**

---

#### **4.1 Metal Mining Effluent Regulations (MMER)**

As a follow-up to the March 2008 Panel meeting, the Panel discussed the draft joint COI Panel-MAC letter addressing the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations. The Panel agreed that the letter should focus on process issues, not substantive issues, and approved the addition of a paragraph at the end of the letter prompting action by the Federal government. The Panel agreed to change the word "muddy" in the third-last paragraph to "unclear".

A Panel member questioned whether reconciliation with provincial regulations is an issue that the letter should address. The Panel agreed that the paragraph beginning "mounting confusion among all parties about the manner in which the MMER might relate to other federal legislation, as well as to legislation in other jurisdictions" touches on this issue.

The Panel agreed that Brenda Kelley would sign the letter on behalf of the COI Panel, and that a full list of COI Panel members would be appended to the letter. The Panel also agreed to add the Federal Minister responsible for intergovernmental affairs to the cc: list.

The Panel discussed whether the letter should be sent before and/or after the upcoming election, given that it is unlikely that the Ministers will see or respond to the letter in advance of the election and officials will not act on it in the meantime. The Panel agreed to send the letter before the election, with a copy to the respective deputy ministers, and to decide after the election whether the letter needs to be resent. The letter would also be posted on MAC's website after the election. However, the issue was raised of the COI Panel and its status under the Lobbyist Registration Act, and whether the COI Panel sending such a letter would be in contravention of this Act since the COI Panel is not a lobbyist organization. MAC agreed to look into this issue prior to the letter being sent.

## 4.2 MAC's Position Statement on the Use of Lakes for Tailings Deposition

In light of MAC's recent position statement on the use of lakes for tailings deposition and the fact Panel members maintain differing views on the issue, one Panel member expressed the view that MAC should not link or mention TSM or the COI Panel in the context of this issue. Gordon Peeling emphasized that MAC does not invoke anyone else's support for the issues on which it takes a position, and is very careful to maintain this separation in its communications. The Panel requested that MAC continue its practice of not linking TSM or the COI Panel with MAC positions.

## 5 TSM Implementation

---

Gordon Peeling, Maggie Papoulias, and Elizabeth Gardiner provided an update on biodiversity indicator development, the draft closure framework, and energy and GHG management. Jim Gowans provided an update on the result of the Governance Team (GT) strategy session held on June 17. These items are discussed below.

### 5.1.1 Biodiversity Indicator Development

Biodiversity indicator development to support the *Mining and Biodiversity Framework* is well underway. The goal is to bring draft indicators to the MAC board in November 2008 for approval, and to have them ready for self-assessment and internal reporting by MAC members in 2009 and for public reporting in 2010. The indicator development is being led by a members' task group under the MAC Science Committee. The subgroup met on May 2, and included participation from a COI Panel member (Alan Penn) and IUCN (John Herity). At this meeting the subgroup agreed to a biodiversity measurement protocol using a 5-level management system approach to the biodiversity indicators, similar to the other TSM indicators. Three biodiversity performance indicators have been developed:

1. Corporate biodiversity conservation policy and facility biodiversity conservation action plan
2. Biodiversity conservation management
3. Biodiversity reporting.

The task group will meet again in mid-October to work on the indicator protocol further. The draft protocol has been distributed to the ILs and was included in the materials for the current COI Panel meeting. The ILs will review them again taking into account Panel comments and finalize them for recommendation to the Governance Team and the MAC Board.

Some Panel members expressed concern that there will not be enough time for the Panel to have an opportunity for substantive discussion and input on the biodiversity indicators. There was debate among Panel members about the need to provide more time for comment before the protocol is put in place, versus implementing the protocol as scheduled and adjusting and refining it based on experience of its use in self assessment by MAC members in 2009. It was noted that the sooner the protocol is implemented, the sooner the performance will be subjected to external verification, which will add credibility and confidence to the indicators and the performance being achieved.

Some Panel members noted the need for the indicators to define what is biodiversity and it was noted by MAC representatives that these definitions and examples of biodiversity actions are included in the FAQs that form part of the protocol. The importance of having baseline data

against which company and facility performance on the biodiversity indicators can be measured was also discussed. It was noted that the requirement for baseline data is incorporated into the indicators (e.g. the definition of a facility biodiversity conservation action plan includes baseline data; assessment of facility-level baseline data is required to score "Level 2" in the biodiversity conservation management indicator). A Panel member commented that in many cases neither companies nor communities will have the resources to collect baseline data, and that governments may need to play a role. Another Panel member agreed that better biodiversity science and collection of baseline data needs to be supported by government in order to increase the knowledge base of all stakeholders and allow for more informed decision making.

Several Panel members agreed that the protocol should not be too prescriptive, and must allow companies and communities to adapt it to their unique locations and situations. Specific biodiversity issues to be addressed and actions to be taken will be identified by engaging communities of interest (required to achieve "Level 3" or higher), which is the preferred approach over establishing a long list of "to-do's" in the protocol that do not reflect local concerns and circumstances.

Another Panel member asserted that the biodiversity protocol should establish a consistent and high standard for biodiversity conservation in the industry, for example related to habitat loss, regardless of location or specific conditions.

Some Panel members also wondered how the implementation of the biodiversity framework and the use of lakes for tailings deposition could be consistent. This issue will be added to the agenda of the March 2009 Panel meeting.

The Panel members were invited to provide written comments on the biodiversity protocol to MAC in advance of the mid-October task group meeting. The Panel requested MAC to invite participation of a small number of Panel members in the task group meeting. MAC did not agree to the request but would discuss this with the task group chair.

### **5.1.2 Closure Framework**

The revised draft of the *Closure Framework* reflects amendments to item #1 to address post-closure as requested by the Governance Team, and an addition to #3 to reflect the COI Panel comments regarding the social dimension of closure. With these changes, the *Closure Framework* was approved at the Governance Team meeting in June 2008, pending clarity on the definition of "mine" in terms of related facilities.

A Panel member expressed a concern about the bullet "Plans will, at a minimum, fully comply with applicable regulatory requirements", noting that in some circumstances compliance with regulatory requirements may actually result in an undesirable closure option (e.g. closure of a mine in an urban area that results in the land being unusable for further development). The Panel recommended to MAC to remove this bullet, since it is assumed that all MAC members will meet regulatory closure requirements, and that the framework is about going beyond these requirements.

Panel members also suggested the following addition to point #3:

3. MAC members will work with communities **to develop the closure plan and** to develop strategies to mitigate the socio-economic impacts of mine closure and to help them develop plans for long-term, economic development

### 5.1.3 Energy and GHG Management

MAC is preparing an updated, easy-to-use guidance document on energy and GHG emissions management to support continued implementation of TSM and to help members conduct accurate energy and GHG measurements, estimates and reports. The revisions will address changes in regulatory requirements. The guidance document will be finalized in October and training workshops held in November and December.

### 5.1.4 Governance Team Strategy Session

Jim Gowans informed the Panel of the results of the Governance Team strategy session held in June 2008 where the GT discussed the results of two studies conducted on progress made in TSM and identified priority areas for TSM going forward.

*Five Winds/Strandberg Study: Analysis of the Mining Association of Canada's Promotion of Sustainability Among Member Companies:* The purpose of this study was to identify areas of strength and potential gaps in MAC's sustainability programming, and to develop recommendations for building on the strengths and closing potential gaps. The study assessed TSM through a review of MAC material and interviews with seven MAC member representatives. The benchmark study examined six key areas: sustainability vision and position; identifying key sustainability issues in the sector; engaging key external stakeholders; supporting industry association members; sustainability/CSR reporting on industry-wide initiatives; and association's sustainability/CSR performance. The results of the study indicated that MAC and TSM are "best in class", in terms of industry association voluntary initiatives, with several examples of exceeding best practice and consistent with best practice in all other areas.

*Decision Partners Study:* The purpose of this study was to obtain feedback from stakeholders on TSM, and to understand stakeholder perspectives on the mining industry's success over the past eight years, challenges that need to be addressed, and emerging issues. The results are summarized below:

| Industry Strengths   | Challenges Today   | Future Challenges   |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic competitiveness</li> <li>• Social engagement</li> <li>• Leadership and technical innovation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing social engagement efforts</li> <li>• Addressing environmental challenges – climate change, GHGs, etc.</li> <li>• Managing operating costs – rising costs of energy and labour</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to continue and broaden social engagement efforts</li> <li>• Address environmental challenges</li> <li>• Uncertainty regarding governments and regulatory requirements</li> </ul> |



The results of the study highlighted the need to communicate more broadly about the performance improvements achieved through TSM. The GT agreed to establish baseline communication principles, and tasked the ILs to develop an options paper on communication strategies.

*Priority areas:* The GT identified the following as priority areas for TSM going forward:

- Key issues: water and health and safety
- Performance gaps: international application of TSM
- Process gaps: Branding and communication of TSM

It was noted that this list of priority areas to be addressed by TSM has implications for the work of the Panel, including Panel expertise and agenda setting in the future.

The Panel commented on the international application of TSM. MAC members currently commit to adhere to the TSM principles nationally and internationally, but are only required to report on their Canadian operations. At least one MAC member currently does report on its international operations. One Panel member questioned whether the Panel had ever discussed developing protocols for international issues. Gordon Peeling confirmed that the Panel has not discussed this issue, but that the industry tried to make progress on international issues through the federal government's CSR Roundtables process. However, the government has not responded to the recommendations of the CSR Roundtable's Multistakeholder Advisory Group, and that the industry should not wait for the government to act on this issue.

The ILs have been tasked with looking into what international application of TSM would mean for MAC and its members. There are some concerns around overlap and duplication with other international programs (e.g. those of ICMM), and implementing TSM in countries with different political and social contexts, norms and expectations. The issue of international application of TSM can be discussed further by the Panel once the ILs have done their initial assessment of the issue.

## **6 Review of 2007 TSM Progress Report**

---

Maggie Papoulias provided an overview of the 2007 TSM performance results, presenting performance across all four indicator areas for 2007 as well as a comparison of 2005 - 2007 performance results for those companies/facilities that reported in all three years. Detailed results were included in the presentation to the Panel.

The Panel's comments on the report focused largely on energy use and GHG emissions management reporting and performance. A Panel member questioned whether MAC has a sense of how much better companies could be doing on energy use and GHG emissions management. Gordon Peeling commented that it is notable that the energy/GHG work, which started a long time ago, has been the most difficult area to move forward and presents some real challenges for companies. Many companies achieved significant energy savings through efficiency improvements a long time ago, so it has become more challenging to achieve additional improvements. Some of the issues that preclude higher TSM scores in this area include:

- Challenges associated with setting energy use and GHG emissions targets;
- Challenges associated with retrofitting measuring and monitoring systems for older facilities; and

- The reality that energy intensity worsens as a mine gets deeper.

A Panel member commented that the energy/GHG results only tell part of the story because no information is provided that would put the data in context – for example, energy use or GHG emissions as a percent of provincial or territorial emissions. Another Panel member responded that it can be tricky to pick the right context in which to put the data. For example, the proportion of NWT emissions from diamond mining will be large because there isn't much industry in the NWT, but in the context of newer versus older facilities they are far more efficient.

The suggestion was made that next year's company profiles could focus on how companies are dealing with energy and GHG management, and some of the constraints they face in this area.

A Panel member asked what commonalities are observed among the good performers versus lower performers. Maggie responded that no such analysis was undertaken.

In terms of the structure of the report, Panel members commented that the report is too long for the general public, and should include an executive summary that focuses on what people will care about and easily understand. The current document and the messages therein should be formally tested with the stakeholders to determine whether there is a better format or different information that stakeholders and the public would like to see. Panel members also thought that the comparison of year-over-year results and facility-level results should be included in the report, not on the CD.

## 7 Aboriginal Relations

---

Maggie Papoulias and Gordon Peeling provided an update on the Assembly of First Nations (AFN)/MAC Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which was approved by the GT in June, with a few additional areas still to be defined. It is proposed that the MOU may be signed at the Canadian Aboriginal Minerals Association (CAMA) conference November 2-3 in Saskatoon.

Gordon Peeling also provided an update on [preparations for](#) the NWT Forum. MAC, the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC) and the NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines ~~met with Aboriginal business, and community representatives~~ [involved First Nations, Inuit and Métis representatives in discussions related to scoping out and planning the forum](#). There is strong support for the proposed NWT forum, which would facilitate regional-level dialogue between industry and Aboriginal governments and groups. A design team will be established later this year, consisting of both industry and Aboriginal representatives, to make decisions about the forum's composition, process, nature of dialogue and agenda setting.

One Panel member noted that it will be important that not all of the Aboriginal involvement in the forum be coordinated through the AFN, because while the AFN represents [Aboriginal-First Nations](#) interests nationally they are not necessarily knowledgeable on each of the land claims agreements and particularities of the situation for individual First Nations in the NWT, [nor do they represent the interests of the Métis or Inuit](#). It was [also](#) recommended that the forum include representation from specific Aboriginal governments, in addition to strong community-based dialogue.

A Panel member inquired as to whether the forum will be specific to First Nations in the NWT, and whether anything similar will be set up in other areas. Gordon confirmed that the forum will be

specific to ~~First Nations and other~~ Aboriginal ~~groups-peoples~~ in the NWT, and that while replicating the concept in other areas is a natural next step, it will depend on capacity of the parties involved as well as real or perceived need. Another Panel member commented that MAC should not wait to see how the NWT forum works out before initiating similar processes in other areas. A Panel member voiced a concern about the need to include non-Aboriginal stakeholders in similar processes.

Lastly, Gordon Peeling provided an update on the *Mining and Aboriginal Peoples Framework*, which is very close to a final version. One Panel member commented that sub-bullet #5 should also make reference to First Nations government. Gordon noted that within the context of the framework all reference to government is meant to include Aboriginal government, not Canadian federal, provincial or territorial government. A few Panel members proposed that the definition of "government" as it is used in the framework should be added to the preamble for clarity. Another Panel member commented that the framework does not address how the industry will respond in the event that a community says no to development.

The Panel explored next steps for MAC implementation of the *Mining and Aboriginal Peoples Framework*, and discussed consultation as well as the provision of case study/best practice information as potential options for implementation support:

- *Consultation:* While precedents have been set on Aboriginal consultation, there is still no common definition or understanding of what consultation entails. Guidance to the mining industry on consultation would have to allow for a variety of unique circumstances (e.g. self-governing First Nations versus First Nation bands under the Indian Act, settled land claims versus unsettled land claims, [Métis Nation unsettled Land Claims versus Métis Settlements \(Alberta\)](#) etc.) A Panel member questioned whether the area of consultation is best addressed through TSM, and that if so MAC will have to take a strong leadership role and engage other industry associations and organizations. The NWT forum may provide a good venue for exploring this issue.

Ginger Gibson indicated that she is working on a toolkit funded by the Gordon Foundation that will include a basic negotiation model for communities and identify the range of information needed in order for communities to make informed decisions.

While the Panel agreed that there may be an opportunity for MAC to pick up the challenge of defining consultation and the implications for the industry, the duty to consult ultimately rests with the government. A Panel member noted that a national consultation framework was supposed to be initiated this fall by the federal government, but appears to have been stalled. It was suggested that the Panel, potentially in conjunction with other organizations that share the Panel's view on this issue, could issue a letter to push the government to put out this long overdue guidance. However, another Panel member commented that the delay is because the federal government is waiting for jurisprudence on this issue – they are hesitant to be drawn into this too far until it is clear where the courts are going to fall.

The Panel recommended that the issue of consultation, and how it could be addressed through TSM as part of implementation of the Aboriginal People and Mining Framework, be addressed by the ILs, and that the topic also be added to the agenda of the March 2009 Panel meeting.

- *Case studies and examples of best practice:* A Panel member commented that the mining industry lacks core information on key issues within Aboriginal society. Consultation is very specific by region and circumstance, and it can be frustrating for industry to know what they need to do. MAC can play a role in providing case study or best practice information on key issues such as land tenures, education, employment and capacity development, etc.

## 8 Panel Renewal

Larry Haber presented the most recent version of the Panel renewal report, and highlighted changes made to the Panel terms of reference to reflect the Panel's decisions on the rate of membership renewal and the possible categories of COIs to be involved in the Panel. Both documents were approved with three minor changes:

- *Panel Renewal Report:* Dan Benoit is now the permanent representative of the Métis National Council. Remove the word "interim" on page three.
- *Panel Terms of Reference:*
  - Add reference to the new mentorship role.
  - Add clause that COI panel members may be asked to step down based on low attendance.

Ginger Gibson presented options for Panel renewal, including a list of the Panel members that offered to step down, members that have had a low attendance record in recent meetings, and a short list of new Panel members:

|  | NAME                            | CATEGORY   |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>Current members that offered to step down</b> | David Scott (firm)              | Investment   |
|  | Ginger Gibson (willing to stay) | Community  |
| <b>Current members with low attendance</b>       | Chief Jim Boucher               | Aboriginal/ <del>community</del> – <u>First Nations Representative</u> |
|  | George Hakongak                 | Aboriginal – <u>Inuit Regional Representative</u>                      |
| <b>Short list of new Panel members</b>           | Andy Baribeau                   | Aboriginal/mine management   |
|  | Rebecca Chouinard               | Youth/academic   |
|  | Stephen Kibsey                  | Investment   |
|  | Alan Young                      | Environmental/research organization                                    |

Panel members recommended that Ginger Gibson remain on the Panel, given that she is a very active member with a strong record of attendance in Panel meetings and participation in inter-meeting activities. Ginger agreed to remain on the Panel.

Soha Kneen, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK) representative on the Panel, indicated that the Inuit regional representative (currently George Hakongak) will be changing with a new member to be identified by the ITK through its own processes. This change will represent one "natural renewal", with room for one-two additional replacements.

The Panel noted that Chief Jim Boucher should be contacted to determine his interest in remaining on the Panel. The Panel was also interested in further exploring the possibility of Andy Baribeau holding either an assigned or unassigned seat (depending on the status of Jim Boucher)

The Panel agreed to recommend Stephen Kibsey to replace David Scott as a representative of the investment community.

There was some debate around the need for a representative from another non-profit environmental organization on the Panel, versus an individual with environmental expertise who is selected on an individual basis. The current Panel membership structure includes one representative from a non-profit environmental organization, and this seat is currently filled by the CEN represented by Brenda Kelley of Bathurst Sustainable Development. An additional environmental representative can be chosen on an individual basis.

The Panel discussed the merits of Alan Young who was on the recommended short list from the Panel Renewal Working Group for consideration by the COI Panel. There was also some discussion about the future role of Elizabeth May on the Panel. MAC will discuss with Elizabeth whether she is in a position to continue her role on the Panel, given the need for another strong environmental voice at the table.

The Panel agreed that in the future, nominees should be contacted in advance to determine their willingness to serve on the Panel before having their name go forward.

In summary:

1. Ginger Gibson will remain on the Panel.
2. Stephen Kibsey will replace David Scott as a representative of the investment community.
3. A process is in place to find a replacement for the current ITK regional representative.
4. Chief Jim Boucher will be contacted to determine his interest in remaining on the Panel and availability for future meetings. Depending on the outcome, Andy Baribeau may be approached as an AFN or individual candidate.
5. MAC will approach Elizabeth May to determine whether she is in a position to continue her role on the Panel.
6. Depending on the outcomes of #4 and #5 above, another nominee (e.g. Alan Young) may be approached.

A Panel member noted that it is not apparent in the current Panel terms of reference that there are representative members assigned for specific groups, and suggested that the terms of reference be amended to clarify which seats are assigned/representative and which are not. The Panel requested the Renewal Working Group to draft revisions to the Panel ToR to clarify this aspect of the Panel membership.

---

## 9 COI Panel 2008 Post Verification Review

---

The Panel's post-verification review process was developed by a Panel subgroup between the March and September 2008 meetings. Details of the process, including scope, approach, company selection criteria, and information expectations and questioned for response by selected companies were provided in the Panel briefing binder. The companies chosen for this year's review were Barrick Gold (Hemlo Operations), Xstrata Nickel, and Xstrata Zinc. Due to logistical challenges, Xstrata Zinc was unable to attend the meeting, and will be invited to a post-verification review at the Panel's March 2009 meeting.

For the purposes of the Panel review, the review questions were grouped into three categories: context, conduct of the verification process, and results and lessons learned. The results of the post-verification review are provided in a separate report that will be sent to Panel members and posted on the MAC TSM website.

---

## 10 Information Items

---

There was no report on information items.

---

## 11 Future Agenda Items

---

Possible future agenda items identified during the meeting for consideration by the Panel included:

1. The consistency between the biodiversity framework and the use of lakes for tailings deposition (as permitted by regulation).
2. Options for implementation support of the *Mining and Aboriginal Peoples Framework*, including consultation and case studies/examples of best practice.
3. Post-verification review of Xstrata Zinc.

---

## 12 Next Panel Meeting

---

The next meeting is scheduled for March 4<sup>th</sup> in Toronto. Details will follow closer to the meeting date.

## **Appendix 1: List of Participants**

---

### **COI Panel Members**

Gordon Ball, Syncrude Canada Ltd.  
Dan Benoit, Métis National Council  
Richard Briggs, Canadian Auto Workers  
Patricia Dillon, Teck Cominco Limited (in lieu of Doug Horswill)  
Ginger Gibson  
Jim Gowans, De Beers Canada Inc.  
Larry Haber  
Brenda Kelley, Canadian Environmental Network (Bathurst Sustainable Development)  
Soha Kneen, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami  
Christy Marinig, Timmins Economic Development Corporation  
Gordon Peeling, Mining Association of Canada  
Alan Penn, Cree Regional Authority  
Chief Darren Taylor, Tr'ondek Hwech'in First Nation  
Eira Thomas, Stornoway Diamond Corporation

### **Other Attendees**

Bill Ferninand, Barrick Gold Corporation  
Vernon Betts, verifier for Barrick Gold Corporation  
Claire Vivier, Xstrata Nickel  
Judy Fedorowick, verifier for Xstrata Nickel

Maggie Papoulias, Mining Association of Canada  
Elizabeth Gardiner, Mining Association of Canada  
George Greene, Stratos Inc. (Facilitator)  
Karla Heath, Stratos Inc. (Rapporteur)

### **Regrets**

Chief Jim Boucher, Fort McKay First Nation  
George Hakongak, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated  
Doug Horswill, Teck Cominco Limited  
David Mackenzie, United Steelworkers of America  
Elizabeth May, Green Party of Canada