

Mining Association of Canada
Towards Sustainable Mining

Meeting of the
Community of Interest Advisory Panel
SUMMARY REPORT

March 3-4, 2020
Toronto, ON



Towards Sustainable Mining
Vers le développement minier durable



Prepared by:

Stratos Inc.

www.stratos-sts.com

Executive Summary

The Community of Interest (COI) Advisory Panel (“the Panel”) is an independent multi-interest group that monitors the Mining Association of Canada’s (MAC) Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) initiative’s progress and serves as an external source of knowledge and experience. This executive summary provides a brief account of the meeting held in Toronto on the evening of March 3rd and the full day on March 4th, 2020.

The meeting began with an informal dinner for Panel members on March 3rd, where Panel members shared issues of importance to the COI they represent relevant to the mining sector. The primary focus of the meeting on March 4th was to provide input on the Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Management Protocol review. The Panel also shared and discussed their reflections from the past 3 years of operations and selected companies for the 2020 post-verification review (PVR).

Issues Tracking and Materiality Process

Panel members shared the following issues of importance to the COI they represent:

- Climate change, including issues related to critical minerals
- Indigenous rights and reconciliation
- Indigenous employment
- Effectiveness of community engagement
- United Nations Sustainable Development Goals
- Public trust and discourse
- Women in mining
- Biodiversity
- Social finance
- Tax justice
- The Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise

These issues will be entered into a materiality survey for the Panel, which will inform the prioritization of issues the Panel will focus on in 2020 and 2021.

3-Year Panel Reflections

The Panel reflected on the past 3 years of operations and identified the following improvements for consideration:

- To ensure an effective use of the Panel’s time, alternative facilitation methods could be used, and the facilitator could be more explicit in how going overtime on one discussion impacts other agenda items and when discussions have been concluded. These changes could help mitigate the limitations of time available, which may prevent Panel members from sharing everything they would like to on the topic.
- The duration of the March meeting could be extended to 2 days and take place either before or after PDAC Convention. This could include having an afternoon “pre-meeting” on day 1 to discuss Panel business and to have an unstructured discussion on the upcoming agenda and pre-reads.
- MAC offered to support Panel members that wish to engage with their communities of interest by providing materials, advice and/or attending events when invited, where possible.
- MAC offered to share more information on relevant MAC activities to the Panel, including engagement with other organizations and governments, and to consider how they align with the Panel’s priorities.
- MAC agreed that the same updates provided to the federal government on TSM could be shared with Indigenous leadership.

- WhatsApp or a similar platform could be used by the Panel for communications between meetings.

The facilitator suggested that all recommendations from the online survey and the meeting's discussion be tracked, with an update provided to the Panel on options and actions taken by the fall 2020 meeting.

Energy Use and GHG Emissions Management Protocol Review

A panel of experts was convened to discuss the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure (TFCD) and implications for the mining sector, including:

- Stephen Walker, COI Panel Member (Finance/Investment),
- Ani Markova, Capital Markets Executive,
- Sean Capstick, Principal at Golder Associates, and
- Adam Rochweg, Senior Advisor at Mantle314.

The Expert Panel addressed the following discussion topics:

- The importance of building resilient systems (e.g. governance, adaptive management, etc.).
- The lack of clear, consistent data requirements for reporting to investors on this topic, and whether government should play a role in requiring TFCD be applied.
- Considering quantification of financial impacts from climate change.

Panel members then discussed the key elements relevant to the scope of the Protocol's review, including:

- Adding a **standalone indicator (or Protocol) for climate change adaptation**, which could follow the MAC guidance being developed on climate change adaptation (e.g. risk assessment, decision analysis, etc.).
- Both **corporate-level and facility-level indicators** will need to be considered. For example, the **TFCD should be integrated** as a corporate-level requirement.
- There should be a performance target to **achieve carbon neutrality by 2050**. This should include guidance on how mine sites closing before 2050 could work towards that target.
- Climate change reporting should **meet the needs of all COI** (e.g. plain language summaries).
- **COI should be engaged** throughout the climate change management process.
- Existing Level AAA and AA criteria that should be moved to Level AA or A, and new Level AAA criteria that should be considered.

Panel Business

The Panel selected Syncrude and Baffinland as the two companies that will undergo post-verification review in 2020. The Panel discussed potential fall 2020 meeting locations/topics, including Baffinland's Mary River mine site in Nunavut, Fort McMurray or Edmonton. There was also a suggestion to organize a discussion about artisanal and small-scale mining. MAC will follow-up with potential hosts to confirm the fall meeting location for the Panel.

Summary of Key Outputs from the March 2020 COI Panel Meeting

- ✓ Advice provided to MAC on the Energy and GHG Emissions Management Protocol review.
- ✓ Deeper understanding of TFCD and climate change in the mining sector by Panel members.
- ✓ Identify opportunities for improvement for the Panel, based on reflections from the past 3 years.
- ✓ Selection of companies for post-verification review in 2020.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	I
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS.....	1
3. ROUNDTABLE FOR ISSUES TRACKING AND PRIORITIZATION	1
4. PANEL BUSINESS.....	3
4.1. PVR SELECTION.....	3
4.2. OCTOBER MEETING LOCATION.....	3
5. 3-YEAR REFLECTIONS.....	4
6. ENERGY AND GHG EMISSIONS MANAGEMENT PROTOCOL REVIEW	5
6.1. EXPERT PANEL PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION.....	6
6.2. PROTOCOL REVIEW DISCUSSION	6
7. CLOSING AND MEETING EVALUATION	9
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	11
APPENDIX 2: MEETING OBJECTIVES AND AGENDA.....	13
APPENDIX 3: ACRONYM LIST	15

1. Introduction

The Mining Association of Canada's (MAC) Community of Interest Advisory Panel ("the Panel") met on the evening of March 3rd and the full day on March 4th in Toronto. The Panel, established in 2004, monitors the Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) initiative's progress and serves as an external source of knowledge and experience.¹ Its mandate is to:

- Help MAC members and communities of interest improve the industry's performance.
- Foster dialogue between the industry and its communities of interest.
- Help achieve the goals of TSM.

This report presents a summary of discussions at the March 2020 Panel meeting, including any specific decisions and recommendations proposed by the Panel, along with any dissenting views. Unless indicated, Panel members' comments are not attributed. Meeting presentations were shared with Panel members and this content is not duplicated within the body of this report. The list of meeting attendees is provided in Appendix 1 and the meeting objectives and agenda is in Appendix 2.

2. Summary of Action Items

Below is a summary of action items arising from the Panel meetings. Action items are reported until complete. Action items throughout the report are underlined.

ACTION ITEMS					
#	ITEM	LINK TO REPORT	RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	STATUS (as of March 2019)
#1 March 2020	Discuss lessons learned from past PVRs and consider how they can be applied to improve PVRs this year.	5.1	PVR Working Group	Summer 2020	Not Started
#2 March 2020	Test Panel interest in discussing artisanal and small-scale mining through issue prioritization process.	5.2	Stratos	Summer 2020	Not Started
#3 March 2020	Track and report back to the Panel on the implementation of improvements identified through the 3-year reflections process gathered in the online survey and March meeting.	6.0	Stratos	Fall 2020	Not Started

3. Roundtable for Issues Tracking and Prioritization

Over dinner on Tuesday evening, non-industry Panel members were invited to share issues of importance that they see as being relevant for MAC or the mining industry in general. The Panel member perspectives are summarized below and will be used to inform the Panel's issue tracking and prioritization process for 2020.

¹ For more information on MAC's COI Panel, visit: <http://www.mining.ca/site/index.php/en/towards-sustainable-mining/community-of-interest-advisory-panel.html>

Table 1: Issues of Importance to the Panel

Issue	Issue Description
Indigenous – rights and reconciliation	Several Panel members identified Indigenous rights and reconciliation as an issue of importance. Two Panel members commented that this topic is forefront in the news (e.g. TransMountain pipeline, Wet’suwet’en protests). A Panel member referenced the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s (TRC) 10 Principles of Reconciliation and the Call to Action #92 ² , reflecting that leaders need to continually push this forward.
Indigenous – employment	One Panel member shared the importance of increasing Indigenous participation in the mining workforce and in mining decision-making.
Climate change – general	Several Panel members identified climate change as an issue of importance. One Panel member noted that changes are already being observed in the North. Another noted the linkage between climate change and obtaining social licence to operate.
Climate change – critical minerals	One Panel member commented on the importance of accelerating green energy development and associated critical minerals extraction in Canada. Another reflected that the increased demand for critical minerals may result in a need for strengthened standards.
Public trust and discourse	One Panel member commented that communities are divided, both across and within communities. Another added that communities are diverse, and that communicating and sharing knowledge through a dialogue with teachers and educators can help get messages to the youth to help rebuild trust and reduce division. Another Panel member commented on the important of building trust, respect and cooperation in effective community engagement.
Women in mining	Two Panel members commented on the importance of supporting women in mining, including beyond administrative roles.
Biodiversity	One Panel member commented on the importance of restoring biodiversity and ecosystems before they are lost.
United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	One Panel member shared that the SDGs are a platform for mining companies to engage and create shared value, acting as a catalyst for sustainable development.
Social finance	One Panel member shared that there is growing interest in social bonds and investment in communities via social finance; they were interested in whether mining had a role to play in social finance. They added that there is a need to address community challenges as a larger collective (e.g. with government, non-profits, etc.)
Tax justice	One Panel member shared their interest in just tax policies for mining (e.g. combating use of tax havens).
Government – Ombudsperson	One Panel member shared interest in discussing the issue of investigative powers for the Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise (CORE).

² More specifically this is referencing the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action document. Call to Action 92 relates specifically to the corporate sector “We call upon the corporate sector in Canada to adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a reconciliation framework and to apply its principles, norms, and standards to corporate policy and core operational activities involving Indigenous peoples and their lands and resources...” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Accessed March 12, 2019 at http://trc.ca/assets/pdf/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf).

4. Panel Business

The start of the full-day meeting on March 4th was focused on Panel business, i.e. PVR selection (section 5.1) and planning for the fall meeting (section 5.2).

4.1. PVR selection

To initiate the selection process for the 2020 PVR companies, MAC shared a list of previous companies and locations where PVRs have taken place, along with a list of companies undergoing external verification that could be selected for review in 2020. Panel members shared the following comments on PVR company selection:

- As there is an interest in understanding how the oil sands mines have evolved since the PVR with Suncor in 2016, Panel members agreed that either Syncrude or CNRL should be selected, but not both as there was also a desire to hear from more than one commodity producer.
- It was suggested that the PVR Working Group discuss lessons learned from past PVRs, in particular the Mount Polley visit, and consider how these can be applied to improve the PVR sessions. A Panel member added that it is important to discuss all issues openly, while acknowledging there may be some polarization or sensitivity with certain issues, and to consider that in advance.
- Panel members were interested in learning more about engagement processes, training and logistics (e.g. managing effluent and material movement) from Baffinland.
- Panel members agreed it would be interesting to review established processes (Syncrude) and new processes (Baffinland).

The facilitator confirmed that Syncrude and Baffinland were chosen by the Panel as the companies to undergo PVR in 2020.

4.2. October meeting location

The Panel shared the following suggestions for an October 2020 meeting location:

- Visit Baffinland, although this may be challenging logistically and financially.
- Visit Fort McMurray or Edmonton; the Panel has visited before, but most current members have not been there.
- Learn more about artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM); one Panel member shared that artisanal mining is a high risk for many companies worldwide and practices are evolving, including through the new Responsible Gold Mining Standards developed by the World Gold Council (WGC). While this is not an issue in Canada, MAC is also working on an integrated audit approach for TSM and other responsible sourcing standards, which does include criteria related to how large-scale mines interact with ASM. The facilitator suggested testing interest in this topic through the Panel issue prioritization process.

MAC committed to follow up with potential hosts for an October 2020 meeting location and will share an update with the Panel once more information is available.

5. 3-Year Reflections

The COI Panel Terms of Reference states “*The Panel’s achievement and operations [are] to be evaluated every three years*”. The last COI Panel evaluation discussion occurred in October 2016. Panel members were asked to share their reflections on the past 3 years of operations through an online survey in advance of the meeting, and the results were presented to the Panel for discussion. Panel members discussed potential changes to Panel meeting duration and timing, how to approach Panel discussions, and Panel and MAC communications and engagement.

Panel members shared the following comments on the **duration of Panel discussions**:

- Sometimes discussions are limited by the time available, which may prevent Panel members from sharing everything they’d like to on the topic. The facilitator suggested they could be more explicit about the choices that are made throughout the day, i.e. by going overtime for one agenda item that impacts the other agenda item(s), and also more explicit in confirming that a conversation has been concluded.
- Small-group activities or alternative facilitation methods could be examined to ensure the most effective use of Panel members’ time.

Panel members shared the following comments on the **approach to Panel decision-making**:

- It was acknowledged that the Panel is an advisory body, not a formal decision-making body.
- Sometimes Panel consensus is needed (e.g. recommending revised Protocols to the Governance Team), while recognizing that further conversations may still take place. In other areas consensus is not required, e.g. when first discussing potential changes to a Protocol (i.e. brainstorm phase) or exploring topics not related to protocols, such as the responsible sourcing discussion that took place at the March 2019 meeting or the exploration workshop that took place at the October 2019 meeting. Seeking consensus on these types of topics may slow down the ability to make progress and that there is value for MAC in simply hearing the range of views on topics being discussed.

Panel members shared the following comments on the **duration and timing of Panel meetings**:

- A Panel member shared that two meetings per year strikes the right balance.
- Panel members discussed increasing the duration of the March meeting from 1 day to 2 days; this would mean the meeting would need to take place before or after PDAC Convention to allow industry members to attend both events. A Panel member reflected that this may make it more difficult for international observers to attend, as they are typically already in Canada for PDAC. MAC will consider the suggestion to decouple the Panel meeting from the Convention.
- A Panel member cautioned that if the March meeting is extended to two days, the agenda should allow for more in-depth discussion on each topic, rather than adding new agenda items.
- Panel members discussed hosting an afternoon meeting before the Panel dinner to discuss Panel administrative items (e.g. Panel renewal, PVR selection, etc.) and/or to have unstructured discussion on the upcoming agenda and pre-reads. This would allow the second day to focus on more substantive discussion (e.g. climate change). This pre-meeting could consist of solely non-industry members, although an industry member cautioned that this may limit the diversity of perspectives shared during the discussion and the benefits that industry receive from participating.

Panel members shared the following comments on **Panel and MAC engagement and communications**:

- The revised Panel Terms of Reference (2015) shifted the emphasis from Panel members acting as representatives of their communities of interest towards ensuring MAC is receiving expert advice from members whose individual perspectives' can represent, to some extent, their communities of interest perspectives. However, Panel members may wish to communicate or engage with their constituents on the work of the Panel on a voluntary basis.
- MAC offered to support any Panel member that wished to engage with their communities of interest by providing materials, advice and/or attending those events.
- MAC also engages regularly with other organizations and non-profits and offered to share more information on these additional engagements; it was agreed that these kinds of updates would be of interest.
- A Panel member suggested sharing the same TSM-related communications sent to government, such as the letter to Cabinet on the new *Indigenous and Community Relationships Protocol*, with Aboriginal leadership and MAC agreed.
- MAC offered to provide periodic updates on relevant MAC activities to the Panel via webinar with individual Panel member participation being voluntary; these updates could be provided based on how they align with the Panel's issue prioritization process. Much of this information is also available on MAC's Twitter and LinkedIn accounts and Panel members were encouraged to follow MAC's activities on these social media platforms.
- WhatsApp is a platform used by CAEM to discuss emerging issues with their COI Panel. This could be considered by the Panel for communications among Panel members between meetings.

Panel members shared the following **additional comments**:

- The facility and the ability to hear each other is important during Panel meetings and discussions. MAC should consider acoustics of meeting venues, where possible, when selecting where to hold meetings. A Panel member shared that some rooms are also wired specifically for hearing aids. MAC will keep this in mind when organizing future meeting venues but recognizes that this is not always possible in some of the smaller communities that the Panel chooses to visit for the fall meetings.

The facilitator concluded the discussion by suggesting that all recommendations from the online survey and this meeting's discussion be tracked, with an update provided to the Panel on options and actions taken by the October 2020 meeting.

6. Energy and GHG Emissions Management Protocol Review

The Energy and GHG Emissions Management Protocol is undergoing a comprehensive review in 2020. In 2019, the Panel was provided with an opportunity to feed into the scope of review, which includes consideration of climate change, performance targets, enhanced reporting and disclosure requirements, enhanced Level AA and Level AAA requirements and a supporting guide.

With the review now underway, an expert panel was invited to this meeting to inform the Panel's discussion. The expert panel first shared their perspectives on the recommendations of the TFCD and implications for the mining sector, as discussed in section 7.1. The Panel then engaged in discussion on the Protocol's review, as described in section 7.2.

6.1. Expert Panel Presentation and Discussion

A panel of experts was convened to discuss the recommendations of the TFCD and implications for the mining sector. The following experts shared their perspectives with the Panel:

- Stephen Walker, COI Panel Member (Finance/Investment),
- Ani Markova, Capital Markets Executive,
- Sean Capstick, Principal at Golder Associates, and
- Adam Rochweg, Senior Advisor at Mantle314.

Following the presentations, Panel members shared the following comments in dialogue with the expert Panelists:

- **Building system resilience**
 - Climate change adaptation involves building systems (e.g. governance, operations and maintenance, adaptive management) rather than assets.
 - MAC is developing a guide to assessing and incorporating climate change adaptation into decision making for the mining sector. The draft guidance suggests the use of multiple climate change forecast models rather than relying on a single model, which also builds system resilience.
 - Many of the concepts in the MAC guidance can be applied beyond the mining industry (e.g. municipalities).
- **The role of government**
 - It was suggested that federally regulated sectors and/or crown corporations should be required to apply the TFCD framework or explain why they are not doing so. This would help in establishing TFCD as the standard, rather than have companies report to multiple investor standards.
- **Quantifying financial impacts**
 - A Panel member asked whether there were expectations to quantify financial impacts from climate change. An expert panelist responded that site-level risk assessment may consider the financial impacts of proactive adaptation strategies versus reactive actions. The MAC guidance does not provide information on how to calculate financial impacts or what level of financial impact is appropriate.
- **Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) reporting to investors**
 - There is a lack of clear, consistent data requirements for ESG reporting to investors. This is partly because investors each have their own models, which use different data inputs.
 - Existing standards such as TSM could be leveraged by investors; for example, Sustainalytics is using the Tailings Management Protocol to assess tailings risk. However, investors need to be educated on these standards and would still need specific data to run their own quantitative models.
 - One of the challenges is that the data used in quantitative models is provided without context, e.g. is it material to that company?

6.2. Protocol Review Discussion

Panel members discussed the key elements relevant to the scope of the Protocol's review, namely:

- Incorporation of climate change and adaptation,
- Performance targets,

- Enhanced reporting and disclosure requirements, and
- Enhanced Level AA and AAA requirements.

Panel members first discussed these topics in small groups, followed by a discussion in plenary. A summary of these discussions by topic is provided below.

Climate Change and Adaptation

Panel members shared the following comments on incorporating climate change and adaptation in the Protocol:

- The draft **MAC adaptation guidance document provides a roadmap** for what a “climate change adaptation” indicator could include, i.e. risk assessment, decision analysis and developing and implementing adaptation pathways.
- There was some discussion on whether this topic should be covered in a **separate Protocol**; however, there may then be overlap in discussing climate change risks, which would be covered in both the Climate Change and the Energy and GHG Protocols.
- Assuming this topic is integrated into the existing Protocol, the **Protocol title should be updated** to reflect this (i.e. include climate change adaptation in the name).
- This indicator may need to be broken into a **facility-level and corporate-level indicator**.
- **Governance**, i.e. accountability, should be assigned at both the facility and corporate level.
- **Climate change impacts other Protocols** such as water, tailings and biodiversity; these linkages need to be considered.

Performance Targets

Panel members shared the following comments on performance targets for the Protocol:

- There was general agreement that there should be a target to achieve **carbon neutrality by 2050**.
 - There was discussion but no resolution on how to demonstrate tangible action, rather than committing to an aspirational statement. One example included setting criteria that was action-based, rather than outcome-based.
- The target will need to consider **how mine sites closing before 2050 could contribute**; suggestions included:
 - Mapping out a curve to reach carbon neutrality by 2050 and defining site progress by meeting more specific and shorter-term targets that align with the curve.
 - Offsets could be used rather than investing in new technology.
- There was **no resolution on whether this target should apply at a site-level or corporate-level**. There was agreement that this should consider the “least cost” mitigation approach and align with MAC’s climate commitments.
- A **viable offset market** will be an important component of meeting this target.
 - Offsets will need to meet certain standards (e.g. ensure offset projects are not causing other social or biodiversity impacts).
 - The mining industry could consider becoming involved in and partnering in the evolving field of nature-based climate solutions.

Reporting and Disclosure Requirements

Panel members shared the following comments on enhancing reporting and disclosure requirements for the Protocol:

- There was general agreement that the **TFCD should be integrated** into the Protocol. This would likely require a **corporate-level indicator**, which could be assessed as a “yes/no” rating.
- **Reporting should meet the needs of all COI** (i.e. not just investors, who are more aware of TFCD). For example, plain language summaries (re: climate change management) could be included in the company’s reporting or website. This could include a description of TSM processes and how they link to performance.
- **COI should be engaged throughout the climate change management process**, e.g. in scenario planning, risk management, governance, etc. While this may be partly covered by the Indigenous and Community Relationships Protocol, some felt it was important to discuss engagement specific to climate change in the revised Protocol. It was also noted that interest in these topics may vary by COI.

Level AA and AAA Requirements

Panel members shared the following comments on enhancing Level AA and AAA requirements for the Protocol:

- **Overarching comments**
 - Move internal verification to Level A and external verification to Level AA.
 - More clearly identify FAQ terms (i.e. terms where FAQ provides further detail).
 - Remove “some” from criteria and replace with more clear, specific language (e.g. “some scope 3 emissions”).
 - A corporate-level indicator may be required. For example, scenario planning (Level AA) and risk assessment (Level A) should be conducted at both the facility and corporate level.
- **Comments on existing Indicator 1 criteria**
 - The term “renewable energy” should be replaced with “clean energy” (i.e. should include nuclear, hydrogen and renewable energy).
 - Level A criterion “General energy and GHG awareness training” should also be provided to suppliers.
 - All Level AA criteria should move to Level A.
 - At least Level AAA criterion 1 (“Procurement and supply chain ...”) and criterion 4 (“Participation with communities of interest ...”) should move to Level AA.
 - Level AAA criterion “Voluntary corporate investments ...” should specify that the size of corporate investments is commensurate with the size of operations or emissions.
- **New Indicator 1 Level AAA criteria to consider**
 - Overall, offsets should be added as a component of the management system (e.g. Level AAA may be developing a technology or new process to quantify offsets).
 - Overall, could use the term “where applicable” in Level AAA.
 - Internal carbon pricing is applied over the long-term and increasing.
 - GHG/energy use factors are incorporated into site design criteria.
 - Energy infrastructure also supplies the community or is handed over to the community.
 - Engage on or advocate for enabling policies to support GHG/energy use reduction.
 - Convene regional bodies to support advocacy efforts (e.g. similar to the Water Stewardship Protocol).
 - Assign GHG/energy use reduction targets to employees.
- **Comments on Indicator 2**
 - Level AAA should include all **material** scope 3 sources in reporting.

- **Comments on Indicator 3**
 - Move Level AAA criterion “Continuous improvement targets ...” to Level A.
 - Consider adding to Level AAA or AA:
 - Setting a carbon neutrality target by 2050 and/or having a facility performance aligned with meeting this target.
 - Setting an intensity target that is maintained as ore grades decline.
 - New mines set absolute targets.

Overall, MAC shared that the input they received from the Panel is generally aligned with the input TSM Initiative Leaders have been providing.

7. Closing and Meeting Evaluation

Panel members shared their closing thoughts in a final roundtable and provided feedback via in-person evaluation forms.

Panel members shared their appreciation for the diversity of perspectives and commitment to dialogue, particularly in the thoughtful comments provided for the Energy Use and GHG Emissions Management Protocol. They felt the meeting was well organized, well facilitated and that there was adequate opportunity to express their interests in a safe, comfortable and inclusive environment. Several Panel members shared that they learned a lot about the mining industry and climate change and would be taking ideas back to their companies/communities. A Panel member also expressed appreciation for the international mining association guests, who bring a different perspective to the Panel’s work.

“I’m very impressed with the commitment around the table in engaging on these issues ... [it is] reassuring to see leaders pushing things forward especially on climate change. There is a lot of momentum happening here and a lot of that is coming from the corporate sector.”

The following comments were shared by Panel members on the meeting’s approach:

- Several Panel members reflected on the willingness of the Panel to continuously improve and evolve, both as individuals and as a group. This is considered one of the strengths of the Panel, i.e. its ability to examine its own processes and continuously improve.
- The expert panel was very interesting and informative.
- Most Panel members felt the break-out groups allowed for more voices to be heard, more interaction, allowed participants to discuss a particular topic more in-depth, and was overall an effective use of time.
- One the other hand, some Panel members felt that the objectives of each break-out group and how they linked to one another was not clear. The small group discussions would have benefited from more structure and guidance.
- The Panel acknowledged that climate change contains highly technical dimensions that not all members felt well prepared to contribute to. Some Panel members suggested identifying discussion questions that can draw more heavily from the knowledge and experience that the Panel members bring and/or better preparing the Panel by providing more materials or presentations in advance.
- There was some discussion on whether some break-out groups were weighted more heavily towards industry voices. One Panel member shared this concern, but several others did not feel it

was unbalanced. A guest reflected that the international mining association representatives may have affected the balance of industry and non-industry members.

Panel members also shared some reflections related to the logistics of the meeting, including:

- Both the dinner venue and meeting room would benefit from a better set-up for sound and acoustics. Some suggestions included setting up a sound system with microphones or finding a room that accommodates hearing aids in its design.
- While the coronavirus was touched on at the beginning of the meeting, there were not any explicit instructions on how to address this emerging issue within the meeting.
- The meeting agenda was followed closely, and agenda items were kept on time.

Appendix 1: List of Participants

TSM Community of Interest (COI) Advisory Panel 2020 Membership List

COI Panel Category	Name
Aboriginal people	Dan Benoit
	Theresa Baikie
	(Vacant)
Environment	Sujane Kandasamy
	Stephen Hazell
Social NGO including faith-based groups	Dennis Howlett
International development	Jocelyn Fraser
Economic / community development	Chief David Walkem
	Tim Johnston*
Finance/investment	Stephen Walker
Labour/workplace	Richard Paquin
Expert	Maya Stano
Industry representatives	Pierre Gratton
	Peter Read*; David Clarry served as alternate
	Scott Yarrow*; Amber Johnston-Billings served as alternate
	Michel Julien
	Mark Wiseman
	Alice Wong
	Josée Méthot
	Shirley Neault (Chair of TSM Initiative Leaders)

* Regrets

Additional Attendees	Organization
Guests / Observers	
Graciela Keskiskian	Cámara Argentina de Empresarios Mineros (CAEM), the national mining association in Argentina
Rocky Dimaculangan	Chamber of Mines of the Philippines
Brenda Conroy	Minerals Council of Australia
Claudia Franco de Salles Dias	Instituto Brasileiro de Mineração (IBRAM), the national mining association in Brazil
Anita Helene Hall	Norsk Bergindustri, the national mining association in Norway
Juan Camilo Nariño Alcocer	Asociación Colombiana de Minería (ACM), the national mining association in Colombia
Brendan Marshall	Mining Association of Canada
Charles Dumaresq	Mining Association of Canada
Guest Speakers	
Sean Capstick	Golder Associates
Adam Rochweg	Mantle314
Ani Markova	Capital Markets
Organizers	
Ben Chalmers	Mining Association of Canada
Katherine Gosselin	
Michael van Aanhout	Stratos
Leah Young	

Appendix 2: Meeting Objectives and Agenda

The objectives of the March 2020 meeting are to:

1. Hear the perspectives of the Panel on issues that are important to their COI and relevant to the industry.
2. Select which companies/company will undergo post-verification review for 2020 and fall meeting location options.
3. Reflect on the COI Panel’s achievements and operations over the past 3 years and consider recommendations for improvement.
4. Improve our understanding of investor expectations for mining industry action on climate change.
5. Discuss and provide direction on the review of the Energy and GHG Emissions Management Protocol.

March 2020 COI Panel Meeting Agenda	
Time	Topic
TUESDAY, MARCH 3rd 2020 Biff’s Bistro, 4 Front St. E.	
5:30 – 9:00pm	Reception and Dinner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cocktail hour (5:30-6pm) • Welcome / Introductions • Roundtable (during dinner) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stratos to provide an update on the issue tracking process following feedback received in the October 2019 meeting. ○ Panel members to introduce themselves, the perspective they represent, and share one issue that is of interest to their community of interest that they feel may be of interest to MAC / mining industry - The issues shared will be added to the 2020/21 issues tracking table
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4th 2020 Melinda Gallery, One King West	
7:30 – 8:00am	Continental Breakfast
8:00 – 8:30am	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and land acknowledgement • Brief introductory roundtable • Safety moment • Review agenda and objectives
8:30 – 9:30am	Panel Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PVR selection • October meeting location • Working Group volunteers
9:30 – 10:45am	3-Year Reflections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of input received from COI Panel • COI Panel discussion of 3-year reflections and development of recommendations

March 2020 COI Panel Meeting Agenda	
Time	Topic
10:45 – 11:00am	Break
11:00am – 12:30pm	Energy and GHG Protocol Review – Expert Panel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert panel to share their perspectives on the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) and investor expectations re: climate change management. Expert panel members include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stephen Walker, Panel member ○ Ani Markova, Capital Markets Executive ○ Sean Capstick, Principal, Golder Associates ○ Adam Rochweg, Senior Advisor, Mantle 314 • Panel Q&A and discussion following expert panel presentations
12:30 – 1:15pm	Lunch
1:15 – 4:30pm (including break)	Energy and GHG Protocol Review – Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief overview to Protocol and scope of review (to be covered in more detail during pre-meeting webinar) • Break-out group discussions on each indicator • Plenary discussion
4:30 – 5:00pm	Closing Roundtable and Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final roundtable • Meeting evaluations

Appendix 3: Acronym List

Acronym	Full Term
ACM	Asociación Colombiana de Minería
ASM	Artisanal and small-scale mining
CAEM	Cámara Argentina de Empresarios Mineros
CNRL	Canadian Natural Resources Limited
COI	Community of interest
CORE	Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise
ESG	Environmental, social and governance
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IBRAM	Instituto Brasileiro de Mineração
MAC	Mining Association of Canada
NGO	Non-government organization
PVR	Post-verification review
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TFCD	Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures
TRC	Truth and Reconciliation Commission
TSM	Towards Sustainable Mining
UN	United Nations
WGC	World Gold Council