

COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS AND PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE
Canada Nickel Company —Crawford Nickel-Cobalt Sulphide Project
3rd MEETING REPORT

MEETING INFORMATION		
DATE	June 23 rd 2022	
TIME	6:30 PM to 8:06 PM	
LOCATION	Videoconference—MICROSOFT TEAMS	
PARTICIPANTS	Members	Presence
	Monika Malherbe, Town of Cochrane	
	Richard Charlebois, Town of Iroquois Falls	✓
	Michelle Boileau, City of Timmins	
	Shannon Michaud, Town of Smooth Rock Falls	
	Jason Michaud, Cochrane Board of Trade	
	Brenda Camirand, Timmins Economic Development Corporation	✓
	Amanda Alexander, Timmins Chamber of Commerce	
	Jason Sereda, Social-Community Representative	
	Brian Marks, Cochrane District Social Planning Council	✓
CANADA NICKEL	✓ Pierre-Philippe Dupont, Vice President Sustainability ✓ Alexandra Armstrong, Community Relations & Communications Coordinator	
FACILIATION	✓ Isaac Gauthier – Facilitator – Transfer Environment and Society (TES) ✓ Anne Bélanger – Note taker – Transfer Environment and Society (TES)	
AGENDA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome and Roundtable (new members) 2. Meeting Agenda Review and Approval 3. Last meeting report (March 3rd, 2022) 4. Crawford Project Updates 5. Presentation and discussion on a proposal for Procurement policy guidelines 6. Presentation and discussion on a proposal for Contributions guidelines 7. Discussions on an application process for contributions 8. Next steps / Next meeting 9. Varia 	

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

- During the building of the contributions program, Canada Nickel should not make any exceptions and wait until it is final to evaluate contribution requests and eventually make contributions.
- The decisional matrix for short term contributions will be built and agreed upon with the Committee and Canada Nickel will then be making the decisions and reporting to the Committee at every meeting.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS

- The exclusion list of the Procurement policy should be refined, and a review mechanism provided.
- The contributions program and matrix for evaluation should consider the elements of urgency, volume (amount of people impacted) and targeted population (senior, at risk, youth) as well as give points for non profit status or partnerships, and the possibilities of stacking with funding from additional sources.
- For contributions, the number of values that guide Canada Nickel's decisions should be limited.
- There should be a maximum amount for contributions (mostly short term) and applicants should have to provide a budget for their project.
- The evaluation of short-term contributions could be a checklist of criteria or a point scoring system, whereas for legacy projects, the evaluation would be broader and more flexible.
- A maximum of two meetings per year would be reasonable for the Committee and Canada Nickel to evaluate legacy project's applications.

1. WELCOME AND ROUNDTABLE

Isaac Gauthier, the meeting facilitator, initiates the meeting and welcomes the members.

Ms. Armstrong, Canada Nickel’s Community Relations & Communications Coordinator, welcomes the participants and explains the decision to include a representative of the Town of Smooth Rock Falls to the Committee members. She mentions the representative will be Shannon Michaud, the town’s economic developer, and invites the participants to raise any concerns on the subject for discussion. No objection was raised regarding the addition of Smooth Rock Falls to the Community Contributions Committee.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 1	A participant mentions that it is a good decision to add the Town of Smooth Rock Falls.	
Q & I 2	Mr. Gauthier asks what elements made it more evident that Smooth Rock Falls needed to be part of the Committee.	Ms. Armstrong answers that the Canada Nickel team is getting to know the region better and with the possible water discharge location being the Mattagami, where Smooth Rock Falls takes its water, it became necessary to add them to the Committee.

2. MEETING AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Mr. Gauthier presents the meeting’s agenda.

The meeting agenda is approved.

3. CRAWFORD PROJECT UPDATES

Ms. Armstrong presents the Crawford project updates:

- Ongoing drilling at Crawford and Regional Properties with positive results;
- Initial Project Description (IPD) meetings completed in May with 14 stakeholder meetings, 2 public meetings and 4 Indigenous meetings;
- New human relations manager hired; the individual is from Iroquois Falls but based in the Timmins office;
- Attendance at the Canadian Mining Expo and PDAC.

No questions or comments are raised.

4. PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION: PROPOSAL FOR PROCUREMENT POLICY GUIDELINES

Ms. Armstrong summarize the proposal of preliminary procurement policy:

- Emphasis placed on local procurement;
- Some reasonable accommodations can be made for local suppliers;

- The policy applies for the exploration, permitting and development phases of the Crawford Project. Afterwards the policy would need to be reevaluated;
- A higher priority is given to Indigenous owned and operated companies;
- Two definitions of a local company will apply, dividing the evaluation in two tiers and constituting the framework to define what is considered local and should be reasonably prioritized. The first tier is focused on the Cochrane District and the second tier on the Abitibi and Northeastern Ontario regions;
- There are a few exclusions from the policy, such as:
 - Goods and services of a proprietary or highly specialized nature;
 - Goods and services for which the reputation of the providing company is a key component in the validity and qualification of the good or service rendered;
 - Low value ad-hoc requirements, where the costs and timing associated with processing and delivery of orders is likely to be prohibitive for Local Companies; and;
 - Emergency operational, safety, or environmental issues.

Mr. Gauthier mentions to the participants that the policy isn't final, and they can share thoughts, comments, and suggestions to improve it.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 3	<p>A participant mentions that the essence of the previous Committee meeting conversations on the subject has been captured. The two-tiered option is appreciated.</p> <p>The participant further mentions that Canada Nickel is a business that must continue to operate, financially speaking, so the main request would be to make reasonable efforts to go towards Tier 1 and eventually Tier 2 if necessary. Ontario is preferred but adding Abitibi in Quebec is understandable.</p>	
Q & I 4	<p>A participant agrees with the comment and adds that there might be a bit of work to do on the exclusions list especially on wording the reputational aspect and other qualitative items.</p>	<p>Mr. Gauthier asks if the participant has any suggestions for the qualitative part of the exclusions.</p>
Q & I 5	<p>The participant answers that for now no suggestions come to mind but that it needs to be thought of as something that can be challenged by different perspectives. There are elements that</p>	

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
	<p>cannot be prepared for, but the wording can be worked on to limit the frustration of some potential suppliers.</p> <p>The more specific, the better.</p>	
Q & I 6	<p>A participant mentions that no matter how specific the exclusions list gets, there are always going to be people to question it or disagree. Understandably all want to be a chosen supplier, but there needs to be limitations for the core business to operate.</p>	
Q & I 7	<p>A participant mentions that it is a good start for a procurement policy and that it can't please everybody all the time, but room could be kept for occasional review and fine tuning of the criteria.</p>	<p>Mr. Gauthier mentions that it is interesting to create spaces for review and fine tuning of the criteria and asks the members if they have suggestions to do so.</p>
Q & I 8	<p>A participant suggests that there could be a greater frequency for review at the beginning of the policy's launch, for example, quarterly. When things are more finely tuned, frequency could lessen. There are obstacles that will happen initially which will help in bettering the policy.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong mentions appreciating the comments and input.</p>
Q & I 9		<p>Mr. Dupont mentions that he is working on a form sent by an institutional investor regarding ESG criteria. A requirement for the social aspect includes considerations for donations and sponsorship of local communities which is interesting to share because it shows on what Canada Nickel is evaluated by some investors. It isn't the majority yet that is asking for those criteria, but it is starting to be more common.</p> <p>Mr. Gauthier concurs with Mr. Dupont and mentions that it is more and more seen with other projects and that even if it isn't the majority yet, it is a clear trend.</p>

5. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON A PROPOSAL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS GUIDELINES

Ms. Armstrong explains that contrary to the procurement policy, for which the final guidelines are almost done, there is still work to be done on the contributions guidelines.

She presents the definition of local for contributions which includes the four communities most directly affected by the project. Ms. Armstrong invites the participants to identify if there are missing communities from the list. No additional communities are mentioned by committee members.

Ms. Armstrong explains that there are two separate programs, one for short term smaller contributions and one for legacy projects, which require more time and budget. For the contributions program, two exclusions are listed: religious or political programs/organizations/projects.

SHORT TERM CONTRIBUTIONS

Ms. Armstrong presents the main elements of the proposed short-term contributions program, directed mainly for events and programs of lesser monetary value which are chosen based on a pre-set list of values as criteria. She mentions that Canada Nickel hasn't firmly decided on any values yet for contributions because they are to be evaluated with the Committee. Of note, contributions values can be different from company values.

A list of values is presented to the members, and they are asked to add any that might be missing, to prioritize some if necessary, and to provide any other comments or suggestions on the matter.

Ms. Armstrong then presents the desired discussion to have with the Committee on methodology for the short-term contribution's applications. She asks the members if there should be an evaluation chart that considers the main values for contributions and, if so, how many values should be considered. It is also asked to discuss if there should be a hard cap on funding and/or a goal on the number of projects to contribute to each year.

The application process will need to be discussed as well to determine the values on which the decision would be based, the method of evaluating and accepting proposals, etc.

LEGACY PROJECTS

Ms. Armstrong presents the legacy projects program, which would concern larger budget projects that are meant to move the needle on specific topics or issues in the communities. Contributions would be based on existing and/or potential challenges in the community that may be triggered or amplified by the development and operation of the project. Those challenges could be related to healthcare, education, social programs and/or services, and the environment. The decision on which challenges to focus on is a discussion Canada Nickel wishes to have with the Committee.

She then presents the elements to be discussed on the methodology applied to the legacy projects program, including the frequency or length of contributions, for example, having multi-year or single year contributions. Options include having a call for proposals every year to evaluate submitted projects or projects being evaluated as they come in. The applications process could include more dense and extensive application form explaining the project and the stage of progress.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 10	<p>A participant suggests that the short-term contributions program could include an element of urgency at the time of application, for example the opioid crisis, the aging population, etc. The urgency can be particular to one or multiple municipalities. It can then become a weighing factor making sure that the contributions align with urgency, local priority or necessity and could even emanate from community plans.</p>	<p>Mr. Gauthier asks the participant if the proposal could be applicable for both for the short term or legacy program.</p>
Q & I 11	<p>The participant answers that it could be applicable to both depending on the scale of what is asked for. An example would be housing that would fall into the long-term contributions. It could also be as small as contributing to a soup kitchen in the community which would be more immediate and therefore fall into the short-term contributions.</p>	
Q & I 12	<p>A participant mentions that for the legacy program, it would be interesting to see where there is an overlap. For example, about acute shortage of workforce, Iroquois Falls and Cochrane are working together for a recruitment committee that would include some staff needed to be paid for two or three years. In this case, it could help two or three communities at the same time.</p> <p>The question is, would that be considered in short term or legacy projects.</p>	
Q & I 13	<p>A participant suggests that an exclusion be made for profit companies. That doesn't mean they wouldn't have decent proposals, but it would need to be thought about if they should or not be able to apply for contributions.</p>	<p>Mr. Dupont asks if the comment is meant for legacy or short-term projects.</p>

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 14	A participant comments that there could be possibilities for profit organisations to apply if they have non-profit partners.	
Q & I 15	A participant mentions that normally these types of programs are for non-profits. If there are private demands, it is required to have a non-profit in the application. The participant mentions it can be a good solution to still give the opportunity to for-profit organizations to apply, but in collaboration with non-profits.	Mr. Dupont mentions that he agrees with the first suggestion, while keeping it open and making sure that the statement follows the contribution objectives.
Q & I 16	A participant proposes that an evaluation matrix for applications could include more points for non-profit sectors. That will still give a chance to for-profit sector applications if they have a very good project ticking other boxes and accumulating enough points.	Mr. Gauthier mentions there seems to be a consensus on the idea to award points extra to non-profit applications.
Q & I 17		Mr. Dupont mentions having seen that for legacy projects there is one or two calls for applications per year and a committee evaluating the project. He mentions being curious on what is suggested by the Committee regarding short-term smaller contributions. He explains that there is a desire for the Committee to be involved in the decisions for the short-term contributions, but it could be a challenge considering that the demands are usually for an event or situation that is happening shortly.
Q & I 18	A participant asks what the process in place now is.	Mr. Dupont answers that every demand received by Canada Nickel is being told that there is no process in place yet and the committee is working on that.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 19	A participant mentions that until an application process is in place, demands will come and be last minute. When there is a process decided upon, it will orient the way and timeline applications are received.	Mr. Dupont mentions that for short term it might be harder to bring applications to be more in advance. For legacy project it is easier to imagine. He further mentions that a legacy committee could itself generate projects for legacy.
Q & I 20		Mr. Gauthier asks the participant if what was meant is that when a process is in place, the community adapts to it and follows the steps.
Q & I 21	The participant answers that it is the case and mentions that when a process is in place, Canada Nickel must stick to it and make no exceptions. The process becomes the tool and if there is an exception, the word gets out. The process can be changed for future years and evolve, but it cannot allow permit exceptions.	
Q & I 22	A participant mentions that the process will be facing challenges, some people will miss deadlines, but they will learn and build the capacity within their organization to meet the process' requirements. Organizations need to learn the process to apply for funding and manage it. It is suggested to have a quarterly or a meeting every second month for evaluation of applications. Management of multiple applications will need to be put in place because if one organization receives funding, there will be a lot of others in the same field asking for the same thing. Canada Nickel will then need to answer questions asking why one similar organization was supported and not the other.	Mr. Gauthier mentions that there seems to be a consensus on having a clear process and that the community will, in time, adapt to it. He asks if there are other values than the ones presented on the list that should be prioritized, other than the urgency criteria already mentioned. There could also be a matrix with all the values and points are appointed depending on the number of values concerned by the project.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
	It will be necessary to have a process in place to re-evaluate the application process and give time for adaptation at the beginning. Organizations missing one deadline will be able to apply to the next one.	
Q & I 23		Ms. Armstrong asks if Canada Nickel should identify specific values to be narrowed down in the matrix and if the guidelines should be the same year after year.
Q & I 24	A participant mentions that some of the values could be in the matrix, but Canada Nickel should avoid adding all of them, as it would make everything and everyone eligible. The idea is to favor quality over quantity.	
Q & I 25	A participant mentions that the aim is to have a transparent and clear process. There could still be criteria that are not public such as not investing in projects that are not aligned with corporate values. That is to make sure that Canada Nickel gets good value for its money.	Mr. Dupont asks the participants about their view on the importance of visibility. He mentions that visibility could be a criterion in the matrix but wonders if it should be important for Canada Nickel. His perception is that if Canada Nickel's initiatives and have a positive impact in the community, the company will have automatic visibility.
Q & I 26	A participant mentions that perhaps not every donation needs to give direct visibility. They mention that through word of mouth, visibility will spread.	Mr. Dupont mentions that visibility could be one of the values and part of the matrix, but with a score that wouldn't necessarily be high. Applicants could fill out a form that would ask to explain the visibility Canada Nickel would gain through its contribution. The Committee can choose the weight given to each criterion in the matrix.
Q & I 27	A participant mentions that whether Canada Nickel wants to be visible is up to the company. Some significant donors sometimes ask for anonymity. In the end it is up to Canada Nickel to decide.	Mr. Gauthier mentions that this topic could be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 28	A participant agrees and adds that larger public events should provide some level of recognition, but other donations could be anonymous.	Ms. Armstrong mentions that in her experience, word can spread fast in the community, and it is not necessarily about anonymity, but more about not publicising every donation. She adds that it's a plus if the name is publicised, but it is not the initial goal or aim of the contributions.
Q & I 29	A participant mentions that anonymity isn't misleading, it is more of not necessarily wanting the recognition. An example is a company that wanted to make sure the asset stayed in the community but without the associated public recognition.	
Q & I 30	A participant asks if the budget for the short-term contributions would be a fixed amount or if they would depend on the projects.	Mr. Dupont answers that because of the small size of the company, Canada Nickel will make a yearly budget that will grow as the company does. The budget hasn't been accepted yet but will be related to the project's capacity. The question about having a percentage going to short term or legacy could be answered by not having a hard fixed budget but by considering that the legacy projects need to be relevant and will therefore require more funds. A potential budget distribution could be around 75% for legacy projects and 25% for short term projects.
Q & I 31	A participant asks if the whole annual envelope will be capped at a certain amount.	Mr. Dupont answers that it will be capped but the way it is attributed could be flexible. He gives the example of the impact study that could identify housing as a significant issue for which it will be important to plan mitigation measures. Contributions could go towards this issue and a more significant amount could be attributed to such related projects. In that case, many ideas can be explored such as using a two-year budget to one specific project and making sure it happens.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 32	Mr. Gauthier asks if the vision is to use contributions as a vehicle for specific mitigation measures but looking for a long-term fixed amount.	Ms. Armstrong answers that the idea would be to keep the numbers private but share them with the committee because the budget could change every year. The values underlying the contributions would stay but the amounts and distributions could change and be more flexible by not being public.
Q & I 33	A participant mentions that something to consider, especially for legacy projects and somewhat for short terms ones, is stacking. For various projects, the applicants will be asking for contributions elsewhere and therefore it would be important to consider funding stacking and the fact that Canada Nickel shouldn't and won't be the sole contributor to local projects.	
Q & I 34	A participant suggests adding a target population for the contributions such as senior, at-risk populations or youth.	Mr. Dupont answers that the impact assessment has a Gender Based Analysis (GBA+) criteria and therefore Canada Nickel will receive data from the nearby communities in the next year which could constitute a good basis to orient decisions on that specific topic. Ms. Armstrong likes the proposal, especially for short-term contributions, as a criterion to be considered.
Q & I 35	A participant mentions that there are many funds available and for some projects, Canada Nickel isn't the best avenue. It happens that funds are only used to apply for other funding pots. The participant also suggests that there should be a maximum amount an applicant can receive, to ensure they obtain other funding sources for their project. They add that some applicants will ask for the full amount even if it isn't what they truly need.	Mr. Dupont appreciates the feedback and the insights behind it.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 36	A participant concurs and explains that some applicant can ask for a certain amount and because the committee members know that other funds are available, the committee can award funds accordingly.	
Q & I 37	A participant suggests asking applicants to provide a budget for their project.	
Q & I 38	A participant adds that the idea behind asking for a budget is not to discredit the applicants, but to see if other funds can also contribute to the project.	Mr. Gauthier summarizes the interventions and asks if the ideas shared suggest having a hard cap for funding per project and having criteria for the kind of positive impacts Canada Nickel's contributions will have, including for populations that would most benefit from the support.
Q & I 39	A participant mentions that it is part of the idea, but it shouldn't preclude consideration for volume where many people are impacted.	Mr. Gauthier suggests that the Committee meet and goes through applications and depending on the number of values that are met, the Committee can decide.
Q & I 40		Mr. Dupont mentions that there would probably be a fixed amount for short-term projects with a matrix and criteria that discriminate between projects and that it could happen that not all the funding is spent in one year. He adds that the idea behind a committee is to get feedback from people that are knowledgeable about the region and to leverage the funds, whatever the amount is, to have an impact.
Q & I 41	A participant adds that the benefit of using the committee is also that each member has their own expertise, which allows different views to balance decisions. The participant then mentions that it makes it very positive to have the committee reviewing the applications.	Ms. Armstrong asks if the focus should be on one or two legacy projects over a few years or if it should be many projects and decisions are taken when applications come in.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 42	<p>A participant answers that it would depend on the applications coming in considering one year there could be none and the next, three or four.</p> <p>Because the legacy projects will be larger, some background verifications may be needed, and the project may not meet requirements at first intake.</p> <p>They suggest that it would be premature to commit to a number at this stage. They suggest that the committee uses the evaluation process to assess what projects makes sense.</p>	<p>Mr. Gauthier asks the Committee if they believe there is a relevance for two meetings per year regarding applications and evaluations of the process put in place.</p>
Q & I 43	<p>A participant answers that twice a year is probably best considering some projects necessitate more planning and won't be ready for the first half of the year. They add that over the years, as organizations get use to the process, there might be less of a need to meet twice a year, but more on a necessity basis.</p>	<p>Mr. Gauthier asks if the idea is to have two intake periods per year, but one yearly funding round.</p>
Q & I 44	<p>A participant answers that it depends on the project because for example housing won't be solved in one year. It probably would be a multi year project, depending on the different applications. The final decision would belong to the Committee and Canada Nickel.</p>	<p>Mr. Gauthier mentions that there seems to be a consensus on the need to have a flexible process, but that there would be two meetings per year on the subject with the Committee.</p>
Q & I 45	<p>A participant suggests that for legacy projects, there will need to have more considerations and a broader evaluation whereas for short-term projects it would be more of a checklist.</p>	
Q & I 46	<p>A participant mentions thinking about the evaluation rhythm saying that meeting a couple times a year is a good idea.</p> <p>They mention that the most important part is building the process and giving</p>	<p>Mr. Dupont mentions that for short-term projects, the idea isn't to have the Committee meet on a monthly basis to evaluate projects, especially if there is a low turnout like tonight.</p>

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
	<p>sufficient time and effort to identify the criteria that would help evaluate applications. This solution would be best instead of working on proposals on an extended period of time.</p>	<p>There could rather be twice a year meetings for legacy projects and a report made to the Committee for the short-term projects so the members can comment and suggest future changes or adjustments. That would mean there would be an established structure for short-term projects and Canada Nickel would be the one making decisions.</p> <p>He then asks the Committee if they agree with this way of moving forward.</p>
<p>Q & I 47</p>	<p>A participant agrees with the proposal.</p>	<p>Mr. Dupont recaps the proposal being that the Committee would be responsible to build the decision matrix. For short-term projects, Canada Nickel would make the decisions per the matrix and report to the Committee. The Committee would then have the opportunity to comment and propose adjustments. For the legacy projects, the Committee would meet twice a year to evaluate and decide which projects are funded by Canada Nickel.</p>
<p>Q & I 48</p>	<p>A participant agrees with the proposal and mentions that for short-term projects, the matrix should allow Canada Nickel to make decisions on its own. They add that certain applications may benefit from the committee's feedback. In such a case, an email outreach by Canada Nickel to the committee should be enough.</p> <p>For the legacy projects, the assessments will require more work and there might be only one project or even none in a given year. There could also be situations where one project takes the whole budget. It will be a case-by-case evaluation and calls for application should reflect that. There shouldn't be any hard decision on how many calls for proposal should be done per year.</p>	

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 49	A participant mentions that it sounds reasonable to prevent the committee members from being overwhelmed with work. The Committee is an opportunity for Canada Nickel to consult with community partners.	

6. DISCUSSIONS ON AN APPLICATION PROCESS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Ms. Armstrong mentions that the topic was addressed during previous discussions.

Mr. Gauthier adds that Committee members could make proposals for projects to be evaluated.

7. NEXT STEPS / NEXT MEETING

Ms. Armstrong presents the next steps for the Committee:

- The meeting report will be sent out when ready along with the procurement policy for the members to be able to read the full document;
- A contributions guidelines draft will be prepared and sent out to the members in order to have discussions on it during the next meeting;
- A reach out to absent members will be made to confirm their interest and make sure that the attendance will be better at the next meeting;
- An Environmental Impacts Committee will be created in the Fall, a Labour and Training Committee as well, later in the year and possibly in early 2023.

She invites the members to start thinking about the 2022 contributions and how Canada Nickel should manage them, considering the process isn't final yet. Either contributions can be made before the final guidelines are decided or the program could be launched only when the guidelines are completed.

Mr. Gauthier adds that Canada Nickel's engagement process will be continue during the fall as the project moves further in the federal Impact Assessment Process.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 50	A participant mentions that the Cochrane District Social Services Administration Board could provide a member from its employment department for the Labour and Training Committee.	

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 51	Mr. Gauthier asks about what timeline would suit the members for the next meeting.	Mr. Dupont mentions not being comfortable with the attendance of the Committee and suggest that the interest of other participants be verified before deciding on the next meeting's date. He suggests that the next meeting could be held during the month of October.
Q & I 52	<p>A participant mentions that there will be municipal elections in October, and it is an important month for business.</p> <p>The first week of November is rather proposed.</p>	<p>Mr. Dupont answers that having the meeting in November gives plenty of time to work on a preliminary matrix for contributions.</p> <p>Ms. Armstrong concurs with Mr. Dupont and mentions that there will be a more established document for contributions by next meeting and that it will be shared to the members in advance, to get right into the conversation at the next meeting.</p>

8. VARIA

Mr. Gauthier, Ms. Armstrong, and Mr. Dupont thanks the members for their participation.

The meeting ends at 8:06 PM.

APPENDIX I PRESENTATION