

COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS AND PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE
Canada Nickel Company —Crawford Nickel-Cobalt Sulphide Project
4th MEETING REPORT

MEETING INFORMATION		
DATE	November 8 th 2022	
TIME	2:00 PM to 3:20 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	✓
	Joel Ahrens, Timmins Chamber of Commerce	✓
	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. Approval – Previous Meeting Report (June 2022) 4. Crawford Project Updates 5. Presentation and discussion on a proposal for Contributions Guidelines 6. Discussion on 2023 meeting formats 7. Next steps / Next meeting 8. Varia 	

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

CANADA NICKEL DECISIONS

- Clarify in the legacy contributions' guidelines that the maximum contribution amount of up to 75% of the budget refers to Canada Nickel's contributions to a project.
- Change the application schedule for legacy contributions to a date in May or June of each year.
- Clarify the eligible expenses for salaries in the legacy projects program.
- Correct the application schedules so the dates respect the calendar (30th vs 31st of the month)

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS

SHORT-TERM CONTRIBUTIONS

- Instead of asking applicants to provide a full budget when filling out the application form, require general budget information in the official application and request more details further into the assessment process.
- Review the short-term capped amount of \$5,000 as the contribution program evolves.
- Require a minimal amount for short-term contributions submissions such as \$1,000.
- Require groups or organizations to resubmit a new application at each new round of applications.
- Clarify if there would be a capped amount for each group asking for contributions, if the same group submits more than one application per year.
- Evaluate the possibility to send refusal letters explaining why an application was rejected.
- Evaluate the possibility to require information on other funders that are contributing to a project and if the amounts of funding should be disclosed in the application to Canada Nickel's program even for the short-term contributions program.
- Evaluate the possibility to reject an application if other contributors have activities or values that do not align with Canada Nickel.
- Evaluate the possibility to require project reporting for short-term contributions, especially for groups that apply more than once for the same project.
- Consider the usage of an excel template to facilitate applications.
- Regarding the evaluation criteria, the most important one is the urgent need aspect followed by the relevance to vulnerable populations.
- Evaluate the possibility to remove the criteria of "quality of application" and "relevance to funding guidelines" for the assessment of short-term contributions.
- Provide examples of how the non-compliance rule would be used.

LEGACY PROJECTS CONTRIBUTIONS

- Consider the usage of an excel template to facilitate applications.

OUTREACH

- Consider reaching out to various local economic boards and committees (i.e., Chamber of commerce) to help improve the contribution program's outreach.
- Consider advertising on social media platforms since many non-profit organizations have a Facebook.

- Consider using traditional media such as radio and television.

1. WELCOME AND ROUNDTABLE

Isaac Gauthier, the meeting facilitator, initiates the meeting and welcomes the members, inviting each member to introduce themselves, considering that there are new members on the committee.

2. MEETING AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Mr. Gauthier presents the meeting's agenda. The meeting agenda is approved.

3. APPROVAL – PREVIOUS MEETING REPORT (JUNE 2022)

Mr. Gauthier asks the members if there are comments on the last meeting report.

No comments or questions, the meeting report is approved.

4. CRAWFORD PROJECT UPDATES

Ms. Armstrong presents the Crawford project updates:

- The Feasibility study is progressing well. It is scheduled to be completed around the end of 2022. The document will include additional project details and technical information.
- The federal Impact Assessment Process was initiated in the summer of 2022 with the submission of the *Initial Project Description* followed by a *Summary of Issues* sent by the Agency. Canada Nickel is currently working on the next documents, the *Detailed Project Description (DPD)* and the *Response to the Summary of Issues*, which is scheduled to be completed in December 2022.
- The next round of engagement meetings will integrate both the Feasibility Study and the DPD and will be an overall project update.
- Following the Committee's comments, the Procurement Policy has been finalized and published on Canada Nickel's website.
- Canada Nickel has hired an Office Administrator.

No questions or comments are raised.

5. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON A PROPOSAL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS GUIDELINES

Ms. Armstrong shares the proposed contributions' guidelines and adds that significant effort was put into including all of Committee's input. She mentions that the meeting's objective is to discuss the content of the documents that were previously sent to the members and not to review the documents extensively.

She further presents the goal of the contribution program, the proposed exclusion list and the guidelines review period. Ms. Armstrong explains that there is a separate program and budget for Indigenous communities not covered in these contributions.

Short-term Contributions

Ms. Armstrong explains that the short-term budget range is capped at \$5,000 and the projects must be completed within one year of receiving the funding. She asks the committee if it would be relevant to reserve the possibility for higher contributions than the fixed amount.

She then presents the application schedule and form. Regarding the application form, Ms. Armstrong asks the committee if flexibility for the evaluation of applications would be appropriate therefore giving Canada Nickel the opportunity to also require more information from applicants during the review period.

Ms. Armstrong then shares the evaluation matrix for the short-term contributions program and explains that the aim is to prioritise and weigh the categories by order of importance. She then asks the members for their opinions and suggestions on this topic.

She further mentions that the full evaluation matrix will not be shared, other than the listed criteria, to prevent a situation where committee members would have privileged information over other applicants.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
EXCLUSION LIST		
Q & I 1	A member mentions having tried to find missing gaps in the exclusion list but it seems to cover all the essentials. They point out that the item about excluding organizations with a concerning mission or financial situation covers potential gray areas.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their comment.
Q & I 2	A member concurs adding that it protects the alignment with Canada Nickel’s values and that it is similar to other contributions programs they have seen.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their comment.
SHORT TERM CONTRIBUTIONS - APPLICABILITY		
Q & I 3	<p>A member explains that, in their experience, many groups apply for contributions at the last minute, which may discourage them if they must submit a full budget early in the application process. Having a clear budget so early in a funding process can be a challenge for certain groups.</p> <p>They add there will be a period for applicants to become familiar with the process.</p>	Ms. Armstrong asks the committee if they have suggestions that would allow Canada Nickel sufficient time to weigh all applications, without precluding groups with legitimate needs to apply.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 4	A member mentions that groups with the intent to submit for contributions should be able to provide early on a general budget, depending on the group's organisation and resources. Further details could be provided at a later date.	Ms. Armstrong agrees that certain details could be submitted later.
Q & I 5	A member agrees with the previous suggestion, stating that a general budget could be required early in the application process, with more details or documents submitted later without any penalty in their application.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the participant for the comment.
Q & I 6	A member mentions that the \$5,000 cap could lead to a large number of small applications. Although it is a good place to start, they suggest that the amount be reviewed to a higher one as the program evolves. The member also suggests requiring a minimum amount, such as \$1,000.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their suggestions.
Q & I 7	A member explains that a group should be required to submit a new application at each application round if their previous application was denied, to avoid having Canada Nickel go through the administrative process of finding the old application and reassessing it.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their suggestions.
Q & I 8	A member asks if it would be possible for a group to apply every quarter.	Mr. Gauthier mentions that Canada Nickel should try to avoid having repeat requests for short-term contributions be a pathway for applicants to obtain the equivalent of legacy project funding.
Q & I 9	A member suggests including language in the guidelines that allow Canada Nickel the right to evaluate more than one contribution request per year by a same group.	Ms. Armstrong answers that it would depend on the total amount and type of requests received during each application period. She proposes that resubmissions be allowed if an application is denied and that a capped amount for each group be provided even if

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
		<p>more than one contribution is made throughout the year.</p> <p>Mr. Gauthier asks the members if the possibility of a case-by-case evaluation for applications over the \$5,000 cap should be in the guidelines, as was asked by Ms. Armstrong when introducing the guidelines.</p>
Q & I 10	<p>A member answers Mr. Gauthier’s question by saying it might be problematic to include it in the guidelines, as it will likely lead to larger upfront demands. They add that Canada Nickel will receive details on a project’s budget through the application process and could then see if there is a need for a larger contribution. A conversation could then be had with the group.</p> <p>The member also mentions that a group could want to apply on different projects they are leading. An organization could therefore want to apply several times.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their feedback.</p>
Q & I 11	<p>A member asks if there was a discussion about sending refusal letters explaining why an application was rejected. Such letters could allow groups to modify their application to meet the required criteria instead of reapplying with the same missing elements.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong mentions it is an interesting idea adding that it will depend on the number of applications received. She does agree that it could prevent from having to repeatedly reject the same project.</p>
Q & I 12	<p>A member mentions that the review process of the program will be key in seeing if it works and addressing any missing elements or recurrent issues.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong agrees with the member’s comment.</p>
SHORT TERM CONTRIBUTIONS – APPLICATION FORM REVIEW		

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 13	<p>A member mentions that information on stacking (where groups have more than one organization that is providing funds to a project) should also be requested for short-term contributions.</p> <p>The member explains the term (see above) and mentions that such information could help protect Canada Nickel from contributing alongside entities they do not want to associate with or who are competitors.</p>	<p>Mr. Gauthier asks for clarification as to what the term stacking refers to.</p>
Q & I 14	<p>Another member mentions that the guidelines for legacy projects require applicants to disclose other sources of funding and that this requirement should also be considered for short term contributions, as Canada Nickel may not want to contribute to projects alongside some other entities.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong explains that the intention behind this specific guideline was to prevent groups asking solely Canada Nickel for the full funding amount needed for a project. She mentions that a provision could be added to allow Canada Nickel to reject an application if some of the other contributors have activities that do not align with Canada Nickel's values.</p>
Q & I 15	<p>A member asks if Canada Nickel would require full disclosure of all the other funders in the application, adding there could be situations where Canada Nickel's logo is alongside a competitor's logo.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong answers that it wouldn't be a problem to contribute to projects alongside competitors. The core issue would be to prevent situations where Canada Nickel doesn't want to be associated with an organization that has different values. She further adds that the requirement could be to solely provide the names of the groups and organizations contributing to the project without the funding amounts.</p>
Q & I 16	<p>A member mentions that it is common for applicants to disclose their funding when applying for new funding.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for the information.</p>
Q & I 17	<p>A member asks if for profit organizations are eligible.</p>	<p>Ms. Armstrong answers that they are but there is a preference if they associate with non-profit partners.</p>
Q & I 18		<p>Mr. Gauthier mentions that there may be situations where a group will receive more funding than what they need for a project. To</p>

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
		avoid such a case, funding amounts from other partners would need to be disclosed.
Q & I 19	A member adds that there could also be a necessity for after event reporting to see the final status of funding.	Ms. Armstrong mentions there is a reporting requirement for legacy projects but not necessarily for short term projects, as this would require more administrative work. She mentions that a simpler reporting process could be required.
Q & I 20	A member mentions it would be relevant for groups who repeatedly apply for funding.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their suggestion.
Q & I 21	A member suggests it is an important administrative task to follow up on short term projects reporting and Canada Nickel should consider its willingness to include that into the short-term program. Nonetheless, the member mentions it might be pertinent for organizations and groups applying regularly.	
Q & I 22	A member suggests that Canada Nickel prepares an accompanying excel budget template with the application process. This would save Canada Nickel from adding language in the guidelines to cover the topics mentioned in the discussion. It would also bring uniformity to the application process and feed the reporting phase as well.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the members for their input on the topic.
SHORT TERM CONTRIBUTIONS – EVALUATION PROCESS		
Q & I 23	Regarding the assessment criteria for short-term contributions, a member mentions that the urgent need criteria stands out as the most important.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their input.
Q & I 24	A member agrees that the urgent need criteria is the most important, the second one being the relevance to vulnerable populations. On the other hand, some projects could be relevant to support without concerning	Ms. Armstrong asks the members if they believe any criteria are missing or if the provided ones are comprehensive enough. No comments are shared.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
	vulnerable population groups. The member further mentions that the other criteria seem to be of equal importance after the two most significant.	
Q & I 25	A member suggests that the criteria for the quality of applications could lead to situations where contributions favour organizations that have more resources, but are not necessarily to most deserving of support.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their input.
Q & I 26	A member suggests that the criteria on the “relevance to funding guidelines” should either refer to definitions clearly identified or be removed.	

Legacy Contributions

Ms. Armstrong explains that there is no specified cap provided for legacy contributions, the minimal amount being \$5,000, since Canada Nickel is still a junior company with an evolving budget. She mentions that the objective is to target bigger projects that focus on healthcare, education, social needs, or environmental considerations, for example scholarship requests or housing development projects.

She mentions wanting to discuss the legacy contributions application schedule with the members.

Ms. Armstrong shares the list of eligible expenses. She mentions that for now, projects with budgets of less than \$30,000 could receive contributions up to 75% of their total budget and for projects with budgets over \$30,000, Canada Nickel could contribute up to 50% of the total budget. Ms. Armstrong further adds that language could be added to the guidelines to reflect that these percentages and contribution amounts could change over the contribution program’s lifetime.

She also presents the different instances of non-compliance and asks the members for their comments and suggestions on this topic.

Ms. Armstrong shares details about the application and assessment processes for legacy contributions, mentioning that the program is likely too broad and flexible to be suited for an evaluation matrix. She adds that an inhouse committee will be reviewing the assessments and making the decisions. She expects that in certain instances, applications will be discussed with the Contribution Committee. She adds that the legacy contribution program will be broader and will require more detailed information than the short-term contribution program.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 27	A member asks if a maximum contribution of 75% of a project's funding means that Canada Nickel could provide up to a maximum of 75% of the required funding or if it means that all contributions received by various funders should top at 75%.	Ms. Armstrong mentions that the wording will be clarified in the guidelines to represent that Canada Nickel could indeed provide up to 75% of a project's funding.
Q & I 28	A member asks if there is a provision in the guidelines for situations where a project would get overfunded.	Ms. Armstrong asks the members if a similar situation has occurred in their line of work and how it was handled. No feedback was shared.
Q & I 29	Regarding the legacy contribution program's launch, a member mentions that if the program is launched in 2024, reminders will be required over the next year to inform groups and organizations.	Mr. Gauthier asks the members if there would be a reason to launch the contribution program a few months later in 2023 than January, and then use January 31 st as the launch schedule for 2024.
Q & I 30	A member mentions that Canada Nickel would not get quality applications if the program is launched on January 31 st this year as the timeline is too short.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the participant for their feedback.
Q & I 31	A member asks if the schedule could instead consider applications received during the fall, to ensure funding is received at the beginning of the calendar year.	Ms. Armstrong agrees it is a good idea to allocate contributions at the beginning of the calendar year instead of mid-year. She adds that receiving applications by mid-year could allow Canada Nickel to fund programs in early 2024. That way groups and organizations would have enough warning and time to prepare. Ms. Armstrong then mentions that the January 31 st date could be changed to either May or June of each year.
Q & I 32	A member mentions that with contributions allocated at the beginning of the calendar year, it would allow organizations time to balance their yearly budget.	Ms. Armstrong agrees with the statement. It is generally agreed upon that the first call for applications will occur mid-year 2023 with funding allocated at the start of 2024.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 33	Regarding the list of eligible expenses, a member asks if a project's incremental wages would be covered.	Ms. Armstrong answers that the funding could help pay the salary of someone dedicated to the project.
Q & I 34	A member mentions that there could be situations where someone works 10% of their time on a funded project and asks if in that case Canada Nickel would want to pay for the other 90%.	Ms. Armstrong answers that Canada Nickel will assess this question and adjust the guidelines accordingly. She then asks what the members think if salaries are removed as eligible expenses.
Q & I 35	A member explains that in some situations having funding for the project but not for the salaries of those who manage it would not be beneficial. They mention that it is a good idea to provide for project related salaries.	Ms. Armstrong concludes that the thing to do will be to make clear what are eligible salaries to cover those situations.
Q & I 36	A member adds that the type of fees Canada Nickel is willing to contribute to, such as salaries and benefits directly related to the project's implementation, should also be clarified, to ensure that Canada Nickel is not only paying for administrative fees.	Ms. Armstrong acknowledges the comment.
Q & I 37	Regarding the non-compliance section, a member mentions that they agree with the language, adding that it should be clear how the non-compliance rule will be used.	Ms. Armstrong agrees with the comment. Mr. Gauthier mentions that Canada Nickel is planning a review process to ensure the guidelines are well adapted. For the first two years, the guidelines are to be reviewed twice per year, and then yearly every following year. Therefore, there will be opportunities to adjust the guidelines accordingly.
Q & I 38	A member suggests, as per the short-term application process, that Canada Nickel provides an excel template to applicants that will clarify the scope of what is needed in the submission process.	Ms. Armstrong acknowledges the comment.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 39	A member mentions that the legacy contribution program should be reassessed regularly.	Ms. Armstrong reiterates that the assessment process for legacy contributions will be reviewed twice per year during the first two years. She also invites the committee members to share any comments or feedback from their communities when the program is launched, and when groups begin applying for contributions.

6. DISCUSSION ON 2023 MEETING FORMATS

Ms. Armstrong presents the remaining steps to launch the contributions program. She mentions that Canada Nickel is hoping to share the contribution guidelines by the end of the month. She mentions that the documents will be added to the website and mentioned in the December newsletter.

She asks the members to share ideas as to how Canada Nickel can ensure maximum outreach for its program.

Mr. Gauthier suggests that all members share the link to the website within their communities and respective network.

QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS		ANSWERS
Q & I 40	A member mentions that Canada Nickel could reach out to the various chambers of commerce and advertise on social media platforms because many non-profit organizations have Facebook pages.	Ms. Armstrong agrees with both comments.
Q & I 41	A member suggests that former applicants be sent emails to inform them of the contribution programs launch.	Ms. Armstrong agrees with the comment, since many groups have already reached out to Canada Nickel.
Q & I 42	Various members voice their willingness to share the contribution program's weblink and information within their communities and on social media.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the members for their support.
Q & I 43	A member suggests that Canada Nickel also use traditional medias such as the radio and television.	Ms. Armstrong thanks the member for their suggestion.

7. NEXT STEPS / NEXT MEETING

Ms. Armstrong asks the committee if there is an interest to participate in a meeting on the Crawford Project's social and economic impacts and early proposed mitigation measures. Ms. Armstrong explains that Canada Nickel believes that the committee is a relevant forum to hold discussions on that topic, even if it deviates from the committee's initial mandate.

Members agree by consensus on their interest to participate in such a meeting.

Ms. Armstrong then asks the committee if afternoon meetings are preferred to evening ones and if they agree with holding three meetings in 2023 instead of four. The members answer positively to both questions.

8. VARIA

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

Ms. Armstrong further mentions that the documents will be finalized and sent to the members. The documents will also be notified when the documents are available on the website, so they can be shared within their communities.

The meeting ends at 3:20 PM.

APPENDIX I PRESENTATION