

MACKENZIE VALLEY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW BOARD**De Beers Snap Lake Technical Sessions****November 25, 2002** (De Beers)**Yellowknife, Northwest Territories**

MR. GORDON WRAY: English is on channel 1, Chippewyan is on channel 2 and Dogrib is on channel 3. If you just wish to hear whoever is speaking clearly, you can leave your little transceiver on 0, which would allow you to hear the room. I would ask, when you are speaking, to as much as possible given the issues that you are going to be dealing with, to keep it simple and try and talk clearly and slowly for the translators, please. It is a very difficult job to begin with, particularly dealing with technical issues, the translators need to clearly understand what is being said.

With that, prior to opening I would call on Sarah to do an opening prayer.

-- Prayer

MR. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. There is a slight change to the agenda this morning. After my opening remarks, De Beers has some opening remarks of their own and then we will take a break, which will allow De Beers time to set up for their main presentation. My name is Gordon Wray. For the purposes of Snap Lake, I will be chairing the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board environmental assessment process. Beside me is Louie Azzolini, who is the environmental assessment officer in charge of the De Beers file. For these sessions, the board has hired Howe Mills and Mike Bell as facilitators. Bill Clausen from the Yukon will also be facilitating, but I believe he won't be in until later on this week or early next week. They have with them their assistant Lisa. She is the one who is going to be making a note of your commitments.

We have translating for us Bertha Catholique, Sarah Bazo, Margaret Mackenzie and Violet Mackenzie. We have prepared a package of relevant background materials for each of the parties that includes the agenda and a summary of the technical issues you provided the board over the last few weeks. Please make sure you have a copy of this, and if you are the spokesperson for one of the parties in the environmental assessment process.

There is nothing new in the package, it has been provided for your convenience and all the materials in the package have already been circulated in preparation for the technical sessions.

Now before we go any further, I would like to, starting on my immediate left, to go around the table and just ask people to identify themselves and just indicate which organization they will be with.

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene First Nation): My name is Rachel Crapeau with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation.

MR. FRASER FAIRMAN (DIAND): Fraser Fairman, Indian and Northern Affairs, environment and conservation division.

MR. SEVN BOHNET (DIAND): Sevn Bohnet, water resources division, DIAND.

MR. ALEXANDRE DESBARATS (Natural Resources Canada): Alexandre Desbarats, geological survey, Natural Resources Canada.

MS. MARGO BURGESS (Natural Resources Canada): Margo Burgess, geological survey, Natural Resources Canada. Alex and I are here for three days this week and two of our colleagues will be here next week for two days.

MR. MARK DAHL (Environment Canada): Mark Dawe, Environment Canada.

MR. DAVE BALINT (Fisheries and Oceans): Dave Balint, representing Fisheries and Oceans.

MR. MARK LANGE (Fisheries and Oceans): Mark Lange, with DFO.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell, De Beers Canada.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers Canada.

MR. DENNIS THOMAS (De Beers Canada) Dennis Thomas, I am regulatory and legal counsel for De Beers. I am with the law firm Fraser, Milner Casgreen.

MR. GARTH WALLBRIDGE (Rae-Edzo Metis Nation): Garth Wallbridge, legal counsel for the Rae Edzo Metis Nation.

MR. GAVIN MORE (GNWT): Gavin More, Government of the Northwest Territories.

MR. STEVE MATTHEWS (RWED): Steve Matthews, Wildlife and Fisheries, RWED, GNWT.

MR. BOB TURNER (NSMA): Bob Turner, North Slave Metis Alliance.

MS. JANET HUTCHISON (NSMA): Janet Hutchison, legal counsel for the North Slave Metis Alliance.

MR. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. Given the number of empty spots, I imagine we will probably have to do this every morning because there will be new faces at the table. One point too is, you must press the white button in order to speak or else your comments will not be recorded. So make sure when you are speaking the little white button is pushed and the red light is on.

First of all, I would like to welcome you and thank you in advance for the assistance and the cooperation so far in the work that has been accomplished. As you know, the review board is responsible for part 5 of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, or MVRMA. That part establishes the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board. The Minister of Indian Affairs appoints board members from nominations made from First Nations and government. Half the board members are First Nations nominations, and the other half are government nominations.

The review board, generally speaking, is responsible for protecting the environment from significant adverse impacts of proposed projects and for protecting -- one more comment, would everyone please switch their cell phones off? I hope it's not mine.

-- Laughter

The review board is responsible for overseeing the environmental assessment process and for protecting the social, cultural and economic well being of residents and communities of the Mackenzie Valley. It is also required to carry out its work in as efficient and timely manner as is possible.

The board utilizes several tools including preliminary screening, environmental assessment and environmental impact review processes created by the MVRMA. De Beers is in an environmental assessment. When the board has finished its work it will prepare its report of the EA for the Minister of DIAND. He will consider the board's decisions, recommendations and reasons. He can agree or disagree with them. When the board and Minister conclude their consultations on the report of the EA, the Minister signs off and the EA is officially completed, at which point in time it usually proceeds to regulatory.

I want to take a few minutes to quickly go over the Snap Lake process so far. The environmental assessment began in May of 2001 when Snap Lake project was referred to the board for environmental assessment. By February of 2002 De Beers submitted its environmental assessment report to the board. There has now been six months to ask questions using the information request process.

Judging by the number of questions that have been asked, there should be no doubt that you have all read the report.

We appreciate the considerable efforts and recognize that we can improve the efficiency of the IR process and we will look forward to doing that together, now and in the future. These technical sessions and the technical reports scheduled for submission to the public record in mid-February will prepare the public for the board's public hearings that are scheduled for March 24th to 28th.

After the public hearing, the board will take about a month before closing the public record and to write and issue its decision on the project in June of 2003. These technical sessions are not the last chance to discuss technical issues, but we are hoping that people will take advantage of this particular step in the process to clarify and perhaps conclude as many of the technical issues as is possible.

After you are finished here, technical reports will be prepared and then they can be presented at the board at its public hearings. The technical sessions are an important step in focusing and resolving technical issues, but they are not the last step.

A word of caution to members of the legal profession. While this is a quasi-judicial hearing, it is not an adversarial process and the purpose of these hearings is to clarify, to resolve and to hopefully provide the board with the information it needs to make a decision. It is not Law and Order, it is not The Practice, so put that side of yourselves away.

These technical workshops are new steps in this process for the review board and this is the first time we have included steps like this in a review board environmental assessment proceeding. We've included this step because we want to bring together people to exchange information and ideas on previously identified technical issues and to find out if the technical issues have been satisfactorily addressed by De Beers and our regulators.

The exchange in this session should assist the parties to understand the evidence on the record; to refine or formulate their positions; and if possible, to eliminate any environmental or socioeconomic issues which have been resolved by the evidence filed to date.

I strongly encourage you to have an open and informal exchange and to work your way through the agenda in a focused and efficient manner. There have been some questions about the legal status of these sessions. We've been asked if they are formal hearings or if they legally bind people to what they say and commit to.

As you know, we are a quasi-judicial board and what that basically means is that we have to provide reasons for our decisions and we can only use information that is on the public record to make those decisions. These technical sessions are not hearings, but the board is recording and transcribing these sessions and we will put that on the public record.

So the board can use whatever is said in these sessions in its decision-making process. Lisa, up in the corner there, is responsible for recording what people agree to and disagree to and what commitments are made. We will try to get this information back to all of you as quickly as possible after these sessions. What the board wants is transparency and accountability. So if you commit to something, we want to make sure that commitment is put on the public record for the board to consider when we make our ultimate decision.

We have hired a number of facilitators to prepare the agenda and to help us move through it efficiently and effectively. The board provided the facilitators, the technical issues, and they have worked with Louie and the parties to the EA to prepare the agenda. There is a lot of material to cover over the next ten days and we have tried to structure the sessions so that you can get the most from them. Each morning we will begin with introductions, a recap of the previous day's work and a review of the day's agenda.

De Beers provides two general presentations a day, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. The rest of the time is for discussion and exploration of the technical issues.

This is the board's EA process and the board wants people to engage in constructive, productive discussions that helps you, the board and De Beers. I know De Beers will limit itself to brief presentations in the times allotted in the agenda, and we ask that everyone respect the agenda outlined and the efforts of the facilitators to maintain the agenda schedule.

That concludes my opening remarks, I was going to have John Donahoe to make a few comments about procedure, but I believe that John is in court this morning and so he will not be here until this afternoon. However, we will attempt to answer any questions that you may have and if not we can always defer them to the afternoon when John is here.

In the meantime now, I would turn over the microphone to De Beers who have a few opening remarks and then we will take a break which will allow De Beers to set up its presentation and for people to get coffee and get settled for the next ten days. Thank you very much.

MR. DENNIS THOMAS (De Beers Canada): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked to make the statement for De Beers at this time.

MR. GORDON WRAY: Could I just -- one process. When you speak to the microphone, could you give your name and identify your organization, because when it is transcribed we need that so we know who is speaking. Thank you.

MR. DENNIS THOMAS (De Beers Canada): Thank you. Let me begin by saying I certainly acknowledge your remarks about the role of the legal profession in this process and hopefully this is the last you will hear of me for the next two weeks. The other thing I wanted to say, having listened, Mr. Chairman, to your opening remarks, is that De Beers certainly accepts everything that you have just said in terms of a description of the process that we hope will be followed.

If I might go then to my prepared points, the first thing I wanted to say on behalf of De Beers was to say how pleased is that these technical sessions are now underway, and to acknowledge that they will form an important part of the overall environmental assessment review process.

I next wanted to note the significant investment that has been made to date by De Beers in both financial and human resources to bring the assessment to this point in time. In addition to that, De Beers will be making further investment in participating fully in these technical sessions and has prepared accordingly to make these as effective as can possibly be.

Arising from that significant investment to date and future investment, arise a number of expectations and commitments by De Beers and I just wanted to quickly review De Beers' expectations as to what may come out of these sessions.

The first one is that in the course of the technical review sessions, the approved terms of reference for this assessment will be respected, and issues beyond those terms of reference -- while they may be raised, it is our expectation that they will not stray from the terms of reference.

Secondly, that in the course of the technical review sessions, information requests which have been refused by the board cannot be resurrected again.

Thirdly, that new issues will not be raised, unless they are relevant, of course, to issues which are on the agenda on a day-to-day basis, and it is hoped that the discussions will stick to the issues defined in those daily agendas.

The fourth expectation I wanted to make or state, Mr. Chairman, really relates somewhat more to the media than to the board, although certainly I hope

everybody listens to this comment. Clearly it is the expectation of De Beers that all parties participating in this process will be respectful and tolerant of other views, but a concern has been expressed to me that personal attacks might be reported by the media.

I am sure the facilitators will not allow such remarks to be made, but I wish to make it clear that on behalf of De Beers that if any statements which are defamatory in nature are made, they will not be tolerated by De Beers. I remind the media that these technical review sessions are not like a courtroom, the chairman has made that observation and I completely agree with it. This is not like a courtroom where there is some degree of privilege. There is no such privilege attached to these proceedings, in my view, and the media must be careful to report fairly and accurately, and not publish statements about others that could be construed as defamatory. Now, we are certainly hoping that, as I say, everyone is respectful and tolerant and we expect that will be the case, but we did want to put that on the record, Mr. Chairman.

The next expectation was that the sessions will have useful outcomes. You have certainly spoken to that, Mr. Chairman. These sessions appear to have been well-organized with reputable local facilitators, experienced facilitators. Therefore, De Beers does have an expectation that to the greatest extent possible, issues will be resolved in these sessions and that the facilitators will drive to find a consensus on as many issues as can be reasonably pursued here.

Finally, that the reduction of the number of issues and the focusing on the specific issues should be important goals for everyone participating in these sessions.

The final expectation, Mr. Chairman, of De Beers is that the outputs of these technical sessions will go forward to the board and will serve as an important basis for the board in defining the project issues which will go forward from this group of sessions to the pre-hearing and the formal review hearings to be held by the board next year.

I would like to repeat and stress the importance to De Beers of the recording and communicating of a resolution of issues. That is, given the amount of effort that everyone has put into this, certainly I think we all would hope that there would be successful resolution of many of the technical issues that have arisen as part of the assessment of this project.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and everyone else for listening to me for those few minutes, and as I said, I hope that is the last you have to hear from me until we get into the pre-hearing later next year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GORDON WRAY: Mr. McConnell, how much time do you need for set up, 15 minutes? Okay, we will take a 15-minute break, after which the facilitators will take over chairing the meeting and we will be starting after coffee with De Beers' presentation.

-- Break

MR. HAL MILLS: Welcome back then. My name is Hal Mills. We have the rest of the morning now for the presentation from De Beers and any discussion you might want to have in particular on their presentation, obviously, but as well in terms of the opening remarks that you heard from Gordon Wray and from De Beers.

And so with that, I will turn things over to John McConnell who is going to lead the presentation on behalf of De Beers. John.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): Thank you. Good morning again, everyone. We have prepared a number of presentations for the next week, or two weeks. Some are aimed at hopefully reviewing some of the issues that are brought forward. There are some areas where there are issues that we haven't prepared presentations before and are looking for questions and dialogue related to those issues.

The presentation I will put forward here this morning is a bit of an overview on the project. I wasn't at the meeting, the pre-hearing conference on November 8th, but Robin tells me there was one poor fellow there who had three binders of our EA plunked on his desk the day before and was told to go to the meeting.

So what I thought I'd do is just back up and start with a presentation that we gave at our technical session back in April which just provides a bit of an overview of the project. And then I am just going to go on and briefly go through some of the things that we have been carrying on with since that technical session. I think everybody realizes that once we have submitted the EA and we are into the information requests, there was still a lot of other work going on in terms of refining the project and I would just like to bring people up to date on some of those things.

What I am going to cover is I am going to introduce you to the team, or at least to the companies that have been working on the project with us for the past three years. I am going to talk about the design considerations for this project, and I will cover the project description. I will just go through the geology, the site infrastructure, how we intend to conduct the mining and then go through the project economics.

I know Chris from the Dene Nation was so impressed with the mining animation in April, I thought I'd also play that again so that people get a better understanding of how we intend to mine this deposit.

As I mentioned, I will go through some of the ongoing activities on the project. The engineering, where we are with impact benefit agreements with the aboriginal communities; socioeconomic agreement with the GNWT and the aboriginal communities; some of our thoughts on an environmental agreement. In our EA, we talk about the fact that we will be putting in place an environmental management system, of which the basis is ISO 14001. I will just update you on where we are with that. Then, I will spend a little bit of time on I think one of the key areas related to the socioeconomic which is, how we intend to staff the mine. We've put a plan in place that will hopefully result in northerners and aboriginals getting maximum benefit from Snap Lake through employment. We will talk about those plans a little bit.

In terms of the team, you have the De Beers people here. I think most of you know Robin and myself. Then there is a whole host of people behind us that are doing bits and pieces. As well as them we have the AMEC, which is an engineering firm. We use their offices out of Vancouver, but they are one of the largest engineering firms in the world and have offices around the world. They have a great deal of northern experience, both with Ekati and the Red Dog Mines in Alaska. They have been involved with us at Snap Lake since 1988 and were the EPCM contractors during the bulk sampling program in 2000 and 2001.

Golder and Associates, you will see a lot of those folks here over the next couple of weeks. They have really been our consultants on the environmental assessment side. Again, an international group of engineers and scientists. They have done extensive work in the north related to diamond work, as they were responsible for the Diavik environmental assessment. They have been involved up in Fort McMurray on Suncor's Millennium project, and they continue to do the wildlife monitoring for both BHP and Diavik. They have also been involved with Snap Lake since 1998.

We also use a company called IER. They have worked with us on the socio-economic impacts of the project. They are based out of Toronto. They as well participated in Diavik in a peer review role and have worked on SCIA's right across the country and have a lot of northern experience. They have been involved on the project since 1999.

Points West Heritage, I think many Northerners know Jean Bussie, and she has done all of our archaeological work, and she as well has been involved in the project since the early baseline data collection going back to 1999.

One of the local firms we've used, primarily in putting our human resource development plan together is Genesis, based here in Yellowknife. It is a company that is founded and run by long-time northern educators, Deb and John Simpson, and John will be participating in some of our socio explanations late next week. They have been involved with us since the year 2000.

I think most of you met Dennis Thomas this morning, he is our legal counsel for the environmental assessment process with a company called Fraser Milner Casegrain. He has just recently joined the team, but has extensive experience both in the north, but primarily in Alberta.

Now I will just move onto the project description. I always like to start with the geology, because Snap Lake is a unique deposit. There is not a deposit like this mine around the world. I think most people are familiar with the Ekati type deposit, which is a pipe. Snap Lake is more like a sheet. I will just have a little animation here that will show you how we feel the Snap Lake deposit was formed. At the end of that I can answer any questions, but I think it is fairly self-explanatory.

There you see Snap Lake, certainly the major diamond exploration in this country is in those two creations. If we sort of stand away and have a look inside the earth here...

This process that you are seeing sort of a narration of is really how they feel pipes are formed as well. One difference is that a pipe is really an explosion when it reaches the crust of the earth. You will see what we suspect happens in the case of a dyke like Snap Lake. When a pipe, you would have seen an explosion right through to surface. Snap Lake, you see the magma hits cracks in the crust and slowly works its way to surface. That would represent the Snap Lake dyke there.

Over time, most people know this area was covered in glaciers -- Deb Archibald probably knows better than me, but miles thick. And we are left with what we see today with the top scratched off, and the Snap Lake dyke which right now we estimate has delineated over an area about 2.5 kilometres by 2.5 kilometres, and it dips at about 15 degrees and is about 2.5 metres thick.

Before I move on, I am not a geologist, but I can attempt to answer any questions on the geology if anyone has any. Okay, either everyone is bored to death or you are all geologists.

In terms of the design considerations, I think number one on the list is always making sure we adhere to the laws and regulations. I guess added to that, where there are no laws and regulations, we look at best practices around the world and

we apply those. In terms of the biophysical environment, one of the things we wanted to make sure of, or things we felt would least impact the environment is by minimizing the project footprint. We think we've done that. The impact area is about 550 hectares. I guess in comparison to Diavik, Diavik is at about 1,800 and I estimated Ekati at about 3,500. I think, Bob, you had a different number. You figured it was a lot higher than that.

The next thing, we sat through the BHP hearings and the Diavik hearings and we saw the problems they had with trying to show that there was no impact by damming water ways and draining lakes, so certainly in our design, although there was economic benefit to a small open pit that would extend into Snap Lake, we threw that idea out very early on in the project and looked at minimizing damming or dyking of waterways.

We also wanted to minimize the amount of waste rock stored on surface, as most granite rock in the NWT does have limited potential acid generating characteristics, and we wanted to minimize the dust and noise. Now we think we've addressed most of those criteria by committing to a solely underground diamond mine, that allows us to minimize the impact on surface. A very small amount of waste rock would be stored on surface and we'd have all the crushing and drilling operations underground which would minimize the dust and noise.

In terms of socioeconomic, I am going to talk a little later about employment and the steps we have put in place to try and ensure we have a maximum number of aboriginal and northern workers. We wanted to make sure that in terms of contracts for construction and operation that we sized them accordingly, so that northern businesses would be able to bid on contracts for the mine.

We considered the health and wellness of the communities. We are looking at a rotating workforce in and out with direct flights back and forth between the mine site and the communities, not taking people through Yellowknife, which seems to be getting the reputation as the Detroit of the North. So we tried to avoid Yellowknife in our rotation schedule.

We want to try and help protect the culture of the people in the region through cross-cultural training, both at site and in the communities. Another big step was we feel it is time that aboriginals had direct participation in projects in the north. We have put forward the idea of the aboriginal community actually having equity participation and being part of a joint venture to operate and manage the mine.

In terms of sustainability, we wanted to ensure that this was a long-life mine. We feel we have a resource there that is plus 25 million tons. We came up with a mining method that we think is appropriate for this deposit and a mining

production rate that we think is appropriate at about 3,000 tons per day, or a million tons per year. It would give us a long-life mine at plus 25 years.

Also, there is a lot of exploration potential in the area, so in our plans and cash flows we have put aside money each year for ongoing exploration, to again ensure longer life to the project.

Now I will just run you quickly through the site. This is an aerial view of the site looking from the southwest to the northeast. You can see the airstrip there, the north pile and then the main plant site. Now we will just focus in on the main plant site. The process plant, a conveyor coming from underground into a storage building. Here is the portal here and the north pile.

In terms of waste rock and processed kimberlite, that is the north pile, it is really the only area onsite where waste rock or processed kimberlite will be stored. Water management, before being discharged to Snap Lake, all water on the plant site will be collected and run through a treatment facility and then discharged. There will be another presentation, I think it is next week, discussing the water treatment facility and some of the issues that have been raised related to that facility.

Service or accommodation unit. If anyone has been up to Diavik, this would be a similar type of accommodation unit with rooms for about 250 persons. Then it would have also the related catering facilities and recreation facilities.

Service complex has the offices for the administration as well as the shops for equipment maintenance. Our present camp is right in this area here, and that will be extended and used during the construction period.

Consumable storage, a couple of quite large lay down areas. Everyone knows we are reliant on winter roads in the north, and so we don't want those trucks sitting on the ice in the winter or unloading the supplies on the ice, so we made room for two large lay down areas, so when those trucks are coming in they can be unloaded and the major consumables stored there.

Explosives storage is off the map here, about halfway between the main site and the air strip. We will also have a large area for cement storage. We will use cement mixed with processed kimberlite that is pumped back underground, and then the large fuel tank farm with capacity of plus 30 million litres. Now I will stop talking for a minute and we will start this mining narration which takes you through the proposed mining method for Snap Lake.

-- Audiovisual Presentation

Finally, on the project description, I would just like to talk about some of the key economic parameters at Snap Lake. As reported in the EA, our mineable resource at Snap Lake is about 22.8 million tons. You have heard me today talk about 25 million tons. There is certainly potential for 25 and some people have speculated as much as 50, but what we know now is that there is a minimum of 22.8 of economically mineable tons. This material is at a grade of about 1.6 carats per ton. That is a diluted grade. That is what, when we are mining, will actually go through the plant. The value of the diamonds at Snap Lake is approximately US\$76 per carat, and that is the U.S. value.

Production rate, as I mentioned, 3,000 tons per day, or just over 1 million tons per year, which would give us a carat output of just over 1.5 million carats per year. Capital costs to build the mine are estimated at about \$490 million, and annual operating costs are estimated at just over \$100 million. The annual revenues as a result of those numbers would be about \$180 million per year.

Just to put that in perspective of the two diamond mines before us, you can see the comparison in the numbers there. Diavik, with a mineable resource of 25.7, extremely high grade deposit at 4.33 carats per ton and a little lower diamond value. Because of the high grade, you can see when you go down to the revenues that they are orders of magnitude greater than what we will see at Snap Lake.

Ekati is the big grandfather of them all with a reserve of 77 million tons. They are also operating at a much higher production throughput rate. These numbers are based on what we saw in the press during the construction period, and their feasibility was based on 9,000 tons per day. I think Bob Turner told me last week that Ekati is running at well over 12,000 tons per day presently. I don't think I need to go through the numbers, you can see the comparisons there.

Just in terms of area where we are still carrying out work over and above the environmental assessment, the first area is engineering. I talked about the fact that we use AMEC out of Vancouver for our engineering, and I would say that about 99.9 percent of our work there has been shut down and won't start up until at least the fall of 2003 when we begin the detailed engineering. That is really just to conserve money at this time. There is no sense taking it any further until we have a little more clarity on the permitting timelines.

Now there are a couple of exceptions. We do continue to modify the mining plans, looking at equipment sizes and some of the rock mechanics related to the mine, trying to optimize the mining method.

We are also looking at an optical sorter, which would be able to take some of the waste out of the ore before it goes into the process plant. Then, the other related

to an environmental agreement is we are presently doing engineering on detailed closure and reclamation plans and coming up with related costs so that when we go into the environmental agreement we could put forward a proposal on a security deposit that would be appropriate for a mine the size of Snap Lake.

We are also working on impact benefit agreements. We are dealing with the Dogrib Treaty 11 Council which is made up of the four communities of Rae-Edzo, Wekweti, Gameti and Wha Ti. Working with the Yellowknives Dene, made up of the communities of N'Dilo and Dettah. And Lutselk'e Dene First Nation and the North Slave Metis Alliance.

Things we are talking about there include employment, skills registries where those communities would provide us with a registry of who is available and what skills they have. Liaison personnel to act as coordinators in the communities. Apprenticeship programs, trades training programs, and as Snap Lake will be an underground mine about 50 percent of the employees will actually work underground, so we are going to need a very large training program to train miners. We are proposing a miner common core training program similar to what has been established in Ontario.

We are discussing business opportunities. We have already hired a business development coordinator to work with the aboriginal communities, assist them with business plans, make sure they know what contracts will be let in terms of construction and operation, and really act as the liaison between De Beers and all the aboriginal and northern businesses.

Again, as I mentioned earlier we will be sizing contracts for aboriginal businesses, making sure they are of appropriate size, and in the IBAs we are guaranteeing minimum dollar value of business opportunities.

Also discussing training and education. We have put forward that we will be having a site training centre. We have also talked about community training centres. In terms of higher education, we've talked about scholarship programs that both De Beers and the aboriginal communities would contribute to.

There is also financial considerations, and to date we have put forward the idea of the aboriginal groups having a small equity participation in the project that would give them real, meaningful joint venture opportunity in Snap Lake. It includes things like if they have a small percentage they would also be able to take their share of rough and use them in local facilities in the NWT. It would also give the communities participation in management, because we envision some form of joint venture committee or board that management from the mine would report to.

In terms of where we are with agreements, with the Dogrib and the North Slave Metis, in both cases we have MOUs in place that spell out a framework for negotiation and a schedule. In both these cases negotiations are fairly well-advanced and they are both looking at the equity participation and have hired independent consultants to review the project. We want them to understand what they are getting involved with and make sure they are happy that Snap Lake is a good and economic project before they actually buy in.

Lutselk'e, we have finalized an MOU and the only thing left is for both parties to find a date to get together to sign it. That is presently scheduled a couple of weeks from now. Yellowknives Dene, we haven't progressed to an MOU but we have had numerous discussions revolving around employment opportunities, training and business opportunities at the project.

In terms of a socioeconomic agreement, we had our meeting with the GNWT and the various aboriginal groups last week, or a couple of weeks ago. So discussions have been initiated. Some of the things that we are looking at including in the socioeconomic agreement are things so the GNWT ensures benefits are maximized for northerners, both in terms of business and employment opportunities.

The GNWT has established a secondary diamond industry here in the north, and they want to ensure that that business is sustainable through the provision of rough through the various mines in the GNWT, so we are having discussions on that.

Training, we want to ensure that the GNWT comes to the table as a partner. We feel that government has a role in training and education. It has been pointed out to us by the aboriginal communities that this agreement is really a way to hold the GNWT's feet to the fire in terms of long-term commitments in education and training. The same goes for community health and wellness. The communities all feel that they have been ignored to date and they want some assurances that the GNWT is going to live up to their role in terms of community health and wellness.

In terms of the agreement we have looked at the Diavik model. I think it is generally acknowledged that this is the way to go. One thing that we haven't discussed is that there is presently a Diavik monitoring agency for their socioeconomic agreement, and it may make sense to combine our efforts and have a single monitoring agency.

On the environmental agreement we have only have very informal discussions with INAC to date. We did participate a couple of weeks ago in the workshop initiated by DIAND on moving towards a single independent monitoring agency. We concur with their thoughts that there are a lot of advantages to doing that, but

we are a little concerned about the timeframe that may be required to bring the various parties to the table.

So we see in parallel to working with INAC to move towards a single monitoring agency, we are also going to have to work on a Snap Lake specific agreement. Again, we have thrown it back at people, should we use Diavik or the Ekati model. I think generally people feel that the Diavik model is the better. Probably what we want is something in between. Ekati seems to be very much focused on the academic side and research, whereas Diavik is very much focussed on community participation. We probably want something in-between those two models.

In our EA we talk about our environmental management system certainly as a means of monitoring site-specific environmental related activities. We have put forward that we will use the ISO 14001 standard. This has a number of phases, this standard, starting with an environmental policy. Then there is the planning and looking...

-- No Overlap Between Tapes

...environmental policy. Then there's the planning and looking at the regulatory requirements and the objectives that are set out in the environmental policy. Implementation and operation under that policy calls for annual auditing to correct outstanding items, and then there's annual management reviews.

Why an EMS? Well, I think that's pretty easy. We want to make sure that there are no disasters on the site. We want to make sure we're striving to continually improve our environmental compliance. This is an independent audit of the system. It wouldn't be a De Beers audit or an INAC audit, so, you know, a couple of weeks ago, we heard a lot of talk about watchdogs and the need to have watchdogs watching both proponent as well as the regulator. This provides for that.

Along with this process, there's legal due diligence. Built into it is risk management, so that we have to assess the risks annually and focus on trying to mitigate and reduce those risks.

Through the annual audit, there's public reporting and people would be aware of our performance. I guess for De Beers, this has become standard, ISO registration, so we think we're showing corporate responsibility and certainly leadership amongst the mining community and taking this various onerous program and applying it at all our mines around the world.

In terms of the steps, I won't run through them, but it doesn't quite show up there, but the only outstanding item we have left is the registration audit. We've had a team... a dedicated team working very hard over the past 12 months. They've completed all of the steps and our registration audit is actually next Thursday and Friday, so we would anticipate being ISO registered by the end of the year. And this is something we'll keep up through construction and into operation of the mine.

Again, I talked earlier about our human resource development plan. We've done a lot of work in this area over the past year. I think everybody realizes that with Ekati and Diavik ahead of us, the capacity of employable people in the communities has become very limited, and this map just shows the areas we're primarily looking on for employees.

In terms of assessing the human resources, we went into the communities. We talked to people. We interviewed them. We asked them what we should be doing differently from government attempts, different from Ekati, different from Diavik, and we asked about problems in the communities. I think what we learned as a result of those surveys was that there is very limited capacity. In the communities, there's low levels of education and literacy. Many of the training programs that have been carried out in the past, we've been told were inappropriate, not designed for, to provide meaningful employment in the future.

There's been minimal career development support from the communities. There's a number... you know, FAS is a problem in the communities, so there are many learning disabilities. There's mobility issues. There's a number of single parents in the communities and working out of Snap Lake or Ekati with rotating work schedule is difficult. Job skills are low, and one thing that we kept hearing is that, you know, don't let government run this, because you know, there programs are always short term and they're poorly coordinated, so make sure that somebody responsible is running any programs and that they're long term with goals and objectives.

So our conclusion from being in the communities was that, you know, we had a lot of work to do, and that there are people there, but it's going to be up to us, through participation with other stakeholders, to train and educate the people that are in the communities so they can take advantage of jobs at Snap Lake.

So our goals, you know, if we're going to have a plan, we need goals. It's to develop a competent aboriginal and northern workforce that is ready, willing, and able to work. To support each employee in their efforts to reach their maximum employment potential. And to assist and support employees and their families to live happily and well.

So the outcome of all this is that we do have a plan now. We've published a booklet that's called developing human resources for Snap Lake. And we do have a number of copies of that here today, and they'll be available at the back if anybody's interested in reviewing them.

We're presently taking these into the communities and talking to the communities about them, and we will modify this plan as required moving into the future.

Some of the critical details is, you know, we've tried to look long term. We've put together a five-year plan. We can't do it by ourselves. We don't think we should have to fund it by ourselves. We feel there's a role for government in this as well. So we see partnering with the aboriginal communities themselves, government organizations like HRDC, ECE, DIAND and Aurora College. This program would be managed by, or guided by, a partnership committee. And I say guided because we want to take control of the management of this five-year plan. We're proposing quarterly meetings with the partnership committee so we can adjust the plan as needed.

One of the components is a major training centre at Snap Lake, and permanent community adult education facilities and educators in the community. There are education facilities in a number of communities, but there's no funding for adult educators. Again, it comes back to commitment by government has been short-term. They built these facilities but never set aside the money to actually put an educator in them. And again, you know, we're a mining company and we want to train people for our site, but we're certainly not going to exclude people that want to use these facilities and better themselves to become a nurse or a teacher or things like that, so these facilities will be public and the educators will be open to the public and any educational materials we provide will be open to the public.

Some of the areas we've identified for pre-employment is really just basic education, you know, reading, writing, math. We've got stay in school projects that we're proposing, achievement awards, and scholarships, trades training program, summer student employment, talked about the adult career centres, information sessions regularly in the communities, as well as accessible on our website.

We're presently going around the high schools now. We see that as an area, because we've got a few years before we start production, we need to start working with kids in high school now, ensure they stay in school, and make sure they know they have an opportunity to work for us when they graduate. Also, you know, a very small number of women in mining, so we also want to promote getting women involved in the mining business. Community programs, literacy programs, adult education, advanced independent study programs supported by websites, trades training, and career counselling.

Some of the wellness initiatives, and again, you know, this is, we feel, very much a role of government, but perhaps just needs a little bit of a kick-start. I know Mark Lange used a term there a couple of weeks ago that people sometimes need a good kick in the ribs. Well, we hope to fulfill that role and give government a kick in the ribs and get them into the communities carrying out these wellness programs.

I think that covered what we intend at the mine training centre.

We've also developed this poster that talks about careers we see at Snap Lake. Again, it's of course aimed at the high school students and elementary school students and a sample is on the back wall there if at the break you want to have a look at it and ask any questions.

Again, we have the... oh, over and above the posters, we also have a career guide book that identifies each position we see at the mine site, gives a description of the job and what that job entitles, and also talks about the education and training that's required to get to that job, so that people in the schools can look at it and say "Well, I want to be a truck driver. What do I have to do to become a truck driver?" Or "I want to be an engineer. What do I have to do to become an engineer?"

That's it for my presentation this morning, so I guess it's back to you, Hal.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay, John, this is Hal Mills. Thank you for the presentation. You covered a lot of material there, and hopefully there are going to be some questions. I'm tempted to ask Robin to lead us through an aerobic exercise here and warm everybody in the room up, but...

-- Interjection

... I understand that that has just happened, that they've just tried to turn things up a bit here.

Okay, hopefully there are lots of questions. I'll remind you that in order that we get things on the transcript, if you would move to a mike, turn the mike on and then identify yourself before asking a question, please. The floor is open.

I know John did a good job, but he needs some questions.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): Hal, I'm not really sure questions are appropriate on a general presentation like that, because the number of the areas that I covered sort of broadly are certainly covered over the next two weeks, specifically. And as I mentioned earlier, in some of those areas, we will have fairly detailed presentations that may generate questions. I think, you know,

this group is a technical group and I wouldn't have expected too many questions on a broad overview of the project.

MR. CHRIS PRATTS (Dene Nation): I'm Chris Pratts with De Beers... with De Beers...

-- Laughter

with the Dene Nation. I hope that doesn't mean I've been indoctrinated already. Again, I liked the presentation. As always, the animation always helps me. I guess I just have one question. Attawapiskat and Fort à la Corne are a couple of other spots that De Beers is doing some diamond work. Can you comment at all on your experience here in Denendeh working with aboriginal first nations compared to what you've done in Ontario and Saskatchewan?

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): It's probably not appropriate for me to comment too much, because my focus is entirely on the Northwest Territories. I can tell you a little bit about the levels of activity at those projects. Fort à la Corne in Saskatchewan is really an early stage and exploration project, so you know, it's kind of where we were back in 1998. Victor is moving from pre-feasibility to feasibility study next year, and so it's probably about a year behind Snap Lake in terms of development.

In Saskatchewan, I'm totally unaware of our work with the aboriginal community, but in Ontario, there's one community, Attawapiskat, and certainly we are in... they've been very involved in terms of the development on the project there to date.

MR. HAL MILLS: Any other questions or comments? Are there any questions or comments that you'd like to make with respect to the earlier, the opening remarks from Gordon Wray and the comments from Dennis from De Beers? Everyone feel they have a good understanding as to what we're about here and how this fits into the overall process that the board is following?

MR. GAVIN MORE (GNWT): Gavin More, Government of the Northwest Territories. I'd just like to make one comment on one of the positions that De Beers was taking as a non-negotiable. That relates to the IRs that the... I think the phrasing was that the board turned down. And it's my understanding that some of the IRs were turned down because the board felt they weren't relevant. It was also my understanding that some were turned down because they were submitted late. And there was some confusion about which IRs were turned down because they were late versus which ones were turned down because they were outside of the terms of reference.

In actual fact, around the table, I don't think anybody's received information from the board as to the reason why some IRs weren't advanced. Therefore, it's unknown to us, and I'm not sure if De Beers actually knows which ones weren't advanced for what reason. Therefore, I don't think that's a particularly fair statement for the group to accept that not all IRs that were turned down by the board or weren't advanced shouldn't be talked about.

It's my hope that many of the groups around the table have kind of reinforced certain information requests that were turned in late from the departments of the Government of the Northwest Territories. So I'm hoping that a lot of those will be picked up in one way, shape, or form, but my impression is that it would be easier for the participants to believe that this is a chance for good dialog rather than that certain kinds of questions will not be discussed at this particular forum. Thank you.

MR. HAL MILLS: I'm not sure if De Beers wants to respond to that, but it might be appropriate to have Louie Azzolini respond. Louie, I think perhaps it would be helpful if you could at least just talk to the process that the board went through with respect to the information requests.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): I appreciate the comments that were brought forward here by Gavin and some of the other individuals which approached me in between the sessions. The reasons for the board's not issuing a number of IRs has not been placed on the public record. I can assure you there are reasons. I drafted the first draft of those and have provided them to legal counsel. I can't speak to the legal areas about what can be included in the discussion, what De Beers has suggested in terms of what the board has refused is fully refused and cannot be entered into this discussion. I'm going to save that for John when he comes this afternoon.

I think we have to go back to what Mr. Gordon Wray said, that really we don't want to start beating each other up on the legal side of it. Let's talk technical stuff. Let's get to the heart of the matter. Let's deal with significant technical issues. This is your meeting. This is not the board's meeting. The board is not here. Try and make it as productive as you can. And if there are issues that need some resolution, please work with the facilitators in break-out sessions, if you have to, together outside of this room, in another area, but just to strongly encourage you to deal with the issues that we can deal with effectively, and when John comes this afternoon, I'll see about getting some clarification from him. I'm just, you know, what the legal component is.

But again, I want to underscore, bold and underline, let's not turn this into a legal, procedural wrangling. Mr. Gordon Wray would not like that and neither would the board.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay, thank you, Louie. Any other comments on that point?

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell with De Beers. I guess we go back to Gordon's comments, and it's certainly our desire to have an open exchange of technical information here, but we certainly don't want to open things up again beyond the terms of reference, and clearly there were a number of information requests which were outside the terms of reference, and appropriately so, the board rejected those. And I guess those would be the areas in particular that we would hope that the facilitator wouldn't allow the technical session to get hijacked and move in that direction.

In terms of the GNWT being late with submissions, you know, I think that most of their questions fall within... if they fall within the terms of reference, they're going to be able to phrase them during this discussion and ask the questions. And I think that was actually the board's advice to the GNWT, that because they were late, they would have the opportunity to discuss those items at the technical sessions.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay. Thank you, John. Any other questions or comments? Okay, it's Hal Mills again for the benefit of the transcripts here. One of the commitments that the facilitators made in terms of entering into this is that we would do our best to stick to the agenda, to the schedule by day and the agenda in terms of time slots, because we know that some people are just coming in for particular things and aren't going to be here throughout. So with that in mind, rather than trying to move to the next item on the agenda, I suggest and I'm open for counter-suggestions, that we break for lunch and resume here at 1:30. Is everyone okay with that?

And I've just got a note that for those of you interested in lunch, that apparently the Smokehouse Café is open for lunch today if anyone wants to go there for lunch. Okay, thank you then. Please try to be back here so that we can get started promptly at 1:30. Thank you.

-- Break

MR. HAL MILLS: We have a few new people in the room, but I think what we'll do is plan to do a round of introductions at the start of each morning, so I'm suggesting not doing another one now. Even this morning, we only did introductions to the people who were at the table rather than everyone in the room. So if you want a round of introductions, more complete right now, we could do that, but what I'm saying is I think at the start of each day, since we'll have a somewhat shifting cast of characters, that we'll start off each day with a round of introductions. Would you like to have a more complete round of introductions

right now? Would that be helpful? Okay. I'll start off and we'll go this way. I'm Hal Mills with GeoNorth. I'm one of the facilitators here.

MR. MIKE BELL: I'm Mike Bell from Inukshuk Management Consultants, one of the other facilitators here.

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene): I'm Rachel Crapeau, Yellowknives Dene First Nation, land environment committee chair.

MS. TAMARA HAMILTON (DIAND): Tamara Hamilton, DIAND.

MR. ALEXANDRE DESBARATS (Natural Resources Canada): Alexander Desbarats, Natural Resources Canada, GSC.

MS. MARGO BURGESS (Natural Resources Canada): Margo Burgess, Natural Resources Canada, geological survey.

MR. MARK DAHL (Environment Canada): Mark Dawe, Environment Canada.

MR. DAVE BALINT (Fisheries and Oceans): Dave Balint, Fisheries and Oceans.

MR. MARK LANGE (Fisheries and Oceans): Mark Lange, Fisheries and Oceans.

MR. DAVE LEVY (Fisheries and Oceans): Dave Levy, consultant to Fisheries and Oceans.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers Canada.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell, De Beers Canada.

MR. CHRIS PRATT (Dene Nation): Chris Pratt, manager of lands and environment at Dene Nation.

MR. GARTH WALLBRIDGE: Garth Wallbridge, legal counsel, Rae-Edzo Metis Nation.

MR. STEVE WILBUR (Dogrib Treaty 11): Steve Wilbur, Dogrib Treaty 11.

MR. GAVIN MORE (GNWT): Gavin More, Government of the Northwest Territories.

MR. STEVE MATTHEWS (RWED): Steve Matthews, wildlife and fisheries, RWED, GNWT.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): Louie Azzolini with the review board.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay, and for the people who aren't at the table, could you make your way up to a mike and introduce yourselves, and we'll go around again this way?

MR. SEVN BOHNET (DIAND): Sevn Bohnet Water, Resources, DIAND.

MR. BUDDY WILLIAMS (DIAND): Buddy Williams, land administration, DIAND.

MS. COLLEEN ENGLISH (De Beers Canada): Colleen English, De Beers Canada.

MS. PAT THOMAS (Golder Associates): Pat Thomas, Golder Associates.

MR. RICK SCHRYER (Golder Associates): Rick Schryer, Golder Associates.

MR. DANNY THOMAS: Danny Thomas, Fraser, Milner, Casgrane, legal counsel for De Beers.

MS. LISA BEST (GeoNorth): Lisa Best, notetaker for GeoNorth.

MR. LEE ATKINSON (Hydrologic Consultants Inc.): Mr. Lee Atkinson, Hydrologic Consultants Inc.

MR. GREG ORYALL (AMEC): Greg Oryall with AMEC.

MR. MARK DIGEL (Golder Associates): Mark Digel, Golder Associates.

MR. KEVIN HIMBEAULT (Golder Associates): Kevin Himbeault, Golder Associates.

MR. ANDREW PRESTON (Harvard University): Andrew Preston, Harvard University.

MS. GLENDA FRATTON (Gartner Lee): Glenda Fratton, Gartner Lee.

MR. JASON MCNEILL (RWED): Jason Neill, policy, legislation, communications, RWED, GNWT.

MS. DEBRA ARCHIBALD (RWED): Debra Archibald, industrial initiatives, RWED, GNWT.

MR. CLAY BUCHANAN (RWED): Clay Buchanan, RWED, GNWT.

MR. P ETRO D E B ASTIANI (RWED): P etro D e B astiani, energy s ecretariat, RWED, GNWT.

MR. LIONEL MARCINKOSKI (RWED): Lionel Marcinkoski, GNWT, environmental protection.

MR. TOM HIGGS (AMEC): Tom Higgs, AMEC.

MR. KEN DAHL (DIAND): Ken Dahl, DIAND.

MR. FRANCIS JACKSON (DIAND): Francis Jackson, DIAND.

MR. FRASER FAIRMAN (DIAND): Fraser Firman, DIAND.

MS. ANNE GUNN (RWED): Ann Gunn, GNWT.

MR. RAYMOND BOURGET (RWED): Raymond Bourget, RWED, North Slave region.

MS. JANE HOWE (BHP Billiton): Jane Howe, BHP Billiton.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay, great. Quite a... quite a crew, and that was almost like a bit of musical chairs, too. Okay, for this afternoon then, we're going to review the schedule and agenda first, and basically to make sure you have a good understanding. If there's serious problems with the schedule and agenda, why, please let us know. If there somewhat less than serious, why, please try to live with it, because for the schedule in particular, which was laid out some time ago by the review board, a lot of people have seen this in advance and they've used that to determine what days they have to have particular experts here and so on, so if one party feels they need to change the schedule, it would likely inconvenience most of the other parties, so we should try to resist that as much as possible.

And as well as the agenda. When the facilitators got involved with this not too long ago and were given a pile of information on issues and invited to come up with an agenda that would make this flow and work, it was a little challenging. So we've done our best. I'm sure it's far from perfect, but basically once again, my message is if you have a serious problem with any aspect of the agenda, let us know. If it looks like something that you could live with, why, please try to do so.

Now, just a general comment on the agenda is that we've obviously gone away from trying to list specific issues, and we tried to group them by topic. This was I guess especially important and crucial with respect to water quality, by far and

away the largest number of issues were in the two days that are listed for water quality.

It's not our intent to take any issue off the table. It is simply that it was difficult to organize the agenda by listing each of the issues, some of which we presume may no longer be issues. They may have already been resolved. Some of them may not be very important issues, so we wanted to go by topic so that you could tell us what you think are the most important issues within that topic that you feel still need to be discussed and addressed.

Now, this not being a legal hearing, the main purpose of it, at least I feel the main purpose, is for you to get what you can out of this in terms of exchanging ideas, getting more information, so that you have a better understanding of the things that are of concern to you and coming out of this, can have a better handle on what you may do or may need to do to draw your issue to the attention of the board.

Now, the deliberations from this, at least the commitments and whatever consensus we have on dealing with things, will be documented. That information will be available to the board. But you still have other opportunities for directly dealing with the board in terms of the things that you feel are important through the report that you can get in and through the public hearings that will be taking place in March.

So, all that is background then to basically what we tried to do with the agenda, and I'd like to go to day two of the agenda, the Thursday, November 26th. Now I should say because there were so many water quality issues for tomorrow and for Wednesday is that we're trying to get you to come and be ready to go for an 8:30 start on each of those two days. For all the other days, we're going for a nine o'clock start.

And basically then on the Tuesday, we'll be covering water, the issues related to water management plan in the morning and to the water management system in the afternoon. We had a number of discussions with people from De Beers in particular, I guess, in terms of presentations related to those issues, and what we've come down to is that for starting off the morning, and starting off the morning for the... or starting off the afternoon for the different water quality issues, that they will give a presentation covering what they see as the main things on the agenda for that morning, and trying to give you a picture as to where your particular issue may fit in.

As well, we'll have Louie Azzolini, of course, from the board and the facilitators, to the extent that we can, trying to interact with you, and you're saying "Well, I don't see where my issue's gonna fit" so that we'll... we'll hopefully be able to

satisfy you and say this fits, or we thought it would fit within this particular topic on the agenda.

So we'll have the presentations then from De Beers early in the morning. We'll then get into the different issues related to the water management plan and a similar format for the afternoon with respect to the water management system issues.

Any questions as to the general way we're structuring this and the particulars of Tuesday, November 26th? Everyone has the agenda, to start with, I guess? Anyone need a copy of the agenda? Good.

Now, as we've already mentioned, the facilitators are going to try to keep you to the time blocks indicated here. If we save time at any point, then we can interact with you to see how to best make use of the time that we saved, but unless and until we save time, we'll be intervening to cut off discussion on that particular topic so that we can move on to the next one and give everything a fair shake.

Okay, on Wednesday, November 27th then, still on water quality, still having a presentation from De Beers in the morning, and another at the start of the afternoon. And basically dealing with Snap Lake issues in the morning and North Lake issues in the afternoon, and winding up with a discussion on cumulative impacts, which I guess leads me to another point I should be making, is that we'll be addressing cumulative impacts at specific topic areas through the agenda, such as water quality, such as wildlife and so on, and socio-economic. And then on the final day, we'll be trying to have a global session on cumulative impacts where we'll try to draw in the different elements of the discussions that have come up under these specific topics. So we'll end up the water quality session then with the discussion on cumulative impacts. Any questions or comments on Wednesday, November 27th?

Okay, Thursday, November 28th, once again a presentation from De Beers and then getting into the various aquatic habitat, aquatic organism issues through the day and winding up with a discussion on cumulative impacts. Any questions or comments on the agenda for November 28th?

Friday, November 29th then, this may not be too convenient to a number of people, but we have wildlife on Friday and Monday. So a presentation from De Beers to kick things off. If I could add a bit of a comment there in terms of the De Beers presentations, the... I think that each of the presentations will be somewhat general and there are more specific things that they'll be able to refer to in what could have been a longer, more detailed presentation, if and when particular issues come up.

So they'll have the general presentation early in the morning. There may be other things that will require short presentations later in the day, depending on what issues are being discussed. Is that a fair way to describe that, Robin?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers Canada. It depends, Hal. In general, what we've... our focus, as stated at the November 8th pre-hearing conference meeting was... would really be providing very focused presentations to address specific issues that, recognizing the number of some of the issues, we have broadened that to include some general presentations, but essentially would have general presentations and we're anticipating that most of the discussion will come around from those presentations.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay, thank you. So on Friday then, we'll be going through things related to wildlife study design, some of the particular species, the impact ratings, and winding up with a discussion on traditional knowledge of wildlife. Any questions or comments on Friday, November 29th?

Okay, on Monday, December 2nd, once again an opening presentation, then getting into the monitoring program, mitigation and adaptive management, and winding up with cumulative impacts. By the way, we'll... through the different drafts of the agenda, we somehow lost biodiversity, which is to be added in on the... as part of the 3:00 p.m. slot.

-- Interjection

Yeah, it's on Monday, December 2nd. We somehow lost biodiversity, which will be added back in.

Okay, on Tuesday, December 3rd then, getting into geotechnical, another presentation in the morning, then getting into northpile related issues, some of the operational issues and the thermal regime. Any questions or comments on Tuesday, December 3rd?

Okay, on Wednesday, December 4th then, completing the geotechnical, another presentation in the morning, getting into the permafrost issues, thing related to reclamation and closure, re-vegetation and so on, and from this afternoon's agenda, one of the things that's been identified under the 2:15 time slot is production rates, which I think De Beers may want to say a few words about, but this is a change from one of the earlier versions of the agenda, and some of the experts who want to speak to the production rates aren't here today and so we're slotting that in right after lunch on Wednesday, December 4th. We'll be putting production rates in. I'm not sure... I guess I'm not sure how much time is required for most of the things on the agenda here, but I'm not sure that's going to require

a major slot of time or not, but we will kick off after lunch on Wednesday, December 4th with a discussion on production rates. And we have not built in a discussion on cumulative impacts related to geotechnical issues. Any questions or comments on Wednesday, December 4th?

Okay, on Thursday, December 5th, starting off with a presentation, going through some of the LCIA, approach and methodology things, effects of mitigation, and sustainable economic development. This almost goes back to my previous comment, and I'm not sure how much any of the things or how much time is required for virtually any of the things here. It seems to me that for the two days devoted to socio-economic that the agenda is perhaps fairly loose, but we may not need all that time, but we'll have to see. Any questions or comments on Thursday, December 5th?

Okay, and the final day, we've not scheduled a presentation there because my understanding -- and Robin, please correct me if I'm wrong, is that De Beers is just going to kick the total socio-economic section off with a presentation. But if there's any need or desire for a presentation at the start of the final day, we can build that back in.

And we may not be getting into socio-economic cumulative impacts and then moving into a discussion of the global cumulative impacts where we try to bring the different things from wildlife and water quality and so on into an overall discussion.

And we may very well be able to wrap up earlier than five o'clock on the final afternoon. Any questions or comments on that day in particular? Rachel.

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene): Rachel Crapeau for the Yellowknives Dene. I'm wondering why they couldn't find somebody to do a presentation for Friday the 6th on the socio-economic and cultural aspect.

MR. HAL MILLS: I'll let De Beers respond. I don't think it was a matter of they couldn't find any. My understanding was they felt a presentation on all the socio-economic and cultural things could be handled through the one presentation, but Robin, do you want to counter that or add to it?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Throughout the proceeding days, we'll going to be covering cumulative effects on essentially every topic area, and so we hadn't identified a need for a presentation for socio-economic, cumulative impacts that these will be discussed in previous, on the tally in a previous presentations, Rachel, so there will be an opportunity to ask those questions and we'll ensure that you get the information you require, rather than having a PowerPoint presentation.

MR. HAL MILLS: The other thing that I could add is that we're open to other people making presentations as well. De Beers obviously has, you know, as part of their response to the issues that have been raised, has been working on these things and they're in a good position to bring people up to date as to where they are on them, but on any of these topics, if the rest of you have presentations, and I think you know when you have something you want to say, you'll have a chance to say it, but if you have presentations that you've prepared or that you think would be valuable to the rest of the audience here, why, we'll certainly accommodate that so that it's just a matter of you letting us know what you have and what you need and where you think it would fit in best.

MR. STEVE WILBUR (Dogrib Treaty 11): Steve Wilbur, Dogrib. I have a question regarding the time lines. You mentioned you weren't sure how long each was going to take. Are you going to keep strict adherence to these time lines, or will you go over when topics are still being discussed, or move forward when a topic is already finished? And will you go past five o'clock?

MR. HAL MILLS: We've been asked to and we intend to stick strictly to the time lines in here, except as I mention where we... if we happen to save time somewhere, then we can look at how to best make use of that time, but if on day 2, if it's coming close to now and we're still discussing water management plan issues, I'll be giving you warning that we've only got 20 more minutes or whatever to discuss this topic, so let's focus in on the major things and whatever position statements you want to make, and then after lunch, we'll be starting on the next topic.

As to whether or not we stay after five o'clock, that's the call of the room. If people have the inclination and the energy to stay to pursue a particular topic, then fine. If we... this is just my own thinking here now. If we have a topic where fairly clearly there hasn't been enough time that we're able to address to it, then we can look at options as to whether or not there is a time slot coming up later on where we could reschedule a further discussion on that. One of the obvious difficulties in that is that with changing...(inaudible)... to characters by some of the people who were in on the initial discussion might say "I'm not going to be here on Thursday." So there may be some difficulties, but if it's the feeling or the sense of the room that they want to make some adjustments, then adjustments will be made.

But aside from that, we intend to be ruthless.

MR. DAVE LEVY: Dave Levy. I'd like to know whether the participants will get a chance to comment on the draft facilitators report before it goes to the board.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): I'm Louie Azzolini. When you say the draft facilitators report, you're speaking to the summation of all the issues, the conclusions, the outcomes of the discussions? That will be put on the public record, and anyone can add to or recommend changes to that.

MR. DAVE LEVY: What I'd like to know is will we get a chance to check the accuracy of the contents of that material before it's posted?

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): It will be posted and then you can correct it.

MR. HAL MILLS: On behalf of the facilitators and on behalf of Lisa who's taking the notes and works with me, we are not producing a report in terms of minutes of these sessions. They are being taped, so there's a transcript, but I just want to make it clear that what Lisa's doing is going to be recording the things that we have agreement or disagreement on, any priorities that might be identified for whatever, and any commitments that anyone may happen to make, and that is what Louie is referring to that will be available. But we're not doing a detailed report or minutes.

MS. JANET HUTCHISON (NSMA): Janet Hutchison, North Slave Métis Alliance. Will there be anything going to the board as a result of the technical sessions other than what is posted on the public registry?

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): Louie Azzolini here. Basically what's going to come out of this is obviously the transcripts that are prepared, tapes that are recorded and the summary agreements prepared by Lisa. The board is not going to get anything from me or anyone else outside of the information that we are going to put on the public record that comes out of this. So that's it.

MR. ALEXANDRE DESBARATS (Natural Resources Canada): I would like to know who and how you determine whether there is an agreement or consensus on a technical issue?

MR. HAL MILLS: We have no plan to do it in a legal way or even by motion. If you people have suggestions or particular needs in that regard, let us know. We will be trying to, through the feeling of the discussion, to say well we think we have consensus on a particular point, and seeing if there is any disagreement with that. If there is, we will simply record it as something that was discussed. We will maybe be able to describe the pros and cons a little bit and say that the room was not able to reach agreement.

MS. MARGO BURGESS (Natural Resources Canada): In that context, will you indicate where the disagreement has come from, which parties? Similarly, if there

is agreement, because you have a changing cast of characters, will you indicate who was present for that agreement?

MR. HAL MILLS: I might have to call in Louie to give his opinion on this, but my opinion would be, I think it would be no to both cases. I wouldn't see documenting that participant X had one position and participant Y had another. I think we would simply record it as an issue that was discussed that there was no agreement on. And the other question?

MS. MARGO BURGESS (Natural Resources Canada): Well even when there was agreement, there may not be everyone present.

MR. HAL MILLS: And I don't think there is any intent for us to record who was present for any particular agreement or disagreement.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): From the review board standpoint, the reason that information is put on the public record is -- and because, I mean we have tried to be quite transparent in this process, albeit probably more legal than some people like it -- is because we want everyone to be able to see what is going on. So there are going to be transcripts on the record, so you will know who spoke to the issue, you will know what they said. You will have our abbreviated version of that in terms of outcomes.

The intent is to provide you that information as soon as we can. The reason we want to have these commitments documented, if you want to call it that, or outcomes, the work that Lisa is doing, is so that we can provide some reasonably fast feedback to all the participants. Then, because the transcription may take a but longer.

In terms of wanting to know who was there, we have an attendance list that the facilitators suggested that we have on a daily basis so that we have a sense of who was here as well, so that will be put on the record as well. I hope that answers your question.

MR. HAL MILLS: Are there any other questions or comments?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): If I could just comment on the final day of the technical session, it is our understanding that discipline specific questions related to cumulative effects should be addressed directly to the appropriate technical expert in the proceeding days and not saved up until Friday of next week when we wanted to have every single expert available. In our mind, global cumulative impacts really gets to general approach.

MR. HAL MILLS: Thank you for that. That was a tricky thing in terms of scheduling. on the one hand it made sense to have a session like that at the end,

on the other hand we knew that some of the people with a great interest in cumulative impacts from a particular discipline may not be there on the final afternoon, so I agree with what Robin is saying.

Just one final comment from me, and I may be infringing on what Mike is going to say next in terms of procedures here, but it is obviously not up to the facilitators to either identify issues or to speak to the substance of them. So in cases where we have the facilitators listed on the right hand column, that is just to indicate that we will guide the discussion. It is definitely not up to us to have an opinion on the issues or to be speaking to the substance of them.

Having said that then, I will turn things over to Mike with respect to talking about the procedures that we hope to follow through the next while.

MR. MIKE BELL: Thank you. I am glad you made that last point. As I keep looking down through the agenda and I see things like past operational issues that would seem to indicate that the facilitator knows something about past operational issues. I don't even know what past operational issues are. That is not a real big problem, it is only a big problem if you don't know what past operational issues are.

I use that example to help clarify what I think the role of the facilitators are. I don't like the word facilitator, it comes from the word faci lease, which means in Latin "to make easy". I think if you take a look at the agenda for the next two weeks and there is not very much in here that is very easy.

I much prefer what our colleagues in Quebec sometimes refer to themselves as Animator De Groupe, Group Animators. Animator comes from the Latin anima, which means spirit, and I think it is the role of the Animator to reach out and try and touch the spirit of the room. So it is something like an acupuncturist, where basically we are trying to keep things moving and move along.

The other equivalency we have in English to Animator is Cartoonist. It is someone who shows the progress of movement. I think that is basically what our role is. That is the role I think we will be trying to fulfill.

I would like to explain the set of procedures that we have worked out and that we are going to use. I will give you a copy of this afterwards. But I think the purpose of this set of procedures is to help us to review the issues and determine their status. Have they been resolved, or must they be referred to the board for resolution?

To make this determination, we have to do two things. First, we have to make sure the issue or issues are properly defined and understood. At this point, we

may provide participants with more information to better understand the issues. So the first thing we have to understand is, is this the issue?

The second thing we have to do is determine the status of the issue. If, after discussion, there is no longer an issue, it drops off the table. This will be recorded. If after discussion it is still an issue, we will try and summarize why it is an issue and refer the matter to the board.

It is not our purpose during these hearings to resolve these issues. That will be a matter for the board to deal with. I think we have to be very clear at this point. If we see things getting bogged down and it is obvious we are having trouble with consensus or things aren't that clear, we are going to move on, because we are trying to stick to a schedule.

We have outlined a six-step process that we would like you to consider. First, the facilitator will identify the area of issues. For example, water management system. Second, the participants will then identify their issues that fall into this area. To the extent possible, these will be listed. Third, De Beers will be asked then to address the issues. Fourth, there will be a brief discussion. Fifth, the facilitators will try and summarize the status of the issue. Sixth, the groups will determine whether as a result of discussion the issue has been resolved and can therefore be put to the side, or whether it is still unresolved and should be referred to the board.

Just a couple of additional comments: The discussion of issues will be limited to the scope already agreed upon. I can see you saying, "what happens if we have a disagreement there?" If we've got a disagreement in relation to the scope, we will ask De Beers whether they think this falls into the scope of the terms of reference for what we are dealing with, and then we will turn to our man Louie over here, who is the court of last resort or first resort. Court of first resort. He will basically at that point say, we think its on the issue. I think the scope issue has already come up and I think we have to have a way to deal with it, so that is the way we are going to try to deal with it.

As facilitators we will keep to the schedule. We have a lot of areas to cover so we ask that you be as brief and precise as possible. Lastly, we will do our very best to make sure that everyone gets a chance to speak. We will stick to the agenda and the schedule. So if we have to interrupt, we hope you will understand. I think the last thing, going back to my first point is, if it is apparent as we are trying to discuss these things that the facilitators don't have a clear grasp of what the issue is because it is technical, we would very much appreciate someone enlightening us, so we can facilitate or animate appropriately. Questions?

MR. GARTH WALLBRIDGE (Rae-Edzo Metis): Your last point there, number 6, I think it is to put it down that there is agreement or whatever. I want to get back to the comments earlier on that. I think this is a very useful process. I think ten days is a long time for people to necessarily be expected to be here, depending upon most important, financial and personnel resources. I think that anything that does go forward, it needs to be recognized -- of course, that is why I am wanting this on the transcript -- that if someone is not here, and therefore doesn't have some input into a particular consensus, if we want to call it that, that does not necessarily mean that they are presumed to have agreed to that because they didn't need to be here.

I think that is important. I will close by saying that I think this is useful and I am glad we are doing it.

MR. MIKE BELL: Just on that point I think it is important to indicate what happens after this on some of these issues. Louie.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): Many people from government here will recall that before the workplan was amended the technical sessions, the technical reports were going to be prepared before this session. There were several recommendations that came forward to the board that said, "Listen. It would be a lot more productive for all of us if we could have technical sessions before preparing summary technical reports." Technical reports are essentially a regulators, expert's, views of the conclusion. We've read it, we've reviewed it, this is what we think and so on. A typical technical report that you would have seen in a number of environmental assessments.

That's what has happened. The board has amended its work plan and people will be submitting technical reports in the new year, mid-February. We hope that the discussions, the dialog, the learning that happens in this room over the next two weeks helps you prepare better, more refined technical reports with more precise sets of conditions or recommendations and helps you work internally within your own organizations to do the work that is necessary as the project moves forward towards whatever eventuality it reaches, whether it be regulatory or otherwise.

So, after the technical reports there is going to be some time to digest those reports. They will be put on the record and they will become the point to which the board will set some of the discussion around in this public hearing. This is what I would call the technical phase of the environmental assessment. At the conclusion of the technical phase, with the submissions of your technical reports in mid-February, for lack of a better word, beginning the public process where the board prepares for its public hearing and your technical reports become very public and people will again provide opinions and views on them.

So, it is not the end and certainly I think it will help the board a lot to understand your views and your recommendations coming from here, and your forthcoming technical reports.

MR. MIKE BELL: Garth, are you happy with...

MR. GARTH WALLBRIDGE (Rae-Edzo Metis): Yes, thank you.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): If he is happy, I shouldn't add anything, but I was going to make the point that even if you are part of the discussion where we document that there is agreement on something, which hopefully will be somewhat useful information to the board, that doesn't bind you to that. You can still, through your report or at the public hearings, you can still say, "well, okay, I might have been there for that discussion, but what I really think is this." So even if you are in the room when something is agreed to, that is not at all legally binding on you in terms of any position you want to take afterwards. Thank you.

MR. MIKE BELL: I think that is an important distinction because of the concerns expressed by Natural Resources Canada. This is an informal information sharing process. It is not a legal process where everyone has to stand up and vote, or anything like that. We are trying to keep it as informal as possible. That has strengths and weaknesses, but I think the point is really the point that Hal has already made. You may feel that you were part of a consensus here, you might go outside and start thinking about it a little more and decide you want to put in a technical report. That is perfectly acceptable.

Ultimately it is the board's role, not our role here, to determine what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. So when in doubt, write a report.

MR. ALEXANDRE DESBARATS (Natural Resources Canada): Just on the same matter, there is really no need to achieve any consensus. All you really have to do is stop at item 5 in your 6 step process and summarize the status of the issue. I think that would be sufficient.

MR. MIKE BELL: We have been asked to try and take it a step further to find out to what extent we have consensus. So if it doesn't work, it doesn't make sense... You know, I have a problem myself. Full consensus, partial consensus, a little but of consensus, it's problematic. So basically we will take it as far as we can do and just try to go with what works. Other questions.

MR. MARK LANGE (Fisheries and Oceans): Relating to this information and the summary that will emerge from these discussions over the next ten days and the information that will be provided to the board, we still have an issue that remains unresolved with this summary, and that is that the summary is being

produced, if I understood it correctly, by the board or board staff for the board and I think the board would go a long way to establishing a very transparent process by allowing participants in these meetings to see a draft version of the report before it is submitted to the public registry.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): If I can legally do that, I will. If that is what the people that I work for, and that is ultimately you and the board, if you say that is what you want, I am perfectly happy to do that. My only concern is that we don't try to recreate history. I know there is a tendency afterwards to maybe be cautious and say, "well I didn't quite say that" so that is why I like to put things on the record, and have people tell me that its wrong... but I am perfectly happy. If it is legally fine, sure.

MR. MARK LANGE (Fisheries and Oceans): That is all that I ask, that board staff consider that option of submitting a draft. Thank you.

MR. MIKE BELL: Further questions?

MS. JANET HUTCHINSON (NSMA): Just a further comment about how rigid or flexible we will be with issues. I think it is important for the facilitators to be aware that the parties were told that they would receive a draft list of issues and the notes of the prehearing conference in advance of this proceeding in order to comment on that and add to it if necessary. That hasn't occurred just because of the timelines that were available, and I think it does speak to if there are parties indicating that they need another issue or a different aspect of the issue raised, it is certainly a point that can be considered towards flexibility.

MR. MIKE BELL: Other comments? Garth.

MR. GARTH WALLBRIDGE (Rae-Edzo Metis): I want to go a couple of steps back. The gentleman from NRC, I heard him ask if we shouldn't just drop number 6 off the process and I fail to capture what the decision was on that. Perhaps a decision was made and I missed it, I am sorry.

MR. MIKE BELL: I indicated that basically we have been asked to try and take it to the next step. If it becomes obvious that the next step is not useful or we can't get to the next step, then probably we will abandon it. What we are trying to do is give the board some kind of idea of whether we are almost finished this issue or we are close or there is still a broad area of disagreement.

So if people turn around and say, "we disagree. We think more has to be done on this issue." I think it is logical to say if that is the case, why is this an issue? We will just document that the group said this was an issue for the following

reasons, and that's it. We leave it to the board, we are not going to decide it. The board is going to decide it.

MS. JANET HUTCHINSON (NSMA): Just a question, Mike. That request to take it to the next step, has that come from the parties, the board staff, the board itself?

MR. MIKE BELL: That, as I understand it, was the request that came from the board.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): Basically as Gordon Wray said this morning, it is from the board in that his hope is that you can resolve issues or at least come to some understanding of where you are on them so that when you prepare your technical reports you can be more precise, more clear on what you are saying or the outcome. So yes, essentially it will be up to you to finally bring those issues that remain unresolved in your technical reports forward. I can't do that for you, but this is an opportunity to identify those issues that you also feel should not be brought forward where there is resolution.

MR. MIKE BELL: Further questions. Garth.

MR. GARTH WALLBRIDGE (Rae-Edzo Metis): Looking at the explanation of the procedures, which I think is helpful, I am going to put forward to you if I might just a couple of minor changes that would relieve some of the concern I have about everyone not necessarily being here all the time, and also that the issue of stuff being dropped off the table just because of who was here decided that it was okay.

If I can take you down to item 6 again, and the sub number in there, number 1, it says "the issue has been resolved." I am not certain that this technical session has the ability, the legal authority if you will, to make that decisions.

A couple of qualifying words in front of that would certainly satisfy me, and I am asking you and the other people to consider them. Simply, after the number 1, if you put "it is likely that the issues..." Then they are still going to go forward. They are going to be documented and I think that is important.

MR. MIKE BELL: I don't have a problem with that, I don't think anybody else has a problem with that, but I am not speaking for the group. Any great problems with that? Next point.

MR. GARTH WALLBRIDGE (Rae-Edzo Metis): Thank you, Mike. On a similar point, just to finish that. Up at the top of the page there is a second bullet point, "Determine the status of the issues" and then under that, "if, after discussion this is no longer an issue, it drops off the table." Just after that comma, if you were to

say "It is documented and it is dropped off the table." again, I would be pretty happy with that and I ask you to consider it, please.

MR. MIKE BELL: I don't have any problems with that. Does anybody else have any problems with that? "It is documented, and it drops off the table." What do you do for a living? Okay, can we move on? One question here.

MR. RAYMOND BOURGET (RWED): If an issue is on the list, for example if we look at the wildlife parks, one issue, one hour, there are three different sections to it. If, because of time one of those sections is not addressed, what happens with it? If it is not addressed, it falls off the table, it is unresolved, or is there another venue where we bring it up again and try to get that resolved?

MR. MIKE BELL: I will give you my sense, and I will stand to my consultant for the board to see what he says. There is a possibility that there are far more issues than we have time to deal with them. But part of the reality that we are facing in each one of these areas is, we can't keep going into water quality on day 1, day 2, day 3 and day 4 because there are people coming from other areas to try and deal with these things.

I guess the best we can say is, we are going to do and handle as much of a workload under these categories as we possibly can. If there are still issues to be resolved or there are still issues to be discussed, we will note in the proceedings that this is the case and I think at that point it will be the board's determination of how it wants to deal with these.

Since we haven't had a discussion on this, I want to hear from Louie on that.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): The entire environmental assessment forces people to prioritize their resources and their time. This situation is no different. We have a fixed amount of time, 10 days, and a pretty fixed agenda. You will notice in the agenda that the specific issues are not listed for you.

-- No Overlap Between Tapes

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): ...talking to another party over the next month and a half. There's nothing stopping anyone from calling De Beers and having a chat with them. But at the end of the day, you will be submitting, if you want, a technical report. Essentially, a technical report would have to identify the issue that you are not satisfied with as a regulator, technical expert, and provide some suggestion or recommendation to the board how it, how you believe that issue could be addressed. I hope that answers that question.

MR. HAL MILLS: I'd like to add to that a bit, if I could. And this is where I think the facilitators have a responsibility. If you take a topic that's on the agenda for

Monday, December 2nd, 10:30, the wildlife monitoring program. Under that there are three different bullets – the ...(inaudible)... species, the regional monitoring initiatives, and collaborative efforts. I think the facilitators have responsibility to make sure that some time is allocated to each of those three bullets. If we get a huge discussion on ...(inaudible)... species, I think we've got a responsibility to cut that off at a certain stage and move on to the other bullets. Under each of the bullets then, exactly what Louie says comes into play. It's going to be up to you guys to try to focus in on the particular issues related to that bullet that you think are the highest priority and to get them out on the table for discussion. Thank you.

MR. MIKE BELL: Any more questions?

MS. MARGO BURGESS (Natural Resources Canada): Margo Burgess, Natural Resources. My question is just on a technical aspect. Are you proceeding sort of going around the table, you're asking people to bring forward their issues? Is it a free for all, open to questions or do you work your way around?

Again, it gets to the question of time, but is there an attempt to try to go around?

MR. HAL MILLS: My inclination is to be nowhere near that systematic, and I think in terms of opening presentations from De Beers, we'll get an idea as to whether some of the major issues that they think are going to fall out in the different topics for the agenda for that morning, for instance, and then we're going to open it up for discussion for you to chime in with what you think are the more important ones that need or could benefit from further discussion here with this group of people.

MR. MIKE BELL: I'd like to make one point on this. On one occasion, somebody asked Marshal McLune what is art? And Marshal answered "Art is anything you can get away with." I think in this particular situation, we're trying to figure out what's going to work. And it raises the issue, if you think that something that we're trying to do is not working, then let us now and we'll try and adapt or change to the reality. But we're really trying to be as flexible as possible and move along at a reasonable pace, so that's the rule of thumb that we've got. There was another question down here.

-- Interjection

Okay. Well thanks a lot. The record should record that we had an obtuse response to that last... okay, anymore? Good. If I could, Hal, back to you.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay. We have the next item on the agenda list is scope and methodology, which we pretty well just worked through anything that I could think

of there. Perhaps to just add in terms of scope, where it's been suggested that – not suggested, it's been mentioned that we need to stick within the terms of reference for this. We have to have some recognition of things that the board is already dismissed, for whatever reason, and we've been encouraged to make it clear that we're dealing with issues that have already been identified. Now, for all of these, to the extent that the facilitators know those things, which is pretty small, then we may say well, we don't think that that should be discussed here because, but that's unlikely to happen very often. It's going to be up to the parties here to remind us or to inform us of those things, so if something goes beyond De Beers terms of reference, why, we will expect De Beers to point that out to us and things of that nature.

If it's something that is already, that the board has already dealt with, we'll expect Louie to remind us of that or whatever. If it's a new issue, and here's where I don't feel any need to be firm on this, if it is not something that is not a pre-identified issue, I'm not sure that we need to say "can't talk about that." I'd be quite happy to entertain a discussion on that. We may not be able to take it as far as we can with some of the other issues. It may be that, you know, if DFO raises a new issue, that De Beers may say, well, we haven't had a chance to look at that yet, so we can't comment. You know, there may be circumstances like that, or we'll need to wait until we have a particular expert here or things of that nature. But if it is something that will help everybody along by having a discussion, we probably should do it.

MS. JANET HUTCHISON (NSMA): Hal, Janet Hutchison. Just a question, if there's a differing perception around the table about what falls within the TOR and what does not, do the facilitators have a proposed process for trying to deal with disputes of that nature?

MR. HAL MILLS: Janet, I think the only thing we can do is try to, you know, help the discussion along to see if the discussion itself will address that, and if it remains something that the participants or the parties cannot agree on here, I think it would have to be referred to the board.

MR. MIKE BELL: I think we have already indicated a process for those things that may fall outside. The first part is I'm going to look down there at De Beers and say what do you think, is this within what you understood to be the terms of reference, and the second thing we're going to do is go to the guru over here and we're going to say Louie, you're the first step in this particular process, what's the feeling of the board on this? That's why we've insisted, and I don't think we even had to insist, that somebody from the board be here at all times, and he's assured me that he is going to be here at all times, so that's the way we would deal with the issue, with the process we've outlined.

MR. HAL MILLS: Anymore questions? Okay, I think we can move on then. The supposedly 2:15, we're not doing a very good job of keeping you on schedule here. Okay, this is Hal Mills speaking. Mike has just asked if we should perhaps take a break before getting into this. I wonder if we could hear from De Beers as to, since they'll be saying at least a few words to the three bullets that are under topics regarding scope and methodology. Is that likely to take a while and should we break now, or would you rather proceed with the discussion?

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell with De Beers Canada. We have a brief presentation on monitoring. Otherwise, we are willing to entertain questions on the other two agenda items.

MR. HAL MILLS: So would it be best if we took a fifteen-minute break now?

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): It's your choice. We're ready to go when you are.

MR. HAL MILLS: Break, I here. Okay, let's take a fifteen-minute break. Thank you.

-- Break

MR. HAL MILLS: Under the scope and methodology, we had three topics that were put in for some discussion at least today, and the first of those is production rates. As we've already mentioned, at least a part of the discussion on this is going to be referred to the second day under geotechnical, which is I believe December 4th, leading off the afternoon. But are there some comments that either De Beers or the other parties want to make regarding production rates at this point?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): De Beers does not.

MR. HAL MILLS: Anyone have anything they want to say about production rates now, or are you happy with simply having it on December 4th? Okay, December 4th it is. The second bullet then is on alternatives, in particular, hydro. John.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell with De Beers. I guess we'd like to hear what the issue is.

MR. GAVIN MORE (GNWT): Gavin More, GNWT. We're prepared to speak to that issue. I'll turn it over to one of our experts, Pietro De Bastiani, and Pietro will lead the discussion.

MR. PIETRO DE BASTIANI (RWED): Pietro De Bastiani, Energy Secretariat, RWED. The issue is the Government of the Northwest Territories, on behalf of

communities, aboriginal governments, is interested in the sustainable development of energy systems in the Northwest Territories, particularly the hydroelectric system, which has been developed to some point to develop mining development in the North to date. In reviewing the initial project description, certainly the conclusion appears to be very quickly arrived at, that a diesel system to meet transportation, heating and electrical generating needs is the most economic alternative to the mine's energy needs. There is mention that there have been some preliminary discussions about hydro opportunities with our agency, the Power Corporation, a Crown corporation.

So at this stage, we're very interested, of course, in looking at every opportunity, along with communities and aboriginal governments, for the opportunities to position the development of sustainable hydroelectric power in the Northwest Territories to meet growing need, especially in the industry and community sectors.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell with De Beers. You know, we're in favour of the development of hydroelectric power in the north as well, and we have had several meetings with the NWT Power Corporation and the Dogrib Power Corporation, and given them the size or amounts of power we'd require on the site. And to date, we're I guess we had a meeting with them I guess as recently as maybe four or five weeks ago, to again suggest that we're interested in working with those two groups to promote that agenda, but we haven't had any concrete proposals back from either of those two groups.

MR. HAL MILLS: Any further comments on that? Pietro.

MR. PIETRO DE BASTIANI (RWED): Pietro De Bastiani, Energy Secretariat, RWED. So the company, of course, is very interested in continuing to work with all parties in that particular area?

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): No question. It's for everyone's good.

MR. HAL MILLS: Have we resolved that by consensus? Okay, thank you. Okay, the third then is monitoring, and I believe that Robin has a presentation to make.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): De Beers Canada, Robin Johnstone. Thank you very much for the opportunity for this brief presentation. The purpose of this brief presentation is really to provide clarification regarding De Beers' plans for monitoring bio-physical and socio-economic environmental effects.

One observation from the EA process to date is that there's been an expressed desire for detailed monitoring plans up-front. Here we essentially briefly outline De Beers' approach to the development of those detailed monitoring plans.

In the environmental assessment report, De Beers committed to developing monitoring plans that meet the requirements of the results of the environmental assessment and regulatory review processes, and are developed in consultation with communities, elders and governments.

Further, traditional knowledge would be incorporated into monitoring plans. And obviously, it's implicit to the permitting process that we'll also have to develop a detail monitoring plan as required by law.

In general, monitoring needs are identified in several ways. Firstly, they're identified during compilation and completion of the environmental assessment report, and that is essentially De Beers' and their consultants' view of areas which we consider should be monitored. And monitoring needs were outlined for most disciplines covered in the environmental assessment, including the likes of socio-economic, heritage resources, air quality, hydrogeology, hydrology, water quality, aquatic organisms and habitat, vegetation, wildlife, cumulative effects and environmental management. So basically the list of chapters in the EA.

In general, details to monitoring plans were not given as De Beers firmly believes that they should be developed in consultation with governments and communities.

Secondly, monitoring needs are also identified by interveners during the EA process, through the likes of technical reports, public hearings, and culminating in the IRB's decision to the Minister, which may include specific recommendations or suggestions, including monitoring needs. Overall, the EA process makes a substantial contribution to identify monitoring needs.

Thirdly, as stated previously, De Beers considers that consultation is a critical way by which to identify monitoring needs and priorities. It's certainly De Beers' intent to strive to develop monitoring plans that reflect the priorities and concerns of Northerners.

Fourthly, the water licensing and land use permits that De Beers needs to build and operate a mine include specific requirements for detailed monitoring plans related to the likes of mine site and development, mine infrastructure, geotechnical, geochemical, water quality, hazardous waste management and disposal, aquatic effects, and reclamation. De Beers will be required to provide detailed plans during this process to satisfy legal requirements.

It should be noted that there's one major exception in this, or one of the major exceptions in this regulatory process is that it doesn't explicitly include wildlife monitoring plans.

Finally, monitoring plans may also be identified under discussion around an environmental agreement. To date, it's certainly a common expectation that the Snap Lake diamond project will require an environmental agreement which may include waters monitored and how monitoring is implemented. De Beers has recently participated in a workshop for a single regional monitoring agency for the Slave Geological Province. And certainly, we appreciate the advantages associated with a single agency, consider that as discussed briefly by John McConnell earlier, that a community orientated monitoring agencies along the lines of EMAD, provides a model close to the version that we see advantages to, rather than that of the independent environmental monitoring agency for BHP Billiton.

However, we also think that it should include both socio-economic and biophysical, an area which was not addressed at the single regional monitoring agency discussion.

As stated, you know, we've all heard and expressed desire for detailed monitoring plans up front. But De Beers considers that in many cases, such detail is inappropriate to the stage of the permitting process where the project presently lies. But where does that leave us?

We see that the next steps in the process to develop comprehensive and detailed plans are first of all, to use the outcome of EA milestone, such as technical reports or public hearings to identify monitoring needs and priorities to assist in developing draft plans. But De Beers considers it critical to consult with communities and regulators. De Beers has received several suggestions from communities to date as to the way that they would like to develop their ideas, including developing and providing monitoring plans directly to De Beers. For consideration.

Bob Turner of the North Slave Metis Alliance, at the pre-hearing conference, suggested that a get-together of representatives from the primary communities would be useful to discuss monitoring needs.

Now, in this process, the next step is for De Beers to contact communities and we'll do so prior to Christmas to discuss their preferences, how to gain their input, and intend to start the consultation process in the year, so that progress has been made prior to the public hearings.

Now, where specific plans, requirements for monitoring exist in the regulatory process, the detail plans will be provided at that stage.

Finally, recent discussions around the single monitoring agency will basically further the process of identifying the how to, the monitoring question and the overall framework under which it sits.

In terms of comments, certainly we're interested in hearing comments, and general. If there are specific questions about monitoring around specific disciplines, then I'd ask you to leave those to the appropriate agenda item in the next coming days, but I'm certainly happy to address general issues now.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay, Hal Mills speaking. Thank you, Robin. Any general comments or questions of a general nature?

MS. JANET HUTCHISON (NSMA): Janet Hutchison, NSMA. Robin, I'm just wondering if monitoring programs are not described in detail at this point in the process, how does De Beers propose that the parties and the board in fact be able to determine whether or not there is actually adequate mitigation of the impact of this project? If we don't know what the monitoring programs are, how they will be designed, and whether they will be effective, how can we determine whether or not there will be adequate mitigation?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers. I guess the critical difference is monitoring this is mitigation, Janet, and that in general, we are identifying monitoring needs that will reduce uncertainty in the impact predictions, or they will contribute to refining those impact predictions. Obviously the aspect that monitoring will be used to refine mitigation techniques as well. Now, the key issue is monitoring has been done before in the Slave Geological Province. There are two projects which precede us that have established performance indicators, if you like. That can be used on this project, but in general, the question is can monitoring, appropriate monitoring be developed? And De Beers is confident that it can be, and that there is nothing new that essentially we're proposing.

MR. GAVIN MORE (GNWT): Gavin More, GNWT. Robin, I had a couple of questions to do with the hypotheticals. You're kind of caught between the timing of, as your project goes forward, when you have to start making decisions, but then there's these other uncertainties about joining forces with the other monitoring agencies of the other two mines. What kind of steps are you taking at this point in time to either work on a voluntary basis with those groups, for example, if there's some kind of studies where it's useful to be... doing monitoring using the same methodology, same timing, same staff, for example. Are you doing anything along those lines? And then, the second question, and I

think this came out quite strongly at the Slave Geological Province meeting, was many people assumed that because the MVRMA requires or defines the word environment as including people, are there some steps taken right now to start looking at that kind of a social and economic monitoring? And again, are you doing that in conjunction with the other mines, if it's at all possible?

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell with De Beers. Maybe I'll just start out. I mean, I don't think that's our role, to try to bring the other proponents together. You know, you've identified the other two mining operations, and they're probably two models there to choose from, but there are other developers in the North that need to be brought into this. So I think, you know, as identified in that workshop, it's really a role for INAC to take the lead on and to try to bring the various groups together for those kinds of discussions. You know, we indicated during the workshop that we were quite prepared to participate in the smaller working group to try and achieve that end, but also, as I indicated this morning, you know, nothing moves too fast when you involve those many groups, so we do see a need to begin discussions on an environmental agreement and socio-economic agreement in parallel to those other discussions. Now, I'm not sure if I fully answered your question, and Robin may want to add, certainly on the environmental side.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Thanks, John. Robin Johnstone from De Beers. With regard to your first question, if I got it right, Gavin, on whether we're using the same timing and the same staff and that sort of thing, remember we don't have a mine, so monitoring is difficult to put in place for a mine without a mine. Having said that, we have an advanced exploration program, and that our approach to monitoring for the advanced exploration program, you know, we have monitoring requirements under our land use permit and water license, and we are implementing those. We have, as required, we have gone beyond that in some areas. We have been continuing wildlife monitoring since completion of the EA to further contribute to baseline data for the project, and to provide information on a regional basis, so as RWED I'm sure knows, that we have discussed the methods that we've used in those disciplines to ensure that they are consistent with what's being used on a regional basis, so the techniques that you see at BHP, for instance, in general the techniques that you are seeing in the selection of ECs are the same for ongoing monitoring at Snap Lake.

So your answer is yes, we have provide careful consideration around the way in which we collect data.

MR. GAVIN MORE (GNWT): Gavin More, GNWT. I guess as a comment, I see great difficulties in trying to work the two streams, and I guess I would feel more comfortable if I knew that the companies were really working very strongly

together at that idea of a single monitoring agency, versus knowing that really, you are going to be doing separate negotiations during the next year or two, with the idea that that other idea might come much, sort of the mid-term, sort of four or five years from now.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell. Was there a question there, or a directive to INAC?

MR. GAVIN MORE (GNWT): Gavin More, GNWT. Actually, I suppose it is a question because I do hear people saying well, we're going to be considering some of these new ideas, but my question is which process are you really following in this next six months to a year? Are you following the go it alone, working on socio-economic environmental agreements versus this potential that's been raised that we might work with the other mines to come and look at developing a single monitoring agency. And I think at this stage, the way I look at the timing, we need to know which is the procedure or the process that De Beers is following most strongly.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell with De Beers. I don't think we're following either more strongly. I think we see a need to move towards our own agreements so that it does not hold up the permitting process, but we're willing to put the same amount of effort into developing a single monitoring agency.

I know we have some representation here from INAC. You know, perhaps they could shed some light on what the schedule is that they see in terms of moving forward.

MR. HAL MILLS: Anyone care to bite on that one?

MS. TAMARA HAMILTON (DIAND): I guess I can just say, I'll let David sit at the monitoring... oh, sorry. Tamara Hamilton, DIAND – is that he is committed to providing funding and to work with others on this issue to create a single monitoring agency. And around the environmental agreement, that's still up in the air right now. That has not been decided yet, but more than likely, yes, an agreement would be required.

MS. JANET HUTCHISON (NSMA): Janet Hutchison. Robin, just another question. Some of the comments about it being too early in the process to finalize some of the methodologies for monitoring, I'm just wondering, is it De Beers intention to have those methodologies finalized by the time of the hearing in March of 2003?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): In general, Janet, it largely relies on community consultation, so a lot of that will depend on the speed at which we are able to get input back from the communities. Robin Johnstone from De Beers.

MR. STEVE WILBUR (Dogrib Treaty 11): Steve Wilbur, Dogrib. One of the issues, Robin, that you raised was this monitoring as kind of a transition, or to continue baseline gathering that you've been working on. I guess one of my concerns is that in order to develop adequate monitoring programs, we have sufficient baseline data. I don't know if this is really a baseline question or a monitoring question, but it begs a question with respect to can we at the end of the EA process, have sufficient information to put a sufficient monitoring program together, and if we don't, should we have, or if we have some idea of a more detail, maybe not a really fine level of detail of monitoring programs, but some level of concept of what De Beers is considering putting into these monitoring programs in order to evaluate whether they've actually, you've gotten sufficient baseline to carry through this with the monitoring.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers Canada. Steve, I think in general, I think the issue around baseline should probably be left to the appropriate area. I think the key question comes down to do we have enough information to adequately identify what monitoring is required and a general framework under which we would achieve that, whether we have eight thermistors or 14 thermistors. We regard that as a detail that is best worked out once we have our whole list of monitoring priorities, and to work with governments, communities and regulators to basically detail the flesh around those, and develop those in conjunction. So the key really is, can we monitor what we're proposing? And areas where we think we may have environmental effects and we've predicted, we've made predictions, and De Beers' answer to that is yes, we can, that there's many examples of monitoring that have been well-established within the Slave Geological Province or within southern Canada, so on that basis, we have the information and we can proceed.

MR. HAL MILLS: Okay, are we all in, all done on that?

MR. BOB TURNER (NSMA): Bob Turner with North Slave Metis Alliance. I'm just thinking about monitoring protocols, I guess. Our experience with the other two mines, BHP and Diavik, some of the monitoring methods that I guess they were using weren't all that consistent, and I guess after a lot of review and comments back and forth, BHP and Diavik are starting to work a little close together in developing more common, I guess, methods of doing their monitoring in regards to caribou movements and such, so I'm wondering if this project or if De Beers is going to consider, I guess, developing a working relationship or a relationship with other mines in the area where monitoring methods are

consistent, so that the data eventually can be useful data in determining cumulative effects in a regional setting.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers Canada. Thanks for your comment and question, Bob. You raised the issue of whether De Beers is prepared to basically develop a relationship and work with BHP and Diavik in developing consistent monitoring methods. We are. And we have already been. Our consultant that sits here, Golder Associates, essentially works for both Diavik and BHP, certainly on their wildlife monitoring programs, so we have started that relationship, we have started using essentially from day one, similar monitoring methods and we look forward to continuing that, because we think that it makes good sense. In the absence of being given clear direction from other parties about how to monitor, I think that that relationship is critical to developing cohesive monitoring plans and methods.

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene First Nation): Rachel Crapeau, Yellowknives Dene, land and environment. You mentioned the elders and TK, traditional knowledge use. Could you explain further about how you are going to be using the elders and using the traditional knowledge?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers. Rachel, the answer to your question is around how we would use elders and traditional knowledge with respect to monitoring is that we follow their lead. It's not up to us to define what their traditional knowledge is, what contributions they can feel that they can make. It is us to sit down and talk with our respective organizations and elders to basically work through how they would like their information and the things that they can contribute to basically develop that. So it's very much dependent on what the elders think they can contribute and would feel comfortable with doing so.

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene First Nation): Rachel Crapeau, Yellowknives Dene. My following question to that is if you're going to be using elders and their knowledge, would you be also willing to put TK as in a panel forum as part of the EA agreement?

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): De Beers Canada, Robin Johnstone. Are you getting at essentially having elder participation in a monitoring agreement, environmental agreement, Rachel?

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene First Nation): Rachel Crapeau, Yellowknives Dene. I want to say do you have a place in the environmental agreement. I hopefully see a panel of elders or use of elders from the communities in the future, so this would ensure that monitoring would be continued.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): De Beers Canada, Robin Johnstone. We're interested in cooperating and the information and experience that elders can pass to us. We do not yet know what form that will take. We have examples of where we have used that information to identify environmental impacts and to identify monitoring means to date from communities such as Lutselk'e. Going forward from that to an environmental agreement, we really need to have a lot of discussion, Rachel, so I think it's very dependent on what the interests of the communities are, so we look forward to hearing that.

MR. HAL MILLS: Hal Mills speaking. Just as part of that, I just wanted to note that we do have that topic on the agenda, the general heading of traditional knowledge and specifically the use of traditional knowledge in mitigation and monitoring on the agenda for three o'clock this Friday afternoon.

That wasn't intended to cut off discussion now, but just to point out that we have another slot where we can return to that.

Okay, Hal Mills again. I'm sensing that we've perhaps reached the end of the discussion on this point on monitoring. Is that correct? Okay, next was just a general discussion. Anything related to today that you've heard that you want to return to, any concerns you've got for the next nine days coming up. I'll just open the floor to you, if there's anything related to this general technical session that you would like to raise, now's your opportunity.

MS. JANET HUTCHISON (NSMA): Janet Hutchison, NSMA. I'm actually just wondering if De Beers will be able to provide us with copies of some of their presentations.

MR. ROBIN JOHNSTONE (De Beers Canada): Robin Johnstone, De Beers Canada. I was going to propose that the presentations would directly go to the board staff for submission onto the public registry.

MS. JANET HUTCHISON (NSMA): Janet Hutchison. That would be excellent. Thank you, Robin.

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene First Nation): Rachel Crapeau, Yellowknives Dene. Are we going to be getting this information every day? The presentation items?

MR. HAL MILLS: I take it that De Beers is going to submit them and that they're going to appear on the MVEIRB website. Is that correct?

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): Louie Azzolini. If I could get some clarification, Rachel. Do you want the copies, the digital copies of the material everyday as it's prepared is what you're saying?

MS. RACHEL CRAPEAU (Yellowknives Dene First Nation): Yes I do because I'm going to be here at 8:30 in the morning and I'll be here until we finish and I'm not going to be able to run back to Dettah to go check my email.

MR. LOUIE AZZOLINI (MVEIRB): Louie Azzolini. In all honesty, I hadn't exactly thought of that. So I don't have an answer off the top of my head. If you bear with me, in part, it's dependent on De Beers' ability to do that as well, so I don't, I can't speak for them so I'll look down the way here.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): John McConnell with De Beers. I don't think it's going to be possible to turn them around that quickly, but I think the presentations that we make on the day, we could probably make a few hard copies available the next morning, and then I'm not sure how quickly, Louie, you can post them on the website.

With respect to the presentations and the graphic presentations you had as well, we can load them basically within a matter of minutes once we get them, so putting them on the website isn't an issue. And what I'm hearing it's really the individuals would like the CD-Rom, would like some digital copy of the material when it becomes available when we do it.

MR. STEVE WILBUR (Dogrib Treaty 11): Steve Wilbur, Dogrib. I guess I need clarification on what you mean by the presentation. Is it just the slide or is it going to be text, and if there's text and figures and so forth. I mean, I don't... I guess these are going to be small presentations, so I don't imagine that there's a lot of text if you did do that.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): I would envision just making copies of the presentations available.

MR. STEVE WILBUR (Dogrib Treaty 11): Excuse me, Steve again. The picture of the slide or... what do you mean by presentation, I guess that's my question.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): I guess you should say what you're looking for, but a photocopy of the presentation and Louie says they can put the presentation itself up on their website.

MR. HAL MILLS: I think what he's asking is it going to be more than what is used and I believe what I'm hearing from you is that it's going to be the PowerPoint presentation as you see it on the screen, period.

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): That's correct.

MR. HAL MILLS: Just like in that TV ad, eh?

MR. JOHN MCCONNELL (De Beers Canada): Well, I mean the board is going to make transcripts available at a later date. I mean, you can't expect us to turn around a transcript. That's not our job. That's the EIRB's job.

MR. STEVE WILBUR (Dogrib Treaty 11): Steve Wilbur again. No, what I was wondering is if you had a text to back up what you were talking prior to it, and if you don't and we're just looking at the slides, that's fine. We can wait for the transcripts. I was just curious.

MR. HAL MILLS: Is there anything else that anyone would like to say? Okay, thank you very much then. That's it for today. I'll remind you that because we've got a lot on the agenda for the next couple of days, that we're starting at 8:30 in the morning. Please be here ready to go at 8:30. Thank you. Have a good evening.

-- ADJOURNMENT