OPR Review- Métis Nation British Columbia

June 17th, 2022

OPR Review

1) When I look at the TMX process in particular the best experiences have come through prime contractor engagement. This has led to not only procurement opportunities but frequent updates on ongoing work that help to inform the communities that I represent. Information can help prevent assumption and mitigates concern through understanding. Ensuring that communities and their representatives are informed and engaged is extremely helpful.

2) I think the process has come a long way recently to be more inclusive and that should be commended. But I think what has to happen now is an attempt to bridge the gap of how the world is looked at. The industry looks at problems and impact as a matter of years whereas First Nations look at this in terms of decades. Seeking to bring this understanding to industry so they can add this further view to their responses would likely help build bridges even further.

3) In my opinion this will always be a problem. Again information to the communities and acknowledgement of an unintended impact will go a long ways. Communities want to feel like they know things and don't want to be surprised by things. But ultimately no matter what when pipeline work occurs there will be unintended impacts that neither party could foresee.

4) For me the TMX process has been well handled. Sure it is a lot of emails, but at least I know where sites of importance are, why work was stopped and what was done in regards to the discovery. Doing the best that a company can to keep communities informed is what has to be done here.

5) I think indigenous knowledge should be interwoven as much in the reclamation plans as the initial planning. To ensure that the land is brought back to where it could be and has been as much as possible.

6) Capacity funded opportunities. Many indigenous communities are feeling a burden with the level of engagement, especially when many community members are volunteers. Capacity funding makes it easier to help compensate for the travel and time required to participate in these events.

7) Boots on the ground who are familiar to communities. As you get further afield to more remote communities a face who lives in the community and is well known is needed as the face of a company operating in that region. People will be far more likely to discuss concerns frankly with a community member that they know will listen and who also has enough information or access to it to get them a good answer.

8) Strive for genuine engagement over checking the box. Showing up and presenting information in a one off evening isn't enough. Again as above, boots on the ground for a longer period so a community gets a chance to feel comfortable engaging will enhance relations.

9) I feel the CER is doing a good job here and is always available to further explain any decisions or packages sent forward.

10) I do not have any comment here

11) This is difficult. But I think the CER could encourage companies to engage before they have to. This will help mitigate delays due to valid concerns presented by a community that require a change in plans.

12) Flexible platforms for all data. As long as your data is easy to consume by the majority of data handling software out there the need to do more is not there. I think the CER should serve to ensure they are facilitating the best access to the data as opposed to spending time and effort on any single product for delivery or custom building their own solution.

13) No Comment

14) No Comment

15) Transparency. A community does not want to be surprised that this is happening or find out over coffee. Make sure the community knows even if there is no opportunity for input.

16) The provided guide is thorough and easily understood.

17) An effort needs to be made here to ensure that the practices and sensitivity outlined translate to the executed work. Often while most companies comply here the sensitivity is not translating to the operational level and many workers continue to feel lower levels of safety (cultural and otherwise) in practice.

18) I am not sure. I feel like reaching the safety manuals misses the target. The goal should be to get these rules and regulations in to practice. The CER should be asking how it can improve the uptake by the folks doing the work.

19) I think this is not an immediate problem that a rule or regulation will fix. It comes with time and a learning and reinforcement of respect and cultural understanding across all peoples. This has come a long ways recently but it still has a long way to go.

20) I think this is another workplace cultural goal. And the real question is how do you set up a reporting environment free from judgement and repercussion. Most employees on site will not report for fear of being singled out as having reported. So they choose to turn a blind or deal. The questions is how you can make it safe to report so that they are not outed.

21) Give it teeth. Infractions should have a predetermined and agreed upon minimum monetary value. Make it the burden of the prime. But also create a scheme where self-reporting can mitigate negative impacts for a company.

22) I find this guide sufficient.

23) This appears robust.

24) This is outside my area of expertise, and I am not qualified to comment.

25) Signed and stamped drawings from an engineer verifying this has been accounted for?

26) No comment

27) Continue to engage with us electronically and give the chance for feedback just like what has been done here.