

APPENDIX 37 2025 TAG ANNUAL REPORT



AGNICO EAGLE

MELIADINE GOLD MINE

2025 TAG Annual Report

MARCH 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Agnico Eagle Mines Limited (Agnico Eagle) is operating the Meliadine Gold Mine (the Mine), located approximately 25 kilometres (km) north from Rankin Inlet, and 80 km southwest from Chesterfield Inlet in the Kivalliq Region of Nunavut. Situated on the western shore of Hudson’s Bay, the Mine site is located on a peninsula between the east, south, and west basins of Meliadine Lake (63°1’23.8’’N, 92°13’6.42’’W), on Inuit owned land.

The Meliadine Terrestrial Advisory Group (TAG) Terms of Reference (TORs) were finalized in early 2023, ensuring compliance with Terms and Conditions (TC) 132 of the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) Project Certificate No.006-002 (PC No.006-002) which stipulates:

“The Proponent shall, in consultation with the groups listed as Responsible Parties above, and any other parties considered by the Group to be necessary, establish a Terrestrial Advisory Group (TAG). The TAG shall hold its first meeting prior to any construction/installation of the waterlines. The central mandate of the TAG will be to continually review and refine impact management, mitigation, and monitoring details within the Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan (TEMMP). The TAG Members will collaborate to share and consider methods, results, and analysis from caribou and terrestrial environment studies and monitoring Inuit Qaujimaningit, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, Traditional and Community Knowledge shared by knowledge holders, and other terrestrial environment monitoring data as it becomes available. The Proponent will consider the information shared by the TAG Members for incorporation into the Project’s impact management, mitigation, and monitoring measures related to the protection of terrestrial wildlife and wildlife habitat as appropriate. Agnico Eagle shall be responsible for demonstrating how the information shared and considered by the TAG has been incorporated into the Project’s impact management, mitigation, and monitoring measures related to the protection of terrestrial wildlife and wildlife habitat as appropriate.”

This 2025 Terrestrial Advisory Group (TAG) Annual Report documents the work conducted throughout 2025 by the working group.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables	iii
Acronyms	i
Section 1 • TAG Highlight of 2024	2
Section 2 • TAG Action items, Recommendations and Advice.....	4
Section 3 • Agenda Items for 2025	13
Appendix A: 2025 Tag Meeting Minutes.....	14

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 : Description of the 2025 TAG meetings.....	2
Table 2 : Summary of TAG Action Items.....	5
Table 3: Proposed Calendar with Agenda	13

ACRONYMS

ADNLC	Athabasca Denesų́łiné NéNé Land Corporation
AEM	Agnico Eagle Mines Limited
BLHTO	Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization
C38	Collared Caribou Meliadine All-Weather Access Road Interactions Memo
CIRNAC	Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada
GKD	Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dene
GN	Government of Nunavut
KHTO	Kangiqliniq Hunter and Trapper Organization
KivIA	Kivalliq Inuit Association
KWB	Kivalliq Wildlife Board
MB	Manitoba
NDFN	Northlands Denesuline First Nation
NIRB	Nunavut Impact Review Board
NTI	Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.
PC No.006-002	Project Certificate No.006-002
SDFN	Sayisi Dene First Nation
TAG	Terrestrial Advisory Group
TC	Terms and Conditions
TC118	Decision Tree Revision
TEMMP	Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan
TORs	Terms of Reference

SECTION 1 • TAG HIGHLIGHTS OF 2025

One TAG meeting took place in March, 2025. This meeting used a hybrid format, with some parties accessing the meeting online via Microsoft Teams and some attending in-person in Rankin Inlet. One additional meeting was convened in November, 2025 in Rankin Inlet, but was dissolved just prior to initiation after some parties withdrew from attendance.

The focus of 2025 was the finalization of revisions to the Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan (TEMMP) and review of the TAG TOR. The agenda content and the participants for each meeting are listed in Table 1. The minutes detailing the discussions can be found in Appendix A.

There are currently seven TAG Parties: Kivalliq Inuit Association (KivIA), Government of Nunavut (GN), Kangiqliniq Hunters and Trappers Organizations (KHTO), Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization (BLHTO), Sayisi Dene First Nations (SDFN), Northland Denesuline First Nation (NDFN), Agnico Eagle Mines Limited (AEM). Five other organizations have been participating as observers or have indicated their interest to participate as observers: Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI), the Kivalliq Wildlife Board (KWB), the Athabasca Denesūliné Néné Land Corporation (ADNLC), Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC) and the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB).

Table 1 : Description of the 2025 TAG meetings

Date	Location	Main Topics Discussed	Attendees
March 12, 2025	Turaarvik Inns North Hotel (Rankin Inlet, NU)	<u>TEMMP V5 Finalization</u>	KivIA
<i>Note: This meeting was scheduled for March 11 and 12 but was shortened due to weather-related flight delays.</i>	Online – Microsoft Teams Meeting	<u>Commitment 38 Response</u>	BLHTO
		<u>Items of Interest (KivIA, KWB, KHTO, BLHTO, SDFN, NDFN, GN)</u>	KHTO
		<u>2024 TAG Annual Report Overview</u>	KWB
		<u>TAG Terms of Reference Revision</u>	NDFN
			SDFN
			ADNLC
		NTI	
		GN	
		CIRNAC	
		Agnico Eagle (AEM)	

Date	Location	Main Topics Discussed	Attendees
(Scheduled November 4 – 5, 2025)	Katimavik Suites (Rankin Inlet, NU) Online – Microsoft Teams Meeting	N/A (meeting dissolved just prior to initiation)	KHTO KivIA KWB BLHTO NDFN SDFN ADNLC NTI GN CIRNAC AEM

SECTION 2 • TAG ACTION ITEMS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND ADVICE

Table 2 summarizes and lists the action items, recommendations and advice from TAG meetings and ensures compliance with the reporting requirements section from TC 132 of the NIRB PC No.006-002 which stipulates:

“An overview of information shared during Terrestrial Advisory Group meetings and how information from the TAG was considered and incorporated by Agnico Eagle into the Project’s impact management, mitigation, and monitoring measures shall be provided to the NIRB on an annual basis in the Proponents’ Annual Report.”

Table 2 : Summary of TAG Action Items

Note: Only action items pending or where a change in status has occurred since the last TAG Annual Report are included in this table. Action items resolved in previous years can be reviewed in historical versions of this report. Action items and their status are shown as documented in the last 2025 TAG meeting minutes (March 12, 2025), unless an update has occurred since that time and been communicated to the TAG (indicated in italics).

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
2022-2	May 4 th , 2022 TAG Meeting	<p>PC No.006-002, TC 118: As per TC 118, AEM should, in consultation with the TAG develop a decision tree outlining mitigation to be implemented when caribou in specified group sizes are observed within a specified distance of the AWAR and waterlines which will be included in the TEMMP.</p> <p>It is suggested that the TAG reviews the TEMMP, provide comments and follow-up a with conference call to discuss the results.</p>	<p>2023 update: The TEMMP revision was an agenda item in every TAG meeting of 2023. The TEMMP v5 Table of Contents was presented to the TAG in June and October 2023.</p> <p>The draft TEMMP v5 structure was discussed throughout 2023 and the draft TEMMP v5, accounting for comments received throughout 2023, was shared with the TAG on December 20, 2023. It was reviewed by the TAG on January 24th and 25th, 2024, and again on March 1, 2024. Following agreement by all TAG parties, the final version of TEMMP V5 will be submitted to the NIRB in 2024.</p> <p>2024 update: In 2024, TAG recommended delaying submission of revised TEMMP v5 to facilitate ongoing discussions of revisions related to calving protection measures. During the year, four rounds of revision of the TEMMP v5 were completed. Many improvements to the draft document were made based on TAG advice. Caribou calving range baseline information was added as well as caribou calving period work suspension protocol (level 4). Should collar caribou be present in the 10 km radius during calving period, which was established by the TAG to be June 1 to 15, Agnico Eagle will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -notify KivIA that collared caribou have entered the 10 km radius; -increase its monitoring efforts to 4 times daily, results of which will be shared and discussed with KivIA in real time; -upon discussion with KivIA, lower the basins as much as possible to minimize the number of pumps operating during level 4 and ensure refueling of essential generators and power supplies to limit the traffic on the site. 	Resolved

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
			<p>Also, road closure trigger was changed to 50 or more caribou within 300 m of the road, compared with 100 m in TEMMP v4.</p> <p><i>2025 update: TEMMP V5 was submitted within the 2024 Annual Report on March 31st, 2025.</i></p>	
2022-3	May 4 th , 2022 TAG Meeting	<p>Blasting/caribou study: KivIA wishes to be at site with their biologist for any blast tests conducted during the caribou migration season.</p> <p>AEM should first collect data outside of caribou migration period.</p>	<p>AEM is building preliminary datasets outside of the caribou migration season period.</p> <p>2024 update: 2024 TAG meetings focused on the update of the TEMMP v5. Discussions on the blasting study may resume after the submission of the TEMMP v5.</p>	Postponed
2022-6	May 4 th , 2022 TAG Meeting	<p>TEMMP revision: TAG members should have an opportunity to review the April 2022 version of TEMMP and provide written comments to AEM.</p>	<p>TAG members have been provided with the opportunity for review and comment on the TEMMP v5.</p> <p>See Action Item 2022-2 for details on the TEMMP v5 revision.</p>	Resolved
2022-9	December 15 th TAG Meeting	<p>PC No.006-002, TC44 and C38: A new analysis is required to address the revisions and recommendations made by KivIA, GKD, and GN regarding the TC44 memo. It is necessary to have access to collared data before conducting data analysis rather than analyzing images. It is also possible to define deflection.</p> <p>Two (2) main proposed objectives of new analysis by the TAG are to understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movement of caribou; and • Behavior of caribou interacting with the road and the project, and the zone of influence (including delays in time and distance). <p>TAG would determine study area, approaches and</p>	<p>As per December 15th, 2022, meeting minutes, the consensus was that TC44 could be considered as completed with the commitment to provide an updated memo accounting for Parties’ comments once data is available and considering comments from Parties.</p> <p>New study objectives summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at ZoI at the time of the year along the road and project. • Considering the proximity of Rankin Inlet and the community. • Step regression is to be determined with movement. • Time and energy. • Caribou behavior, such as walking parallel. • Caribou that interact with road and caribou that do not. • Understand movement in spring vs. post-calving. • Response to mine and road. • The proximity between collared data and road. • Ice on and off. • Landscape and orientation; Herd Meliadine Lake on one side or the other. 	Resolved

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
		<p>methods based on the discussion on December 15th, 2022.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunting pressure analysis. • Caribou by observing data type and monitoring (HTO). <p>Notation per 6.2 of the TAG TORs: SDFN/NDFN wishes to add the following editorial comment to these minutes, which was not stated during the meeting: “At this time, SDFN/NDFN do not agree that TC44 has been fulfilled/satisfied with respect to the collared caribou memo. It may be satisfied once the new analysis by Agnico Eagle is shared and discussed with the TAG, based on updated data and comments discussed between the members of the TAG.”</p> <p>AEM was still pursuing in 2022 the caribou satellite collar Data and Sample Sharing Agreement (DSSA).</p> <p>Update 2023: A DSSA was signed on March 3rd, 2023.</p> <p>Analysis using collar data was conducted following the detailed instructions given by the TAG under the topic: Commitment 38 – Update Collared Caribou Analysis Memo. The methodology was presented and discussed on April 13th, 2023. A memo including the results was presented on June 27th, 2023. The revised version of the memo accounting for the TAG’s comments was presented at the TAG meeting on October 25th, 2023.</p> <p>No comments on the latest version of the memo were received from TAG parties in 2023. TAG parties were given until March 1st, 2024 to provide comments.</p> <p>2024 update: TAG parties shared additional comments on the C38 technical memo and addendum. The C38 model has been updated to include the new parameters requested by the TAG parties. The result of the analysis remains the same. C38 response will be shared and discussed with TAG during 2025 March TAG meeting.</p> <p><i>2025 update: Agnico’s responses to comments received on the Commitment 38 Report and Addendum were provided in a technical memo</i></p>	

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
			<i>and plain language summary in early 2025, and were discussed during the March 2025 TAG meeting.</i>	
2022-18	December 16 th TAG Meeting	<p>The use of drones for caribou monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Image clearer with the drone hovering at 300 m above ground level. • Verify the limit at 300-350 m above ground level for large groups of caribou). • Require high resolution (6k) camera. • Find the balance between drone size and capacity to fly in windy conditions. • Verify with GN and Transport Canada about wildlife harassment. • Establish a pilot project to gather information about distance and noise. • Be aware of female caribou that show alertness behavior. 	<p>AEM will account for the information collected and present to the TAG proposed methods to monitor caribou during migration at the next TAG meeting.</p> <p>2023 update: The use of drone for caribou monitoring was discussed in meetings held in April and October of 2023.</p> <p>2024 update: The TAG has decided to postpone discussion on drone usage to focus on the TEMMP review.</p>	Postponed

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
2023-7	October 24th & 25th, 2023, TAG Meeting	<p>TEMMP Revision: Complete the TEMMP revision by the next caribou migration; Include a section on the calving grounds; Provide a written draft to Parties in advance of the next TAG meeting; Include a revision frequency of TEMMP and monitoring shared in the Annual Report.</p>	<p>The draft TEMMP v5 includes a section on the calving grounds and a TEMMP revision frequency. See Action Item 2022-2 for details and updates on the TEMMP v5 revision.</p>	Resolved
2023-10	October 24th & 25th, 2023, TAG Meeting	<p>C38 Addendum: TAG members to provide written comments on the C38 memo and addendum.</p>	<p>See Action Item 2022-9 for updates on the C38 technical memo and addendum.</p>	Resolved
2023-12	October 24th & 25th, 2023, TAG Meeting	<p>Use of Drone for Survey: To be discussed for future migration seasons.</p>	<p>See Action Item 2022-18 for updates on use of drones for wildlife surveys.</p>	Postponed

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
2024-9	January 23th & 24th, 2024 TAG Meeting	Collar Method: GN to provide information on how collar methods have changed over time, and how the health of the collared animals is assessed.	The GN proposed to share the information on how they ensure they are only collaring healthy cows, and any follow up information when the collars come off, and how healthy they are then.	Pending
2024-11	January 23th & 24th, 2024 TAG Meeting	Muskox Harvest Data: GN to provide information on muskox harvest data, past studies beyond what’s already cited in the Meliadine TEMMP, and any planned work.	The GN proposed to look into muskox surveys done since 2014 and share the outcome with the TAG so AEM can update the baseline information related to muskox in the TEMMP V5. <i>2025 update: The most recent Muskox study report was shared by the GN on February 26, 2025 and information was added to TEMMP V5.</i>	Resolved
2024-13	January 23th & 24th, 2024 TAG Meeting	Caribou Vs Traffic: Agnico Eagle to assess different ways to present traffic information when caribou are in level 3 on a daily basis	Due to the difference in caribou migration paths in 2024, the camera did not take as many pictures of caribou as in the previous year. This point will therefore be evaluated as part of the camera's 2025 caribou report. <i>2025 update: Infographic showing the difference of traffics frequency when AWAR is open and closed was added to the 2025 Caribou Camera report.</i>	Resolved
2024-26	December 6th, 2024 TAG Meeting	TEMMP V5 Comment Table Agnico Eagle to revise wording of its answers to KivIA-3, GN-1	Agnico Eagle provided a revised answer to comments KivIA-3 and GN-1 which was shared and discussed during the March 2025 TAG meeting.	Resolved
2024-29	December 6th, 2024 TAG Meeting	Muskox Population Assessment GN to provide information on the most recent assessment of the muskox population.	GN agreed to provide the latest muskox population assessment. <i>See Action Item 2024-11 for details and updates.</i>	Resolved
2024-31	December 6th, 2024 TAG Meeting	GN December 6th Recommendation Email Agnico Eagle to provide answer on proposed recommendations from the GN.	Agnico Eagle provided an answer to the GN December 6th recommendation, which was shared and discussed during the March 2025 TAG meeting.	Resolved
2024-32	December 6th, 2024 TAG Meeting	TEMMP V5 Word Version update Agnico Eagle to revise TEMMP v5 draft as discussed during this meeting and distribute for review ahead of next scheduled meeting (Q1 2025)	Agnico Eagle provided a revised TEMMP v5 for review on February 28, 2025, prior to the March, 2025 TAG meeting.	Resolved

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
2025-1	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	Extended Distance Monitoring Trial Agnico Eagle to share again the Extended Distance Monitoring Trial Reports with TAG	Extended Distance Monitoring Trial was shared with TAG via OneDrive and email.	Resolved
2025-2	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	Action Item Table Agnico Eagle to provide the Action Table attached to the meeting minutes with the TEMMP v5 submission	TEMMP V5 includes a cover letter summarizing all meetings related to the revision and a table detailing comments from each party, indicating whether they were incorporated into the management plan.	Resolved
2025-3	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	Blasting vs Caribou Location Agnico Eagle to provide a memo on blasting and propane noise cannon data versus caribou migration dates. GN to get back to KHTO related to a collaring map animation.	The memo concerning the use of propane noise cannons and blasting during the caribou migration was shared with TAG on May 1, 2025.	Resolved
2025-4	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	Bundling of C38 analysis Agnico Eagle to bundle the C38 analysis and plain language summary in a way that all the analysis are in one document.	The C38 Analysis bundle was shared with TAG members on October 1 st , 2025.	Resolved
2025-5	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	Translation Timothy’s comments will be translated and provided in the meeting minutes.	Provided in appendix of the 2025 TAG Annual Report	Resolved
2025-6	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	AWAR traffic Agnico Eagle will follow-up with KHTO relative to personal vehicle passing the gate house	Work with HTO to monitor the road, Policies applied	Resolved
2025-7	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	AWAR Phase 2 Agnico Eagle will get back on the AWAR Phase 2 tentative date	Agnico Eagle does not yet have a confirmed start date for AWAR Phase 2. All required information, as per licensing and permitting requirements, will be communicated prior to project commencement.	Pending
2025-8	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	Vehicles on the AWAR when Restricted and Closed Agnico Eagle to provide the range of variation and the frequency of vehicles on the AWAR when Restricted and Closed graph	See Action Item 2024-13 for details and updates. Additionally, this information was resolved through the circulation of an infographic sent to TAG members on 2025-10-01.	Resolved
2025-9	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	Local Summer Student Agnico Eagle to assess having a local student during caribou migration	In 2024, the Environment Department hired a summer student from Baker Lake who actively contributed to caribou migration monitoring and management.	Resolved

No.	TAG Meeting Reference	Action Items	Follow-Up	Status
2025-10	March 12, 2025 TAG Meeting	<p>TOR revision to include Athabasca Dene Agnico Eagle and CIRNAC to meet to discuss the funding part. KivIA to review ADFN proposed changes with their board. Agnico Eagle and KWB to meet to reach out to regional HTOs.</p>	<p>The Term of Reference of the TAG is currently in revision. Discussions will continue at the next TAG meeting.</p>	Ongoing

SECTION 3 • AGENDA ITEMS FOR 2026

Table 3 describes meeting proposed for Q2 2026. Additional meetings could occur throughout the year as required. The meeting venues, dates and topics are subject to change throughout the year based on logistical considerations, TAG suggestions or other considerations shared by TAG Parties.

Table 3: Proposed Calendar with Agenda

Calendar	Proposed Location	Proposed Agenda
April 28 & 29	In Person –Rankin Inlet	TOR Review

APPENDIX A: 2025 TAG MEETING MINUTES

Topic: Meliadine Mine Terrestrial Advisory Group (TAG)

Meeting Date: March 12, 2025 9 am – 5 pm CT

Location: In Person (Rankin Inlet, NU) and Online

Attendees:

Baker Lake Hunters' and Trappers' Organization (BLHTO)
Hosea Iksiraq* (HI), Secretary Treasurer
Timothy Evviuk* (TE), Board Member

Kangiqliniq Hunters' and Trappers' Organization (KHTO)
Andre Aokaut (AAo), Director Manager
Roy Avaala (RA), Acting secretary-treasurer

Kivalliq Inuit Association (KivIA)
Anne Gunn* (AG), Consultant, Caribou Specialist
Jakob Voisey (JV), Wildlife Technician
Jeff Tulugak (JT), Executive Assistant
Gabriel Karlik (GK), Chief Operating Officer

Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. (NTI)
Raymond Mercer (RM), Resource Management Coordinator

Kivalliq Wildlife Board (KWB)
Tiriao Maria Kusuluak (TMK), Wildlife and Environment Technician

Athabasca Denesuliné First Nations
Katie Rasmussen (KR), Biologist

Sayisi Dene First Nation (SDFN)
Geoff Bussidor (GB), Chief Negotiator
Dan Chranowski (DCh), Wildlife Biologist Consultant

Northland Denesuline First Nation (NDFN)
Dan Chranowski (DCh), Wildlife Biologist Consultant

Government of Nunavut (GN)
Natalie D'Souza* (ND),
Jennifer Williams* (JW),
Jessica Waldinger* (JW), Project Manager, Impact Assessment
Stephen Atkinson* (SA), Biologist Consultant

Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC)
Aminul Haque* (AH), Water Management Coordinator

Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd. (Agnico)

Sara Savoie[‡] (SSav), Environment Superintendent

Jade Robitaille (JR), Compliance Counselor

Puujuut Kusugak (PK), Director Nunavut Affairs

Leilan Baxter[^] (LB), Minutes Record

Dan Coulton^{*} (DC), WSP Sr. Wildlife Specialist

Neil Moss^{*} (NM), WSP Wildlife Biologist

Morgan Skinner^{*} (MS), WSP Ecologist

Cory de la Mare^{*} (CM), WSP Terrestrial Ecologist

Greg Sharam (GS), ERM Caribou Specialist

Mitch Fennell (MT), ERM Wildlife Biologist

[‡]Meeting chair

[^]Record keeping

^{*}Online attendee

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY

Action Item	Requested By	Summary
Extended Distance Monitoring Trial	SDFN	Agnico Eagle to share again the Extended Distance Monitoring Trial Reports with TAG
Action Item Table	ADFN	Agnico Eagle to provide the Action Table attached to the meeting minutes with the TEMMP v5 submission.
Blasting VS Caribou location	KHTO	Agnico Eagle to provide a memo on blasting and propane noise cannon data versus caribou migration dates. GN to get back to KHTO related to a collaring map animation.
Bundling of C38 analysis	KivIA	Agnico Eagle to bundle the C38 analysis and plain language summary in a way that all the analysis are in one document.
Translation	All	Timothy's comments will be translated and provided in the meeting minutes.
AWAR traffic	KTHO	Agnico Eagle will follow-up with KHTO relative to personal vehicle passing the gate house.
AWAR Phase 2	KivIA	Agnico Eagle will get back on the AWAR Phase 2 tentative date.
Vehicles on the AWAR when Restricted and Closed	SDFN	Agnico Eagle to provide the range of variation and the frequency of vehicle of the Vehicles on the AWAR when Restricted and Closed graph
Local Summer Student	KWB and KivIA	Agnico Eagle to assess having a local student during caribou migration
TOR revision to include Athabasca Dene	ADFN	Agnico Eagle and CIRNAC to meet to discussion funding part. KivIA to review ADFN proposed changes with their board. Agnico Eagle and KWB to meet to reach out to regional HTOs.

MEETING TRANSCRIPT

Note: All supplementary material referred to in the meeting minutes is provided to the TAG Members by email and/or OneDrive for review.

Supplementary material (e.g. slides or tables) were reviewed by the presenter as indicated. Discussion and comments are documented here.

This meeting was recorded for the purposes of transcription, without objection. While most speaker comments were transcribed directly during the meeting, some were paraphrased or summarized to facilitate note-taking.



1. Welcome

Time: 9 am – 9:20 am

Supplemental Material: Agenda

Presenter: Sara Savoie, Agnico Eagle

SS: (*Welcome, introductions, review of revised agenda*)

ND: Is Agnico seeking to submit this version to the NIRB, or is Agnico open to changes?

SS: Thank you for your question and that is the topic of the next presentation. The annual report submission is coming at the end of the month and as discussed in previous 2024 TAG meetings, if we want the TEMMP v5 measures to be effective for 2025 migration, this is the timing to submit it.

2. TEMMP V5 Finalization

Time: 9:20 am – 10:25 am

Supplemental Material: pdf file titled “TEMMP – March 2025” (provided by email)

Presenter: Sara Savoie, Agnico Eagle

Slide 1 – TEMMP v5 Update

SS: (*Review of TEMMP changes from v4*) We've had 13 meetings since 2022. More recently we have heard for road closure triggers to be more conservative. We changed that from 100 m to 300 m. Since last meeting, we also made some adjustments to wording in line with parties' proposals, as shared with all before this meeting.

Slide 2, 3 – (Review of changes since December 2024 Meeting)

Slide 4 - (Next steps)

SS: TEMMP v5 will be submitted to NIRB as part of 2024 annual report along with table of comments and responses from Agnico. (*TEMMP v5 Comments table shared on screen*) We won't go over the table in entirety right now, the table was shared in December.

KR: I think the table should also include the recommendations made in person at meetings. For example it doesn't show requests for bigger changes to road distance made in Dec, and also around planned shutdowns. There are recommendations made that aren't reflected in the table. I think it's important that verbal comments are treated with equal respect as written ones.

SS: Good point, something we can be proud of as a group is that our minutes are very thorough, and we have a table with all the comments made. It's available in the TAG annual report as presented to NIRB. Something I wanted to highlight, which is unique to our group, is that those documents are publicly available. We can for sure copy paste that table.

KR: Thanks, I think it's important.

DCh: On this table, the second point about 10 km triggers. Can you remind me how these trials were done for the distance monitoring?

SS: The summary of these trials was part of the TAG package for meetings in 2024, we can resend as needed, but we'll also recap now.

JR: We went in the field with KivIA, standing on the WRSF at the mine, a HOL survey point. We used a PPE vest, a caribou skin brought by elders, and a helicopter as a bigger object. We sent them out to 3, 5, 8, and 10 km and we were looking with eyes, binoculars, and scope. We tested it in winter and summer 2024. The outcome was that after 5 km it was really hard to see the caribou skin or the PPE vest. At 8 we could see the helicopter but at 10 in the summer it was really hard to see it with the binoculars or scope.

DCh: Wavy?

JR: Yes

SS: In the presentation there are photographs as well.

DCh: 1 person?

JR: 3 people. Agnico, an elder, and a KivIA member.

DCh: What's the height of the waste rock?

JR: It's higher than the buildings.

AA: We can see it from here.

DCh: I seem to recall that the land to the east and north is higher land, and west is lower.

JR: It was done to the west.

JT: Would it be worthwhile for people today or tomorrow to go see the sight?

SS: Today will be packed but we could check for a future visit.

SA: Trying to understand what we're doing at this point of the meeting. Many of the key recommendations from the GN and others weren't incorporated in this draft. Are we here to discuss edits, or are you just telling us this is what you're submitting? If that's the case, are you asking for this document to be endorsed by the TAG, or will you be presenting it as a document completed with TAG consultation?

SS: The intent here is to present how we incorporated the different comments from TAG. We've been working on this for many years. Last year we went through the migration with TEMMP v4. As we discussed in 2024, Agnico feels we've made quite a bit of progress in v5, and we'd like to go into 2025 migration with these improvements in effect. At this time, we're proposing to submit this document to NIRB in the annual report. We won't speak on behalf of TAG. What we will do is explain the discussions that took place and how we incorporated the guidance of this advisory group. If we get the TAG's stamp of approval we'd be very happy and it would recognize the work and effort put by all participants.

SA: After the meeting in December I was hoping some of the bigger issues would have moved forward in this draft. I don't see that has having happened. But it seems we're beyond that now.

ND: Stephen asked the question we were wondering about. Thanks. There were several recommendations from the GN that we don't see reflected in this version. There are some as well that Agnico had stated they would update in the TEMMP but we don't see those either, such as incidental observations to trigger mitigation and monitoring. Table 5 hasn't been updated. Maybe an error. And the Arctic fox mortality threshold was supposed to be updated. But for the more significant recommendations, the answers from Agnico don't really provide any rationale or justification about how Agnico considered the GN's recommendation. Will you provide any additional rationale, for example for our recommendation on distance threshold for the road? If



you could provide some additional writing to support this Power Point in some areas where you haven't fulsomely answered why our recommendation isn't adopted, that would be helpful. And if there are points of disagreement and you could clearly articulate that it would be helpful.

SS: Something to circle back on is this is a living document and as part of adaptive management we can keep updating it. As for the rationale for some decisions, I believe throughout the meeting minutes and the table we've provided this information. With regards to the 300 m, the reason is several parties here at the TAG did propose 300 m, based on local observations, knowledge and science. It's tripling the threshold that we're using. And there is also room to recognize the work with the landowner KivIA, so there is wording in there to say we may be more conservative based on conversations with the landowner on IOL.

ND: I don't think I heard a response to my question. I think if Agnico is planning to submit this document, we as a TAG member wouldn't be able to endorse it.

AA: In regards to that, HTO is in favour of GN and the Sayisi Dene and the Athabasca, and we'd like to set up a meeting with names mentioned along with NTI and KWB before the next TAG meeting to discuss the TEMMP, so Agnico can revise the TEMMP accordingly with all members requests, that would be very helpful.

SS: I would have a question for TAG members. As we mentioned, last year we went through the migration without the TEMMP v5 measures in place (calving ground, level 4). Agnico feels we have worked too hard not to go through the migration without these measures. So that's why we're proposing to submit the document, keeping in mind we can keep refining and working on it.

DCh: To be honest, 100 m for a road, it probably should have started at 300 m a long time ago. It still could be more. Some of the behaviour studies are showing disturbance at greater distances. There is some progress, and things we'd like to see more of. If this is going to go to NIRB, ok, but we'd like to see more changes. We'd like to see them today, but I guess if this is going to NIRB, at what point can we do more changes? Because it seems to take a while. There are a few things with minor wording, like incidental monitoring as the GN mentioned. I know you say it happens, so I can't see why you can't put the words in there. Those are my feelings.

SS: A few good points. It's not a fixed in stone document. With regards to the 300 m perhaps we can hear from Greg.

GS: Some more background and context on 300 m. But also, on the flexibility in the field, I might hand it to Jeff on that. The backstory is it's always been 100 m but Agnico has used a larger number, mostly because for safety reasons you can't leave people out on the road, so if you see the caribou coming you're going to shut the road regardless of distance. The 300 m came through behaviour work that started in 2020. Mitch and Nina before him were doing that work on the road, and reported every year from 2021, that around 300 m there is a shift in behaviour from the caribou. They were a little more flighty, moving faster, more likely to be alert or respond and to react within 300 m. Beyond that they were doing more calm behaviours, and less likely to react to a vehicle. So at that time we started to discuss if the buffer should be 300 m. There is flexibility to use a bigger number in the field though, and Agnico does that.

JT: In previous years we used the approach, like the morning meetings are very important to see if the road will be open or closed and if the flight will come in. If observations show caribou are coming towards the road, those are used to see if the road will be open or closed. It's either KivIA or HTO that will escort the convoy to camp. Those decisions are made on the fly, with observations on the ground.



Meeting Minutes

DCh: It's great that 300 m is somewhat evidence-based. Hearing from Jeff it helps me understand they are taking the caribou issues in consideration for the running of the mine. Great to hear from the people out there on the land.

SS: As we discussed there is a very close collaboration during the migration with KivIA, HTO, GN conservation officer. Something we heard from past TAG meetings was that we're already doing good practices, it was just not written. So that's why we added in writing that there are more conservative measures that can be applied. They will be fully transparent and documented.

SA: I'm really trying to restrain myself from getting into detailed discussion, but as we pointed out in December, we have an issue with the way the TEMMP is written, where you put thresholds in that even you yourselves don't think are adequate. If you're closing the road at greater than 300 m, why not put that in the document. That's why the GN suggested 1.5 km, with evidence backing that. It's also consistent with the Meadowbank road trigger distance. With regards to the comment for more conservative measures on IOL, why do those caribou matter more? (*cuts out*) Why do you keep leaving this stuff in here? It's nonsensical. It's frustrating when we haven't made progress on some of the very simple things that could be done to make this a more realistic representation of what's going on in the field.

SS: First, we need to be careful not to put words in each other's mouths, and Agnico does believe that 300 m is a good trigger based on the evidence we see and the studies. Why we added some flexibility is to recognize the complexity on caribou movement and also the inputs from our local collaborators. Regarding the addition of IOL, I also believe this is appropriate as most of our project operation is on IOL. Thirdly, I'd like us to be cautious in using wording such as nonsensical. We have lots of different views and everything presented here is in good faith and based on our own unique experience and knowledge.

JR: I don't think Sara's question was answered if the TAG prefers to go ahead with submission of v5. The point of it would be to incorporate the changes we've made so far, knowing we can pursue further discussion. I'd be interested to hear what members think of that.

TMK: You mentioned that this has been ongoing and discussed since 2022, so that's only 3 years. Why can't you stretch it to 5 years. Like a 5 year study. I'm asking because this past winter AEM installed a new discharge line from the mine to the ocean. So that's also something that needs to be considered. We don't know how the caribou are going to be reacting to that. It's going to be a new thing for 2025. I know you really want to submit this but I think putting that into consideration in TEMMP v5, to have an ongoing study because of the discharge line.

SS: Good points, and something we need to mention is that all the monitoring Agnico is doing, we're not proposing to stop it. We monitor every year, and various types. All that will keep going. Why we're proposing to update the management plan now is because we heard questions, concerns, suggestions from people around this table that they'd like AEM to add more mitigations or monitoring methods especially related to the calving grounds. So it won't take anything away from our regular monitoring, it's adding additional monitoring. I don't know if that answers the question but we're happy to talk more about it. Last meeting we heard some different views on whether we should go into the 2025 migration with TEMMP v4 or if we should go ahead with v5, so that's what we're looking to discuss.

ND: I think you were asking about TAG feedback on submitting this version of the TEMMP now or not. I think that's for Agnico to decide. If you're submitting it through the NIRB's annual report we can comment through that forum. I will note that our experience working with your colleagues at Meadowbank, we've felt our comments have been by and large meaningful incorporated into that



document. We know it's not perfect but we had appreciated the work they had done. But here quite a few recommendations aren't reflected. We understand Agnico has a desire to submit this document, so we'll leave that up to you. To clarify, earlier you made a response to Stephen where he had used the term it nonsensical, so I apologize if it sounded offensive, but it was actually just the way a sentence was worded it didn't make sense. We don't have much more to say at this time, but if you can provide additional rationale where comments weren't addressed that would be helpful.

SS: Agnico is planning to submit this document with the 2025 annual report but we are interested in hearing other members' responses to the earlier question on whether your respective organizations would prefer to go through the 2025 migration with the current TEMMP v4, or with the proposed TEMMP v5.

KR: Back to what Andre was saying, we'd like to have more discussions with all the groups around the table. Our major concerns were sensitivity with caribou during calving and post calving. During our site visit, seeing those tiny caribou calves crossing the road was a concern. So more protection during level 4 and larger road triggers is of interest to us. Another concern was in the annual reporting I don't see those disagreements reflected. So if you do submit this to the NIRB I'd like to see those areas of disagreement more clearly defined. Whether you submit this or not is up to you. I'd like to see improved mitigations for this year, but we don't see our concerns addressed in this version of the TEMMP.

SS: As mentioned we do have a table on outstanding action items from both parties and observers, which is available. We've also invited written comments on multiple occasions. So what's being said is being captured and we're also happy to receive written comments.

KR: I appreciate that but in the tables that you shared there are a number of items that are marked resolved and I did ask in writing about how you define resolved. It seems that in your mind resolved means answering a question, whereas to me it means we came to an agreement.

SS: We have a section of the meeting today to discuss the TAG annual report specifically so we can discuss this then. The TAG annual report and that table is circulated to all before it's finalized. We'd still like to hear from parties and observers on their recommendations and advice on submitting v5 or heading into migration with v4. NIRB will surely be interested to hear from all.

JT: I have a suggestion. From our point we want to see improvements on this v4. To go to v5 there are significant improvements. If there are issues with v5 as proposed, I'd invite the GN to come during migration to see it, to see what works and what doesn't. This is a living document so there can be improvements later. Seeing it first hand is the best way to see what works and what doesn't. V5 has improvements that are a lot better than what we're currently using. Time is getting short to get a v5 done, as spring migration is just in a couple months. So if we could get something pushed forward and then we could see it first hand during next migration. I invite GN staff or consultants to see the migration first hand and that way we can get it in writing how v6 could be, as it's a living document.

SS: I think we've taken a bit step in v5..

HI: I agree with the party. I'd like the government to go and witness all of this so they can have an understanding of how the migration and calving goes. It would be more understandable for the government to see first hand. I'd invite them go to see this and witness it so they have more understanding.



KR: I know that some of our members were saying they'd like to come see things on the ground, so if that invite could also extend to Athabasca Denesuline, we'd like to see it.

DCh: Us as well.

ND: We'd appreciate discussing with Agnico to see if we can come during the spring migration.

AA: That's if we have spring migration. If they can start monitoring and decreasing work when they get to 10 km it would work. This year we had no caribou. Everyone was going past Baker, past Chester. So it would be great if the work could decrease and the monitoring increase. Especially with the blasting. Because the blasting does go miles and miles. And last year the caribou turned away and never came back. So if AEM can commit to no blasting and get rid of that sound gun we should be able to see caribou migration this spring.

JV: I'm going to be attending the migration this coming spring and summer. Throughout the whole migration I'll be onsite. Before the morning discussions KIA will be having their own independent decisions on what should be happening for the day.

AA: So are you managing all that yourself or is there another team?

JT: (*Inuktitut*)

AA: Ok

JT: The reason I invited the GN specifically is they have the wildlife portfolio in the land claims agreement and I think it would be important to be present, so that's why I specifically asked for the GN.

SS: Thanks Jakob and KIA. We know it can take a lot of time to attend to the migration. One additional clarification, with regards to blasting there is none during Level 3 and 4. Also Natalie, thanks for providing some feedback on the invitation extended by KivIA.

AA: We do have your guys blasting times from last years' data along with the sound gun so when you say you don't blast during that time evidence shows from the collar data you were blasting that exact week caribou turned around. So some things need to change in that regard.

SS: As mentioned we have data with regards to the blasting and the propane noise cannon, we're happy to share that.

AA: I do have that, we finally got them during the last TAG meeting. We'd been asking for a while.

JR: I'd be interested to see what you came up with.

AA: It's the same table that you have. I'll pass that out. Along with the collar data. I was trying to request an animation.

JR: But you saw an animation?

AA: Nope we never got that. I've been trying to get it for 6 months. But it's all on the daily collars that we received in the email. Along with the blasting times and sound gun use. Last years' migration we know it's from AEM's blasting and it coincides with the migration.

SS: Perhaps we can help out with providing some additional information that you're looking for.

JW: I believe it was Andre from KHTO who mentioned the animation data. Mitch and I are both flying the survey right now but I can reach out to him and ask about the status of that request. I just want to confirm it came from Andre?

SS: Yes.

- Break (10:25 – 10:45 am) -

3. Commitment 38 Response

Time: 10:50 – 11:58 am

Supplemental Material: Presentation “Responses to Comments on the Commitment 38 Report and Addendum” (provided in the OneDrive)

Presenter: Dan Coulton, WSP

Supplementary material was reviewed by the presenter. Discussion is recorded here.

Slide 2, 3, 4 - Background and timeline (of Commitment 38)

Slide 5 – Variable Abbreviations and New Variable Descriptions

Slide 6 – Sample Size, Statistical Power, and Sensitivity Analysis

Slide 7 – Sample Size/Statistical Power: Comment Summary

Slide 8 – Sample Size/Statistical Power: Approach to Comments

Slide 9 – Power Analysis: How many steps for Individuals?

Slide 10 – Sensitivity Analysis :How many caribou for population?

Slide 11 – Sample Size/Statistical Power: Summary and Conclusions

Slide 12 – Alternative and Simpler Models

Slide 13 – Alternative Models: Comment Summary

Slide 14 – Alternative Models: Approach to Comments

Slide 15 – Test#1: Results of Base Habitat vs Simpler Models

Slide 16 – Test #2: Approach to Deflection Step Methods

Slide 17, 18 – Test#2: Results of Deflection Step Models

Slide 19, 20 – Test#3: Logistic Deflection Step Models Without Habitat

Slide 21 – Test#4 and #5: Test Parallel Step Models without Habitat

Slide 22 – No Habitat: Test Step Models

Slide 23 – Summary and Conclusions

Slide 24 – Cross-validation: Comment Summary

Slide 25 – Cross-validation: Approach to Comments

Slide 26, 27 – Cross-validation: Results

Slide 28 – Summary of Conclusions

DC: Questions?

SA: Distance from mine – is that from the site or the mine and/or road?

DC: Distance from nearest feature.

SA: One comment would be that the mine itself vs the road represent different sources of disturbance with the mine being a place with continuous human presence and activity vs a road that has more unknown or sporadic presence. Linear feature vs point feature. I still struggle with treating the road as equivalent to the mine for potential effect on caribou. Second comment. Looking at the social stuff, distance to nearest collar, average distance to collars, I assume you were not mixing years? Only collars in the same year and relative distance?

DC: Correct.

SA: That's all for me.

DC: For the first comment, I suppose caribou might respond differently to the mine vs AWAR. I know most concern for deflection and paralleling was related to the AWAR. But ultimately which one the caribou interact with is inherent in the collar data itself. If there are more interactions with the AWAR than the mine then the results reflect that.

SA: As I said it's complicated. If this was just a mine without a road we wouldn't have this mixture of linear vs point sources, and with different potential to impact caribou. In future we might want to discuss how we deal with that. But thanks it's good for now.

DC: The results reflect the cumulative effects of the project, including the road and the mine. I don't see how you can separate those, and say one isn't present and one is. Either way though, at the cumulative level it doesn't seem to matter. We're not picking up a strong adverse response to either.

SA: When you're creating the dataset and this parameter "distance to mine", we might expect for example that "distance to AWAR is less than "distance to Mine", but by pooling those sets into a single parameter, you may be losing your ability to detect differences.

DC: The results indicate that the response behaviours investigated, the deflections and paralleling, weren't associated with distance. So if the mine is having a stronger influence over caribou interacting with the road, then we would expect a stronger response relative to what's happening further away. But that's not the case.

AG: I'd like to acknowledge the efforts for the additional analyses. We had 38 comments and I think the efforts made to deal with those have been helpful. The additional analyses have been reassuring and have clarified the role of the mosquitoes and how the caribou respond. The overall conclusion I guess is that caribou have to eat and have to avoid mosquitoes. How will Agnico bundle these three reports together so that they stay together, and how will that work with a plain language version? We will provide our technical review of the third report. We won't be asking for further analyses though. So next question is are the conclusions constrained to the post calving period? Would you agree with that? And how do the results relate to effectiveness of mitigation? Third, how do the results relate to the monitoring thresholds? They are fairly complex statistics so the plain language version is extremely important.

DC: I'll let Agnico comment on the bundling of reports. My assumption is that each report will be provided or has been provided to the TAG or maybe posted to the NIRB registry.

AG: There should be a covering letter to make it clear there are 3 reports that should be considered together. That note should be in each report. And will the plain language report be bundled with the 3 technical ones.

SS: We will certainly look at making this clear that it's a set of reports. And have it bundled along with the plain language summary.



DC: For question 2, about how do the results relate to mitigation. If you recall in the commitment 38 report we tested different temporal and spatial components. The temporal were related to advanced exploration phase vs operational phase. Inside of that phase we assessed whether the AWAR was open or closed and a fourth treatment with the reference animals, an area 15 km beyond the study area or ZOI. Those results indicated under all four treatments there were no differences. Whether the road was open or closed didn't seem to matter in terms of how caribou responded. In terms of monitoring thresholds, I believe GN had asked a specific question about the 10% deflection. We responded in written comments that the number deflecting were 1%, so less than the 10% monitoring threshold. What was question 1 again?

AG: There has been a trend in caribou distribution during the time of the study, the caribou in 2023 were present in the RSA earlier in the year in June. Most of the analyses are during the time when mosquito harassment was a likelihood. I think your additional analyses have clarified the importance of mosquito harassment. So my question was should the conclusion about the impact of the mine be constrained to the post calving period?

DC: Not necessarily because the commitment 38 report included the whole scope that was required to be assessed. The more recent analyses including power and sensitivity were based on the later data in response to a comment by GN, but they showed that the sample size for number of steps was large enough. So that translates back to the approach used in the earlier commitment 38 analysis.

AG: I don't want to get into an argument. We will look at the distribution of the caribou years relative to season, because I think it's a more complex story about the impact of the mine, and caution is warranted about general statements, given the seasonality of the data used in the analyses. I think it comes back to the clarification of study during post calving, the importance of the caribou's requirement to have enough to eat and response to mosquitos and learned experience.

DCh: I'd reiterate what Anne said. You've gone through a lot of the comments and did things to look at those questions to clarify in many ways some of the suspicions about what may be going on. I would say that the overall analysis still has to be qualified by a few limitations, including the 4 h fix intervals. Caribou can do a lot in 4 h. When the plain language report comes out that should be a qualifier. You mentioned the average deflection was 1% but wasn't there a wider range of variation, something like 46%, right?

DC: It wouldn't be an average, it would be the proportion of the collared population.

DCh: That's the other statement I'd make, that this of course is limited by the collar information.

DC: Agnico hasn't set the fix interval. That's determined by the GN. If we're talking about finer scale resolution we're talking finer spatial effects than what we've tested for. So right now, it was assumed in the FEIS that caribou respond to the road adversely out to 5 km, but we didn't detect any spatial relationship that supports that. It would be much less than that. So now what you're saying is that the limitation of the study is that those effects are indeed smaller than predicted in the FEIS. So I'm not really sure how that would be a limitation.

DCh: You're putting words in my mouth, I didn't say the effects would be at a closer scale. Fine tuned movements at a half an hour or an hour could show up at greater distances. They could be doing a lot of things in a four hour period. It's certainly well recognized in other studies that a finer fix interval could show differences.



DC: But if we're not observing effects at a four hour interval but we do observe them at a 10 min interval it may be statistically significant but it's still a smaller duration.

DCh: Collar caribou at 4 h fix intervals are just a capture of what we're trying to observe. Uncollared caribou could show very different effects, say by land observers, that could then be compared to this stuff. I fully recognize that GN controls the fix intervals. I'd suggest there are still unknowns and it's not as definitive as you state.

DC: You're welcome to disagree. I'd agree there are other sources of monitoring data that represent different lines of evidence. I'll leave it to the GN to respond whether they think the collared caribou are representative of caribou herds.

ND: Briefly I just wanted to turn back to the work on commitment 38 and wanted to express our appreciation by efforts made to address comments. we're not completely finished with reviewing the technical memo provided before the meeting so before that we may have additional comments.

- Lunch (11:58 am) -

4. Items of Interest

Time: 1:11 – 1:49 pm

Supplemental Material: None

Presenter: All

TE: When they were speaking about the caribou, in the summertime, the caribou like to eat. And during this time, they go along the Mine road. As there are some IQ Principles, the southern people need to know that this is Inuit lands. For example, when someone says: "I haven't seen any caribou", it's not hard for someone to lie and say that. With IQ Principle, the southerners should not be lying about the IQ. This I would like to be fixed. This is all I would like to say for now. ¹

DCh: Is there a translator available?

SS: No there is no translator there today.

TMK: (*Offers to translate for Timothy*). He mentioned something about blasting and drilling, and that Inuit know best because we grew up with them (caribou). He also mentioned that Inuit don't lie about IQ.

ND: We don't have any items of interest. We are keen to have site visits. Also echo the comment that I hope there is an interpreter for the meetings going forward because I'd like to have heard those comments from Baker Lake.

AH: No comments

RM: The Baker Lake elder also mentioned that caribou can hear the vibrations from the drilling and blasting. And he mentioned that white people shouldn't lie about what they see.

¹ Translated from Inuktitut



SS: Thanks. On the drilling and blasting it's something we've heard from other community members. It's why we have level 2 and 3 and it's why we have local partners onsite during that time. So hopefully that gives some confidence.

GB: What Andre said this morning is disturbing. If there are plans to blast at certain times and then they are going beyond that time frame, so caribou didn't come around, and that affects harvesting. Is there no control on that, or what's the story there?

SS: There is no blasting in level 3. Following the comments today we're going to prepare a memo for TAG on the blasting dates vs the different caribou protection levels. Once again I'll mention we have different personnel from Agnico and external consultants onsite during the migration but there is also KIA, GN wildlife officer, and HTO collaborators working with us. We'll provide that in a memo.

GB: Yesterday as I was wandering around the community I was talking to a person. I don't remember his name but he was born in 1970. He was telling me the changes he's been seeing. I asked about the effects of the mine. He said it's good to have it but at the same time it's destroying the land and the water and the fish. Trout are starting to show up with bumps, swelling. So I don't know what can be done about that. So it's a report from the ground level, grass roots level. You need to clean up your act if that's the case.

SS: We do monitor aquatic effects, and have reports on that. We don't share them here because it's a terrestrial focus..

GB: Does that mean you'll have a marine group too? Because your discharge is going to the ocean so I think we should be a part of that too.

SS: Right now our aquatic effects monitoring is reported and publicly available, and as per the annual reporting process they are available to the public.

DCh: Geoff was asking if you were thinking about setting up an aquatic effects advisory group.

SS: That's not something that has been brought up to us before and I can't answer at this moment.

JWi: Can we please have the elder Timothy's items of interest translated for us. I'd like his concerns to be addressed completely and for everybody to understand what he said. And maybe in the future there should be a translator to translate Inuktitut.

SS: Yes we will translate Timonthy's intervention. As for the translator we have a section in the terms of reference (TOR) and that's coming up this afternoon.

JR: To add to Geoff's concern about aquatic effects, the community relation department also addresses some of the concerns on the water quality of Meliadine Lake with the community. They did a tea session using the water from Meliadine lake and they looked at any changes in the colour or the taste of the tea. So it's just to say, when there are community concerns, there are measures taken to address it.

DCh: We still have an emphasis on visual and auditory disturbance for the mine and the AWAR, and other people talk about other types of disturbance that we aren't talking about. It's a difficult topic to address but otherwise it's just not addressed. Indigenous people know caribou use all senses. If we were truly a collaborative group we'd be putting together ideas to address that and test that. I think we need to be moving towards that.



KR: Are we going back to commitment 38 discussion?

SS: Do you have more comments?

KR: Yes I can just say it now. There were two other members but they couldn't switch their flights. The Qamaniruaq herd is what sustains the Athabasca Denesuline so this is very important to those communities. The main thing I want to say is I'd like to see more surveys that involve Indigenous knowledge. My one comment on commitment 38 is the validation of land users observations. We've heard that land users are observing changes in caribou movement. We'd really like to see a formal survey, maybe every year, to include the HTOs and talk to land users about what they see happening to the caribou because that's really trustworthy information and we're not seeing that in the commitment 38 analysis. There are people who have always been using the land here who can provide insight into whether those results stand up or not. I think those are the main comments. As we move into a new year of this group I'd like to see how we can make more opportunities to equally incorporate Indigenous knowledge into these analyses.

SS: Good suggestions thank you. Something to discuss with the group is we do have the Kivalliq Elders Advisory Committee, and we attended a workshop with them last week focussed on caribou management and they had some positive feedback to share with Agnico and I think it would be beneficial for this group to hear from the elders so we wanted to propose that.

DC: I don't think the Athabasca Dene were present when the Commitment 38 was designed with the TAG but certainly NTI was there, and I believe Sayisi Dene were there, and they did provide perspectives on the study design and what kind of things should be evaluated. So there was some of it. But I understand what you're saying about having other community members contribute. I just want to be clear that there was local knowledge provided in the original study design.

KR: For me to clarify too, I'm talking about a completely separate study, fully based on Indigenous knowledge. So not only having it support a study like this but a stand-alone study.

RM: I think going from 100 m to 300 m is a good distance but it sounds like there are concerns about it with the road monitors, be it Agnico, HTO, or KIA, or GN, it sounds like they stop traffic when they are further out. So I think that might need to be looked at and put down in writing to make it's further than 300 m. That's it for me.

AA: Nothing right now.

JT: Just want to see a newer version than what's currently out there. We're open to always making it better. Glad GN's willing to be at the site during migration and they can see what goes on and be part of the decision making as they have the wildlife portfolio.

TMK: I'm just going through the TEMMP v5 and under IQ and Community Involvement it's just a broad description of how it's integrated into this document. There's a lot of valuable information that can be included, especially crediting elders, hunters, and there's nothing in here that shows how Inuit have contributed to the document. In the December TAG meeting I wasn't able to attend so I just wanted to ask about the Level 4 if it was finalized?

SS: What we proposed is to include Level 4 in the TEMMP v5. It would be between June 1 – 15 and when collared caribou come in 10 km radius during that time we initiate discussions with KivA and we lower the basins as much as possible in collaboration with KivA and we increase our HOL surveys to 4x day rather than 3x, and we also monitor for 50 caribou within 5 km of site. During level 4 there is a daily transportation plan that is discussed and routes are agreed upon



daily with KivIA, to minimize any potential visual contact by caribou. That's done with the site features, the stockpiles, but also with seacan barriers to shield the view.

TMK: You mentioned it's according to the collared caribou that are approaching, do you also observe for caribou without collars?

SS: Yes we look for 50 or more caribou within 5 km in our height of land (HOL) surveys.

BLHTO (TE): I am going to apologize that I can only speak Inuktitut. I would like to speak about the roads. In my opinion, I would they are close in distance. 100-300 m is a little too close. For example, 5-10 caribou, because these ones are considered to be a part of the first herd. Following the IQ principles, the first herd is usually a smaller herd. Even if there is a small herd, no one is informed. Some inuit will only say something if they do see it. But, for the food for the caribou, 100-300 is still a bit too close.²

(Interpreted by BLHTO): Talking about for the access road, 100 m, 300 m is a bit too close. Whether it's 5 or 10 caribou you have to recognize that they have the right of way. If they are detoured back from their herd, they will tell them there's a spot we were turned back. They have their way of communicating. Maybe make it a bit further than 300 m.

SS: Good reminder, caribou do have the right of way on site. If there is nothing else, this concludes our items of interest section. We're now going to provide a short overview of the 2024 annual report.

TMK: I'll add to what Timothy said. All Inuit know there are not many caribou in the first herd. They are always the leaders and the bigger herd will follow them. That migration route has to be followed from the first herd to the bigger herd which we hunt from. Because there is not a lot in the first herd, even if there are 5 or 10, it still needs to be considered because that could be part of the leaders.

SS: Thanks.

5. 2024 Annual Report Overview

Time: 1:49 – 3:45 pm

Supplemental Material: pdf files titled "2024 Annual Report Overview" and "A.1_Meliadine_CaribouMonitoring_TAG_March2025" (provided by email)

Presenter: Sara Savoie, Agnico Eagle and Mitch Fennell, ER

Supplementary material was reviewed by the presenter. Discussion is recorded here.

Presentation 1: file "2024 Annual Report Overview" (presented by Sara Savoie, Agnico Eagle)

Slide 3 – TAG Annual Report

SS: I wanted to add that this report is added to every year. There were some comments related to previous years. We only addressed the comments for 2024 because the rest was already submitted.

Slide 4 – Next Steps

² Translated from Inuktitut



DCh: Are we going to go over the comments and your responses? Or we're waiting to see the report?

JR: We addressed the concerns that we received in the report.

KR: I had brought this up earlier, how Agnico marks something "resolved". I also mentioned it's hard to get an overall sense of what discussions happened here and what was important to people. I was wondering what other parties felt about having more collaboration in making the document tell the story about what happened, maybe submit a few sentences on their thoughts.

SS: We are always open to comments and suggestions. One of the reasons we share that report in advance is so parties can provide comments. We improved on our meeting minutes with the table that shows the action items and comments. There are some things where we understood the item was resolved and changed based on Parties' feedback. We have a mechanism in the TOR for any advice or recommendations and we abide by that. And we also provide the meeting minutes in full.

JR: There is an item in the TOR that specifies the details of the report we have to submit, so we can look at that if we revise those TOR.

KR: Ok. And for the piece about labelling something resolved, what determines that?

JR: The way we've done it is we look in the meeting minutes and if it was done we're going to say it was resolved. And also we will look at the comments we get from parties and if they feel something wasn't resolved we will adjust the wording.

DCh: Can you think of anywhere in the TAG annual report where a "resolved" comment has been adjusted to another designation like "ongoing" based on parties' comments?

JR: Yes one specific for this year. There was an item regarding the road closure. As we revised the TEMMP we felt like we addressed it, and some parties said for them that didn't address the intent of the question, and it should be changed from "resolved" to "ongoing", so we changed it to "ongoing". Sometimes we misinterpret responses from the meeting minutes, so I agree going forward we could have this discussion in a meeting at the end of the year to agree on all that.

DCh: Our feeling was that once Agnico states something as resolved it rarely goes back, so maybe that would be an issue that we could try to identify a bit better.

ND: We did provide our comments on the TAG annual report, we didn't have much, but we did note some action items where it states something wasn't implemented and it wasn't clear why. I wanted to add I would appreciate if you could have verbal comments captured and tracked in a similar way to how written comments are tracked, that would be helpful.

JR: Thanks. The Table 2 in the TAG Annual Report is basically only verbal comments made during TAG meetings that are outstanding, where we needed to provide more information or actions.

BLHTO (TE): I would like to thank you for letting me speak. For the topic on Caribou Migration: When the caribou get too close to the mine road, it's not hard to recognize that the caribou is being disturbed. For example, using the bombs on site is a disturbance. And the hunters know this because the caribou are moving elsewhere and their migration routes are changing.³

³ Translated from Inuktitut



SS: Thanks. Does anyone wish to provide a short summary? We will make sure the translation is available in the meeting minutes.

Slide 5 – 2024 Caribou Migration Highlights

Slide 6 – 2024 Caribou Calving Range Map

SS: We will move to Greg and Mitch to get into results of the camera and behaviour monitoring program.

Presentation 2: file “Caribou Camera and Behaviour Monitoring Program, 2024” (Presented by Mitch Fennell, ERM).

Slide 2 – Outline

Slide 3 – Caribou Occurrence

GS: One point on that, there was an addition to TEMMP v5 to include land user information that may come in from the KIA or HTO, but that in addition to the collars can also trigger the HOL surveys.

Slide 4, 5 – Caribou Camera Program

Slide 6 – Caribou Detections: AWAR Cameras 2020 – 2023

Slide 7 – Caribou Detections: Discovery Cameras 2023 - 2024

Slide 8 – Caribou Detections: Mine Site Cameras 2023 – 2024

Slide 9 – Caribou Crossing Locations: 2020 - 2023

Slide 10 – Road Structure Survey and Caribou Crossing

MF: We don't see any clear relationship between number of crossing events and substrate type, roadside slope, or roadside height.

Slide 11 – Vehicle Traffic on the AWAR: May 28 – July 31, 2024 (64 days)

DCh: That's not individual ATV, that's ATV detections right?

MF: This is the number of ATVs itself. We gave a 30 min buffer to create an “event”. So events are the #s listed here.

AA: Why is there at least 3 or 4 personal vehicles getting off at 15 to their cabins when the rest of the community isn't allowed to pass the gate house? Because I know there are personal vehicles passing the gatehouse and getting off at 15 to their cabins. And the rest of the community aren't allowed to go there, they are stopped at km 12. It's posted on Facebook all the time. So if that can be fixed, or open to everyone, or move the gatehouse 3 - 4 km, then I'll be happy. The rest of the community can go to 15, not just cabin owners.

MF: When is that happening?

AA: Throughout the whole year. You should move the gatehouse to open it up to the whole community.

SS: Thanks for the suggestion Andre. Moving the gatehouse is no small feat, I think it would require a larger, separate discussion.

AA: We got it moved, originally it was closer, and to have it moved even further would be better.



Meeting Minutes

SS: Interesting points, of course it would require separate discussions. A few clarifications, for everyone, these numbers we're seeing here were outside of the level 3 shutdown. I also want to clarify it's a road used for heavy traffic and hauling, so there is a specific set of rules that we need to follow for health and safety, and something we do every year is we have a community consultation tour and we make sure to share those rules of the road with the community.

JT: When is it phase 2 of the road, when it will become public access to Meliadine Lake?

SS: We will have to get back to you..

DCh: Would this be considered by Agnico to be resolved? Or is this ongoing?

JR: We don't have the information on hand and it's not our department that deals with that but we'll bring the concern to them and check on that. And same for the date on Phase 2.

SS: I'm sure this will be in the minutes and there will be an action item to check on that. And you'll have the opportunity to comment on the resolution of that item.

Slide 12 – Vehicles on the AWAR when Restricted and Closed

DCh: Do you have a range of variation for those averages?

MF: I can get it.

DCh: That would be interesting.

KR: Do you also have the frequency of vehicles, like how many trips of individual vehicles or groups together?

MF: Yes we can get that. When we're in closed status it's a convoy, one event.

KR: Knowing if there are a few hours with no vehicles would be useful, or if they are continual.

SA: Those are averages over the year, or the migratory period?

MF: The time the cameras were out, so the prime migratory period. May 28 to end July. A few weeks on either end of the usual migratory period.

Slide 13,14, 15 – Caribou Behaviour Program

Slide 16 – Behaviour Survey Locations 2020 – 2024

Slide 17 – Behaviours and Group Size, 2020 – 2024

AG: The observations for 2024, what month are they?

MF: June 19 – July 3

AG: Is that earlier than other years?

MF: Slightly earlier. Other years there has been a longer duration.

AG: I'm asking because in June, the responses may be more sensitive. Also, have you considered taking a subset of the data for the four years and using the same time period to compare them? Say for July 15 – 30.

MF: It's not something we've done, partly because of limitations on sample size. I think it's something we could look at for future years.

AG: You could actually combine some of your groups. And choose a fixed time period.

DCh: I was thinking of a specific sampling period, consistent year over year.



MF: We do have that to an extent, in that we go to site the same time each year, shifted slightly according to collar maps. The caveat is we don't control when caribou do show up, so some years it's a week or two earlier.

GS: You also have the life history to consider. In 2020 – 2023, the caribou all followed the same pattern of arriving at the north end of Meliadine lake, going down to the coast, up to Chester, then back and crossing the road again, but doing it really quickly. So groups crossing when calves are 10 days old and then when they are 3 weeks old. I don't know if that makes a big difference in response. Is that what you were getting at Anne?

AG: The age of the calves will influence the cows responsiveness. When the calves are younger, the group dynamics change. And as the calves get older, the groups get larger.

DCh: You were talking about 2020 – 2023 because movements were similar. But I wonder if you look at all that data is there a timeframe that was consistent, as far as a sample size or observations in surveys, and you could look at variation within that. And it hopefully coincides with say 3-week-old calves or something. Because I see what Anne is saying.

GS: Or just include calf age as a variable.

DCh: That's another way yes.

Slide 18 – Behaviours and Group Size, 2020 – 2024

MF: Groups of 3 – 25 caribou are significantly more responsive than group of 26+. And groups of 1 – 2 are even more responsive.

TMK: What does 0.2521 mean

MF: It's the proportion of the group that is doing the response.

TMK: Responding to what?

MF: To a potential disturbance event. A vehicle, a predator, a hunter. It's mostly vehicles here.

GS: This is quite a difference from some of the older information that either hypothesized or reported that bigger groups would be more responsive. This is why we separated observations by group size because we anticipated that..

AG: There is a consideration there of the apparent lack of reactivity of the larger groups. They tend to be the ones further away. I think also insect harassment, you almost have to subset these groups as to if they are showing responses to insects. I think it's not simple, drawing conclusions about whether the larger groups are less responsive or not. Just a cautionary comment.

MF: On the note of the insect responses, we've added that as a data field. In 2024 it wasn't super buggy, but we will carry that forward to future years.

AG: Have you thought about looking back through the camera data to see if you can identify caribou on a particular day that are responding to mosquitos? That would be useful data to have, considering their crossing behaviour.

MF: Good question. It's not something we've tried. I know from doing similar work with cameras it's hard to standardize responses from images.

AG: I wonder if you had a subset of photos that as you say can't be used to categorize movements, I'd work with the elders to see does it look like there were mosquitos around, from how they carry their ears and their head. They have a distinct look when they are being bothered by mosquitos and the elders might be able to help you there.

Slide 19 – Behaviours and Distance to Infrastructure, 2020 – 2024

MF: Wind speed was a surrogate for insect harassment. It was measured at the location of the survey.

AG: Outside the mosquito season you wouldn't expect wind to be a relevant variable. Its impact might be diluted by the duration of your sampling period.

GS: Not sure I understand that.

AG: During the mosquito season, that's when the wind will have an impact, because it affects exposure to mosquitos. If your annual frequency distribution is skewed more towards the calving period, the effect of mosquitos on response might be diluted.

MF: I think that's definitely something we can look at in future years as we build this dataset.

AG: Good point, now you've got ways to dig into what exactly are the caribou responding to. And what trade offs are they making. Because sometimes mosquitos and wind will be more important than traffic and other times not.

Slide 20 – Response to Disturbances

MF: Increasing proportion of alert behaviours with increasing disturbances during a survey.

Slide 21 – Response to Disturbances

MF: When there are more disturbances stacked up, more caribou take longer to return to baseline behaviour. Our takeaway from that is that condensing disturbances with things like convoys as a mitigation measure might be very effective.

DCh: So this is a sample of observations where caribou are at the normal behaviour to start with.

MF: Yes. So we had to cut out some of the data to achieve that.

DCh: Did that reduce the data a lot?

MF: Not a ton. We still had over 200 surveys.

KR: Are you able to show the difference between different types of disturbance?

MF: We haven't looked at that yet. This is the first year we've had enough data to do this type of analysis, so we should be able to do more of that as we build the dataset moving forward.

Slide 22 – Conclusions

DCh: To go back to the cameras. The number of cameras is 40 (45 this year). To be able to compare year over year you need to increase the amount of cameras. Because they keep moving and being spread out. To detect something we need to have it done in a proper way. I really appreciate what all you've done but I also see that we are compromising some of the results. We don't have proper controls and treatment areas with the number of cameras we have. We've been saying this from day 1, that we need to increase the number of cameras. Because they aren't as invasive as other methods. We want to know what's going on out there. My suggestion is you enhance the camera studies with more cameras.

GS: The redistribution of cameras was a request from the TAG. I think it came from Anne. Just to rewind, the original reason for the camera program was to gather data before the waterline install. To find out where caribou are crossing the road, and if there were certain points of the waterline that needed to be covered, and with what material. So that question got answered, and we started

moving them to answer other questions. We will always have cameras on the road, and now we will see them crossing the waterline.

DCh: Obviously that was the original reason, compare crossing before the waterline was installed and now it is installed, so I recommend increasing the camera numbers because we want to see. So keep the ones on the discovery road and add some on the AWAR.

TMK: These studies are they only based on cameras, or observations too?

MF: The camera one is just cameras, the behaviour study is observations in the field. We're normally out for the whole caribou season.

TMK: Is there flexibility to increase capacity for Inuit to be in the field too?

SS: It's something we're always looking for. Right now as part of our environment team we have Inuit working for Agnico. We're also collaborating in other monitoring programs with a firm based in Rankin Inlet. For now they are not involved in the caribou program but it's something to consider. Agnico is also very grateful to have KivlA staying onsite, we also have HTO monitors on the road, and GN.

TMK: Because if this is closely monitored all day, an Inuk next to them would also be a benefit to this study. Our recommendation would be for an experienced hunter. I know they might not want to because they will be out hunting. But 90% of the time if you ask an Inuk about their behaviour they will know. They will have a better understanding why they are reacting that way, where they are going. This whole section on behaviour could have been consulted with Inuit too.

SS: You bring a really good point. One study that we didn't have the opportunity to discuss much in detail is our Hunter Harvest Study, for which we collaborate with the HTO and we meet with different hunters on the land four times a year. For sure there is potential to better showcase and increase the collaborations.

JT: I think that would be a good idea to do what KWB suggested, maybe have a local summer student along with an experienced person on the land.

SS: For sure we will put that in our action tracker.

SA: What distance are you normally observing these groups of caribou from?

MF: From the observer to the caribou group?

SA: Yes

MF: It depends. We're trying not to influence the caribou so most are from 400 – 500 m. Occasional cases that are closer.

SA: I know the methods require a 15 minute period when you first encounter them, you take that set of data out, so caribou reach baseline. I'm just wondering if it might be interesting to look at those 15 minute of data on its own. Because the survey vehicle itself is a disturbance. It might be interesting to look at that. But my main question was, in this analysis instead of creating distance bins you've treated distance from road as a continuous variable. What inference can you make on the actual distances over which caribou are responding? Last year there was a suggestion that once you got beyond 300 m you didn't see much in response behaviours. Anything different this year?

MF: It was similar this year. We presented the distance this year as a continuous variable this year based on a GN request from last year. We did also complete the binned version as well and

saw the same pattern. Within 300 m we see a higher proportion of response behaviours. And all distance bins beyond that are not significantly different from each other.

SA: But treating it as a continuous variable, it is highly significant so there is a response based on distance from road. Any idea what that function looks like?

MF: We didn't explore that this year.

SA: That would be interesting to see. Whether there is a break at 300, or whether still a fairly strong effect beyond 300 m.

MF: Something to look at in future years.

- Break -

6. Terms of Reference

Time: 3:47 - 4:38 pm

Supplemental Material: pdf file "TORs 2025 Revision" (provided by email)

Presenter: All

SS: We have circulated the document with proposed changes from the Athabasca Dene, and we also have a requirement to review the TOR every 2 years, so considering the amount of time this takes, we are proposing to complete those items together.

KR: To respond to that, for context, the revisions we have suggested here, there are none to the content or substance. We're simply asking to have the Athabasca Denesuline inserted like the other groups are. And we'd like to have this discussed separately because our ability to become an official party is dependent on these changes. So I'd like to ask for the group to discuss these changes first, so that we can become an official party. So the TAG already voted to have us become an official party, but the TOR didn't allow it without revisions. We'd like to ask for it to go ahead in two stages like that so it doesn't delay us becoming an official party.

SS: To provide context, any changes to the TOR might seem simple but there are funding elements and they require a broader and legal review and approval by all parties. In any case we will have to go through an amendment process of the TOR, and just acknowledging how long that process can take, and the fact that we have to revise the TOR around this timeline, our view is that it would be more efficient to merge the two topics together.

KR: I guess it depends what other parties have to say. You brought up funding. Athabasca Dene are only asking to have our name put in like other parties do. Maybe other parties would have concerns with that but we weren't anticipating those concerns. I was thinking if we could just hear from the parties if they have any concerns with the suggestions we've made to have Athabasca Dene incorporated as step 1, and then go from there for other revisions we would appreciate that. I want to respect people's time also, but I don't want a scenario where another few meetings have passed before Athabasca Dene are recognized as official parties.

SS: Thanks for that context. I think the TAG have been very welcoming to observers, giving a place to speak, and I'm happy to have these discussions with the Athabasca Dene. Theoretically under the TOR, discussions on TOR updates are between parties only so this is why we were proposing a joint discussion.



Meeting Minutes

DCh: That seems counterintuitive, if you want to have them a part of the TAG then you need to revise the TOR so that when you do the complete revisions they are a part of that. If you don't make those changes first, then they are just observers. Is that the way you want it?

SS: I'm just referencing the TOR. When there is the addition of an extra party, the update of the TOR is between the parties.

AH: Regarding the revisions I see that there is a clause for financial support for Athabasca Dene to attend the TAG meeting, so at this moment I cannot confirm or deny regarding that, so we will refrain from accepting this terms and conditions because we need further validation on this.

ND: We don't any concern with listing Athabasca Denesuline as a party in number 2 as it's listed. We can't comment on 8.7. If this could get resolved sooner so we can move on to the TOR review that's great. And if not then it can be incorporated. But we have no objection with that.

AH: I forgot to mention we don't have any objection adding Athabasca Dene as a party but just for the financial support we'd have to check on that.

AA: KHTO is in support of Athabasca's request to join the TAG. Due to financial reasons, HTO doesn't have any resources, unlike everyone around the table, so the more help the HTO can get from other parties it would be beneficial for residents of Rankin.

KR: It might be helpful if you can pull up the actual TOR, because they do have sections for everyone to receive financial support. So it's not just for Athabasca Dene to receive financial support, there are sections for all parties to receive that.

DCh: And just to be clear Northlands would support Athabasca being added to the TOR in the appropriate locations.

(TOR shared on screen, proposed revisions reviewed)

KR: So Sections 8.4 and 8.5 deal with support for HTOs and KIA to be here, and then 8.6 for Northlands and Sayisi Dene, so we're saying just add Athabasca Dene to that as well.

JR: Did I miss anything?

KR: I think there was just a list at the beginning. 4.1. So just adding our name in that list.

JR: From what I heard KHTO is supporting, Sayisi Dene is supporting, CIRNAC has just to figure out 8.7, GN has no concerns,

SS: And for Agnico Eagle due to the financial component their would need to be a separate discussion on this item.

RM: I think it was brought up in December we were supportive of Athabasca joining but only after contacting local HTOs. Was it done?

SS: Arviat and Whale Cove have been contacted previously in the 2022 period. They haven't been recontacted, but we as part of the TOR revision we could reach out to them.

RM: I thought that's what we agreed on, to reach out to them first before saying yea or nay for Athabasca Dene to join the TAG.

KR: The vote already happened to say yea to Athabasca joining. The hang up is just for us to sign this. The vote happened before the December meeting.

JT: HTO brought up at the December meeting that before the TOR are signed, the other HTOs would be asked if they wanted to also join before making any changes to the terms of reference.



AA: So did that happen?

(head shaking)

AA: So there you go, it died after the Dec meeting. It's been how many months now and they haven't been asked since 2022.

GK: For KivIA I want to bring this to our board for some clarity. I would also suggest KWB reach out to their HTO to see if they are interested. From KivIA I can't say yea or nay I would just need some direction from the board.

DCh: I would certainly encourage the greater representation of other communities.

SS: So what I'm understanding around the table is some parties are in agreement with the proposed changes from the Athabasca Dene, other parties wish to review the financial section, other parties wish to speak with their boards, and we also have the suggestion to reach out to other HTOs to confirm if they would wish to join the TAG. So those are action items that will need to be followed up on. Like we mentioned signing the TOR is a legal process, so we will have to get those items run by our legal council. What I would suggest for next TAG meeting is that every party has a legal review of the TOR and comes to the meeting ready to discuss those.

DCh: We heard from our legal council and they want to be involved when we do that.

KR: Can I just ask how people would feel, for those groups that want to take it back for discussion, could that be done over email before the next TAG meeting? I know Sara you've had these revisions since December but it sounds like your legal team hasn't looked.

SS: We had to meet as a TAG because it's not ours only.

KR: But I mean to say yes or no for yourself.

SS: And we also had to hear what other parties had to say.

KR: For the groups that have to think about this, if it can be done before the next TAG meeting we could come as a party.

SS: Since this is going through legal review for most of the parties, this is why we were suggesting just doing one legal review because we know it takes a lot of time and effort.

GK: From KivIA we have a special board meeting in a couple of weeks, so I'll have direction at that point. I don't know about KWB, how long it will take to contact the HTOs.

TMK: Is it Whale Cove, Chester?

AA: And Arviat.

KR: I know Canada said they had to discuss, and Agnico is this something you think we can do over email before the next TAG meeting?

SS: We can get it going, but for the funding agreement I know there will need to be discussions and not only by email so we'll make sure to organize those.

ND: You mentioned that all the parties will need to do a legal review of the TOR - do you mean just for these proposed edits or were you talking about a complete review?

SS: We will need all parties to sign the revised TOR, so if we do two revisions, one for the Athabasca Dene and one for general revisions, parties will need to sign both. Whether GN decides to go through a legal review or not, is up to you, but I know from experience most parties do that.

ND: OK, based on the presentation and based on the edits proposed, we don't have any concerns. If you want to circulate a track changes version of the TOR where the edits are incorporated in the body, that's helpful. But based on the nature of the comments we don't have concerns at this time. If it can be done as two separately, so this can be out of the way that's great, if not, we can combine them. This seems like a minor edit apart from the funding agreement, which I understand you'll have to discuss with the Government of Canada.

SS: This ties into our next TAG meeting. We've been a working group since 2022, 2023, we've heard good comments and feedback on how we want to work effectively. We're quite a large working group. With this upcoming more in-depth revisions of the TOR, what we're thinking is it might be a good idea to have at least a 1 day in person workshop to go over how we want the TAG to function in the future. What's working, what will make it work better, things we want to change. All items. It would be easier to discuss in person during a workshop. We could have an external party lead the workshop.

DCh: Why not have the TOR review and workshop and discuss next steps combined.

SS: Actually the TOR review is to discuss how we want to function as a group.

ND: So you're suggesting a workshop to discuss how the TAG can function better, is that part of the TOR review or separate?

SS: We're proposing to have a workshop on the TOR review and this discussion would lead to improvements on how the group would work together. The objective of the workshop is a revision of the TOR.

ND: We have no concern with a workshop. I like the suggestion that it will be lead by another party. But depends on timing.

SS: As usual, for this meeting we would send out a survey, but if parties have an idea already of which times work for them or work less for them we can work around that.

AH: You're proposing a workshop next month? To go through the revisions of the TOR? Does that mean that the revision proposed today, we don't have to consider it?

SS: Date to be determined but the next TAG meeting will be a workshop on the TOR. Usually to determine the date of the meeting since we are so many parties and observers we send a survey.

AH: Does that mean we don't need to consider the revisions presented today?

SS: What was discussed earlier was that there would be two revisions of the TOR, one with the Athabasca Dene proposal, and one more thorough revision.

AH: Ok thank you.

JT: Just to keep in mind, spring is coming, then summer. I say October.

SS: We acknowledge it is difficult to find meeting time for a group as large as this. But we will send a survey.

DCh: Maybe just an online thing to have the lawyers look at this, suggest an amendment. Maybe online in April.

JT: Our schedule is booked for April.

SS: We will send a survey out.

DCh: Back in Dec we talked about scheduling for the year and there was a plan to have something in Q2.

SS: What we were not anticipating was the difficulty in getting this meeting together.

DCh: I still suggest we try to find a half day online. It'd be nice to continue to discuss on a fairly regular basis and not have a big gap.

KR: If you're sending a survey out please just do it right away so we can nail down dates.

SS: Natalie is suggesting if we can identify the location of the in person meeting in advance. I know last year we'd discussed wanting to do more meetings in Rankin, around site, potentially a site visit. We had also discussed logistical considerations when organizing meetings in Rankin, like venue availability. The easiest for logistics may be Winnipeg.

JT: We got suggestions from our vice president to have these meetings in the affected area, like Baker Lake for Meadowbank and Rankin for Meliadine.

SS: It's something we're more than happy to look at, it was where we were heading at the end of 2024. What we will do then before the survey is verify the availability of venues. What we will ask for your part is a relatively precise estimate of who will attend in person, so we can block a sufficient amount of hotel rooms. If no other questions we will move on to closing remarks.

BLHTO: My suggestion would be first week of May.

AH: Regarding the TOR revision it would be useful if we can circulate the document ahead of the workshop so parties can be prepared.

DCh: Were you envisioning a 1 or 2 d workshop?

JR: We can add that to the survey, to see what parties prefer.

RM: I think two days. One day for TOR.

BLHTO: Timothy suggests two days.

SS: We will move to closing remarks.

7. End Comments

Time: 4:38 - 5 pm

Supplemental Material: None

Presenter: All

NM: Thanks for having me.

MS: Thanks. First TAG.

ND: We did note down some of the actions for GN today so we will follow up with the parties that raised them, and with Agnico regarding commitment 38 and the TEMMP questions where we'd like additional information. We appreciate everyone.

AG: Interesting to hear everyone's concerns.

SA: Good to keep the dialogue going.

BLHTO: I would like to thank the Meadowbank staff for allowing us to have this meeting and listening to our words.⁴

AH: Thanks. CIRNAC will follow up on our items.

JWi: Thanks. First TAG.

DC: Thanks for engaging in our meeting and presentations.

GB: An emotional trip for me because my brother came to mind and it saddened me. But hearing comments from Andre and the member I spoke to earlier reminded me of my brother who was contacted to be a part of this.

DCh: Thanks. Everyone from the top to the bottom of the caribou range are here to discuss this important issue. I don't know how long any of us will be here but we want the caribou to be.

KR: The few times I've come to Rankin it's been a warm welcome. Thanks for the stories that the elder from Baker Lake shared today, and the knowledge and observations that everyone shared. It's a great group to be a part of. The last time I was here, the caribou were here, and now the caribou are in Athabasca Dene territory. So it's making me reflect on how connected the communities are throughout the caribou range.

RM: Looking forward to the next one.

GK: For my team we were looking for some direction on the finalizing of v5, which didn't happen, but thanks for coming and I want to hear more information on these meetings so we can bring it back to our board and management.

JV: Unfortunate that the weather didn't cooperate and everyone couldn't attend. Hopefully different next time.

JT: It's been a process trying to get from v4 to v5 and the updates needed to make the TEMMP better. I know it's a living document and it's been hard to progress to the next stages, we seem stuck on v4. I don't know if it's the size of the group or the dynamics, I'm also on the Meadowbank TAG and thing seem to move forward a lot better. But hopefully we can continue to work on this.

MF: Thanks all, and glad to be here.

GS: Great to be here, thanks to the community.

TMK: Thanks, nice to see everyone here today.

RA: First TAG meeting, a learning experience, all these terms. I'm new. Thanks.

AA: Thanks all for travelling, look forward to next time.

JR: Thanks for making it. Always interesting to hear the sharing. We will make sure to follow up on the items that we need to.

SS: Thanks to all, people have mentioned the time away from your family and your regular duties. We want thank you for sharing your feedback and suggestions. Lots of things we can address to improve our caribou management practices onsite. Special thanks to Jade for all the logistics to organize it. We will send surveys out shortly for next meeting.

⁴ Translated from Inuktitut

The next meeting of the TAG will be scheduled based on groups' availability (survey to be sent).

Meeting Minutes

APPENDIX A – PENDING ACTION ITEMS (from previous meetings)⁵

Action Item	Responsible Party	Summary	Status (e.g. Pending/Completed)
Items from December 6, 2024:			
Daily of movement	Various	The GN to provide the daily movement rate in the collar's daily map	Pending
TEMMP V5 Comment Table	Various	Agnico Eagle to revise wording of its answers to KivIA-3, GN-1	Completed
Calving Range Map over time	KivIA	Agnico Eagle to add the Calving Range Map overtime.	Completed
Annual Calving Range Map	KivIA	Agnico Eagle to provide the annual calving range map to the TAG prior to submission it in the Annual report	Completed
Muskox population assessment	Various	GN to provide information on the most recent assessment of the muskox population.	Completed
Incidental Observation as trigger	GN	Agnico Eagle to revise the wording on the use of incidental observation as trigger for caribou work suspension.	Completed
GN December 6 th Recommendation Email	GN	Agnico Eagle to provide answer on proposed recommendations from the GN.	Completed
TEMMP v5 Word version update	Various	Agnico Eagle to revise TEMMP v5 draft as discussed during this meeting and distribute for review ahead of next scheduled meeting (Q1 2025)	Completed
Items from January 23 & 24, 2024:			

⁵ Only action items pending, or whose status differs from the last meeting minutes, are included in this table.

Meeting Minutes

Action Item	Responsible Party	Summary	Status (e.g. Pending/Completed)
Collar Method	GN	GN to provide information on how collar methods have changed over time, and how the health of the collared animals is assessed.	Pending
Muskox Harvest Data	GN	GN to provide information on muskox harvest data, past studies beyond what's already cited in the Meliadine TEMMP, and any planned work.	Completed
Caribou Vs Traffic	Agnico Eagle	Agnico Eagle to assess different ways to present traffic information when caribou are in level 3 on a daily basis	Pending