



## Meeting summary

The 265th meeting was held by videoconference on August 25, 2021.

Present: Pierre Philie Joseph Annahatak  
 Daniel Berrouard Lisa Koperqualuk  
 Cynthia Marchildon  
 Murielle Vachon

Executive Secretary: Florian Olivier

### PROJECTS AND OTHER MATTERS

### DISCUSSIONS OR DECISIONS

<b>Follow up on condition 9 of the CA of August 29, 2019. Innavig Hydroelectric Power Project in Inukjuak (3215-10-005)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After analysis and discussion, the Commission decided after discussion and analysis of the preliminary information provided to it, the KEQC decided to address the following questions and comments to the proponent:</li> </ul>
<b>Request of authorization of modification of the CA. Nunavik Nickel Project by Canadian Royalties Inc Underground mining of the Méquillon deposit (3215-14-007)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Biopile and in-situ treatment of petroleum hydrocarbon contaminated soils in the Northern village of Ivujivik by FCNQ (3215-16-059)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After analysis and discussion, the Commission decided not to subject this project to the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure</li> </ul>
<b>Project to Build an Access Road in the Northern Village of Kuujjuarapik, by the Northern Village of Kuujjuarapik (3215-05-008)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Culvert Reconstruction and Crossing Restoration Project on Tasialuup Stream in the Community of Kangirsuk (3215-08-054)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Construction of a backup generating station on the territory of the Northern Village of Inukjuak (3215-10-012)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Project of terminology workshop</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>Meeting with the Impact Assessment Act Working Group</b>	•
<b>Moving of the secretariat in Kangiqsujuaq</b>	•



The project under this request consists of underground mining a portion of the Expo deposit via ramp access. It is an extension of the current Méquillon deposit operations that were authorized by the 2008 certificate of authorization. The existing infrastructures consist of a waste rock stockpile, a water collection pond, a water treatment system, an office and service infrastructures.

Underground mining involves the construction of new infrastructure. An access portal to the underground ramp (5 m high by 5 m wide) will be built on the surface to the east of the pit, at the location of the existing ore impoundment area. The underground ramp will be approximately 7,143 m long, with a maximum slope of 15% and will reach a depth of 480 m. A 13,000 m<sup>2</sup> temporary ore storage area with a capacity to hold 48,000 m<sup>3</sup> of ore will be developed to the east of the planned building development area. Support infrastructure for underground operations will also be built, including an underground backfill plant, a mechanical workshop, five generators, diesel tanks, three ventilation raises with access roads (each approximately 25 m<sup>2</sup>), and platforms to accommodate the ventilation and emergency exit raises.

After discussion and analysis of the preliminary information provided to it, the KEQC concluded it needed more information, and decided to address the following questions and comments to the proponent in order to make a decision regarding the modification of the CA:

#### ***Redevelopment and restoration plan***

- QC-1.** Filing of the redevelopment and restoration plan is required under Section 232.6 of the Mining Act. This plan must be filed with the Ministère de l'Énergie et des Ressources naturelles (MERN) for approval, with a copy sent to the Provincial Administrator for information purposes.

#### ***Water management***

- QC-2.** For underground operations at the Méquillon UG1 deposit, the Commission asks the proponent to specify whether ditches will be required to divert clean water or contaminated water in the area where the new infrastructures will be installed.

#### ***Ore management***

- QC-3.** The Commission asks the proponent to clarify why the existing ore stockpile will not need to be expanded and demonstrate that water that may potentially come into contact with the ore in the new stockpile will be diverted to the collection pond.

Underground mining of the Méquillon UG1 deposit is linked to the request to amend tailings management in the Expo pit, since the ore with acid-generating potential will be processed at the Expo site concentrator and the tailings will then be dumped in the open pit on the Expo site until 2028.

- QC-4.** The Commission asks the proponent to file an updated tailings management plan for the Expo pit, taking into consideration the placement of the Méquillon UG1 tailings. Authorization for the management of the Expo pit tailings must be obtained before a decision can be made on the acceptability of this request to amend the certificate of authorization for underground mining of the Méquillon UG1 deposit. A revision of the operation schedule of the Méquillon UG1 deposit may be required.

No design details for the ore stockpile development have been presented to demonstrate that Mining Directive 019 requirements will be met.

- QC-5.** The Commission asks the proponent to provide a description and a detailed plan of the storage method (under cover, in an outdoor stockpile, in a silo, etc.) and to detail the measures that will be put in place to control peripheral drainage. In the event that ore cannot be stored under cover, the proponent must indicate the measures that will be put in place to prevent wind erosion and surface and groundwater contamination.
- QC-6.** The Commission asks the proponent to locate the 13,000 m<sup>2</sup> temporary ore storage that will be located near the area planned for building development and it must specify the duration of its use in order to confirm that “temporary” does not mean “short term.”

#### ***Sterile management***

- QC-7.** The Commission asks the proponent to confirm that the current waste rock stockpile can be used and will not need to be expanded, considering the production of approximately 662,000 tonnes of waste rock during the operations phase of the Méquillon UG1 deposit.

The proponent mentioned that the waste rock from the sinking of the ramp and the underground mining will be returned underground.

- QC-8.** The Commission asks the proponent to specify both the backfilling sequence and the length of time the waste rock will be stored outdoors before being returned underground for backfilling the work sites.

#### ***Air emissions***

- QC-9.** The Commission asks the proponent to specify whether the fans in the ventilation raises will be installed above or below ground. If they are installed above ground, the decibel level of the fans and the impact of this noise in the ambient air must be detailed. In addition, the proponent must indicate whether this noise would be perceptible in the Parc national des Pingualuit and whether there would be any repercussions on park users or wildlife. If so, the proponent must propose ways to reduce the impact or appropriate mitigation measures.

#### ***Completion schedule***

The proponent stated that the Méquillon UG1 deposit is scheduled to begin production in the fourth quarter of 2022 and is slated to be completed in 2031. However, there are no details regarding the construction phase.

- QC-10.** The Commission asks the proponent to provide a detailed sequence of works, including a schedule for the completion of the project based on the authorization for tailings management in the Expo pit.

#### ***Projected infrastructure***

- QC-11.** The ministerial authorization, issued on October 15, 2019, and under section 22 of the Environment Quality Act, included the construction and use of a single garage. The Commission is asking the proponent to specify whether it wishes to install a second underground garage or if it is referring to the existing garage.

Action: letter to the Administrator – Questions and Comments

**6. Biopile and in-situ treatment of petroleum hydrocarbon contaminated soils in the Northern village of Ivujivik by FCNQ (3215-16-059)**

6.1. Preliminary information

*Task: For discussion, decision*

A diesel spill occurred in May 2020 at the pumping station of the Northern Village of Ivujivik, on the edge of Lake Imirtavialuk. After approval by the municipality, the contaminated soils were excavated and stored at the northern landfill in the Northern Village of Ivujivik. The excavated soils contain very high concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and monocyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, that call for decontamination. The proponent plans biopile treatment of the excavated soils, aiming to achieve hydrocarbon concentrations that will allow the soils to be used periodically as cover material for the village's northern landfill site, in accordance with the requirements of the Regulation respecting the landfilling and incineration of residual materials (Q-2, r.19). Volumes are estimated to be between 300 and 400 m<sup>3</sup>. The approximate dimensions of the biopile are expected to be 12 m wide by 12 m long by 2 m high.

Contaminated soils will be treated at the northern landfill site where they are currently being stored. On-site treatment at the pumping station site is expected to treat the residual contamination on the site, to achieve remediation to its initial state.

After analysis of the preliminary information and discussion, the Commission decided not to subject this project to the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure.

However, the Commission wants to bring to the proponent's attention the following:

The contact information provided in section 2.1 of the preliminary information document is incorrect; it does not correspond to either the pump station (on-site treatment) or the northern landfill (biopile treatment). The proponent must provide specific contact information for each treatment site.

The proponent indicated that other soils with similar levels of contamination could be added to the biopile. The Commission wishes to remind the proponent that in that case, it would need to file another request of exemption for the treatment of those.

**MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**7. Project to Build an Access Road in the Northern Village of Kuujjuarapik, by the Northern Village of Kuujjuarapik (3215-05-008)**

7.1. Request of exemption – complementary information, answers to questions and comments

*Task: For discussion, decision*

The Northern Village of Kuujjuarapik and the Whapmagoostui Cree Nation have been using the same trench landfill for solid waste since the 1950s. The trench landfill is located within the municipal limits of Kuujjuarapik, close to the airport and to both communities. In addition to having nearly reached its capacity, the landfill poses a risk to air navigation because of the increased presence of birds at the location. In addition, the smoke from burning waste, which is done to reduce the amount of garbage destined for the landfill, has a great impact on the communities' air quality.

The two communities have therefore identified the need to open a new landfill to replace this site, a project studied by the Environmental and Social Impact Review Committee (ESIRC) for which

a certificate of authorization was issued by the regional administrator on November 13, 2019. The selected site is located over 5 km north of the communities of Kuujjuarapik and Whapmagoostui, on Cree Category IA lands. The development, operation and closure of the new landfill site are the responsibility of the Whapmagoostui Cree Nation.

The access road to the new landfill site is 1.5 km long and crosses approximately 600 m of Class I Inuit land and then Class IA Cree land. It will be used to transport waste, metal, contaminated soils and heavy equipment to the landfill and metal and contaminated-soil storage site.

The choice of access road that was presented to the ESIRC the challenges related to the plowing of the snow and to the avoiding of a wetland. A stretch of about 600 m of this road is located on category I Inuit land and is subject to chapter 23 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (JBQNA) while the rest of the project is under chapter 22. This section of the road, while related to the projected new landfill site, is nevertheless considered a separate project and is the object of this request of exemption.

After having analysed the preliminary information, the Commission had decided to send the promoter a series of questions and comments in order to clarify its intents and commitment to rehabilitation of the existing landfill site, shared by the communities of Kuujjuarapik and Whapmagoostui.

After analysis and discussion of the complementary information received, the Commission decided not to subject this project to the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure

**Action: letter to the Administrator - exemption**

## **8. Culvert Reconstruction and Crossing Restoration Project on Tasialuup Stream in the Community of Kangirsuk (3215-08-054)**

### **8.1. Answers to Questions and Comments**

*Task: For discussion, decision*

The Tasialuup Stream crossing is the only access road to the northern landfill site located to the west of Kangirsuk. The existing crossing, which a certificate of exemption on June 20, 2013, (ref. #: 3215- 05- 005) is made of riprap covered with granular material, was heavily damaged during the 2016 flooding: one of the main culverts was torn out. It was replaced with a temporary structure consisting of two end-to-end shipping containers covered with wood decking. The second main culvert shows significant corrosion and has partially collapsed. In addition, the existing fill shows signs of erosion, particularly around the main culverts. These failures lead to a decrease in the functions of the eroded main culvert as well as an inability to assess the safety and strength of the temporary main culvert.

Considering the hydraulic and civil security risks of the current structure as well as the importance of the road for public services and access to the territory, the proponent wishes to restore the crossing by replacing the obsolete culverts and stabilizing the structure with riprap.

The crossing of Tasialuup Stream is slated to undergo major repairs over its entire length (200 m). The two main culverts and the two overflow culverts will be removed and replaced with two new rectangular reinforced-concrete culverts. In addition, two metal guardrails will be installed on the crossing. The entire length of the crossing will be graded (300–500 mm) to ensure stability.

After analysis of the preliminary information and discussion, the Commission had decided to send the promoter a series of question and comments.

After analysis of the complementary information and discussion, the Commission decided not to subject this project to the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure

Action: letter to the Administrator - exemption

## **9. Construction of a backup generating station on the territory of the Northern Village of Inukjuak (3215-10-012)**

### 9.1. Impact study

*Task: For discussion, decision*

The Innavik hydroelectric generating station project, under construction for two years now, is the result of a partnership between Pituvik Landholding Corporation and the Québec firm Innergex Renewable Energy Inc.

The community's electricity supply is planned to be provided by the new hydroelectric generating station (Innavik), which is scheduled to be commissioned in 2022. The Inukjuak Backup Generating Station Project, by Hydro-Québec (hereinafter "the proponent") is intended to back up the Innavik hydroelectric power plant in case of breakdown or maintenance.

More specifically, the project provides for the construction of a backup thermal power plant initially equipped with two 2.5 to 3.0 megawatt (MW) generating units, for an installed capacity of approximately 6 MW. A third set (also of 2.5 to 3.0 MW) may be added as needed to bring the total installed capacity to 9.0 MW.

It should be noted that the data presented in the impact study, particularly the atmospheric dispersion study, is based on a scenario in which the backup generating station is equipped with two generators.

Consequently, the project analysis was carried out using this scenario. Should a third generator be added to the plant, the proponent will have to file a request to amend its certificate of authorization.

This project being submitted to the environmental and social impact assessment and review procedure, the promoter provided the Commission an impact study.

After analysis of the received impact study and discussion, in order to make a decision regarding the emission of a certificate of authorization, the Commission decided to send the promoter the following series of questions and comments:

### ***Project description***

In various places in the impact study, notably in sections 4.1.9 and 5.6.2.5, and in section 17 of Appendix E, there is mention of the management of non-hazardous and hazardous residual materials. In this regard, it should be noted that waste management in northern Quebec is a major issue. Consequently, it is crucial for the proponent to ensure that the residual materials generated during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the station are disposed of in accordance with the Regulation respecting the landfilling and incineration of residual materials (chapter Q-2, r. 19). It will be important to ensure that any unused materials or machinery brought in by contractors are not abandoned at the station and are returned to southern Quebec or recovered on site.

**QC-1.** Consequently, the proponent must provide:

- A list of residual materials generated during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the generating station that must include: all residual materials generated (putrescible materials, metals, plastics, fibres, glass, wood, tires, electronic products, etc.), including solids recovered by the domestic water treatment unit, notably septic sludge;
- A waste management plan that favours waste recovery and detailing in particular the methods of storage, sorting and transportation, the facilities planned for the storage and sorting area, the storage conditions, the duration of storage before transportation, etc.;
- The names of the ecocentres and landfill sites governed by the Regulation that will receive all of the residual materials generated by the project, as well as written proof of their agreement to receive these residual materials.

Section 5.6.2.5 (pages 5-45 and 5-46 of volume 1 of the impact study) discusses the management of residual materials in the Northern Village of Inukjuak. It is mentioned that the village uses a northern landfill site to dispose of residual materials.

**QC-2.** The Commission asks the proponent to indicate if it plans to dispose of waste there. If so, it must provide a document confirming the northern landfill's agreement to receive the waste.

#### ***Physical environment***

Page 15 of the Directive mentions that the proponent must carry out a physicochemical characterization of the initial state of the soils, prior to project implementation and carried out according to the Guide de caractérisation de l'état initial des sols avant l'implantation d'un projet industriel, by the Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Lutte contre les changements climatiques (MELCC).

**QC-3.** The Commission asks the proponent to file this study.

Section 5.4.4 (pages 5-10 to 5-11 of volume 1 of the impact study) mentions that a phase I environmental site assessment and an environmental soil characterization were carried out by Englobe on the site in 2020 and 2021, respectively.

**QC-4.** The Commission reminds the proponent that it must file the phase I environmental site assessment report and the environmental soil characterization study mentioned in the impact study.

#### ***Greenhouse gases and climate change***

As mentioned in section 3.7 of the Directive, the proponent must develop a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions monitoring plan. This plan must be implemented to track and, potentially, to better control the project's fuel consumption and emissions.

**QC-5.** The Commission asks the proponent to file a construction phase GHG emissions monitoring plan.

Section 5.4.1.2 (page 5-7 of volume 1 of the impact study), which addresses the project's adaptation to climate change, states that "the likely increase in the frequency and magnitude of extreme weather events, such as thunderstorms, high winds, heavy precipitation in liquid or solid form, may lead to failures of the backup plant"

**QC-6.** The Commission asks the proponent to round out its analysis by identifying project components that are potentially vulnerable to such events (such as structures intended

for surface water drainage) and the adaptation measures it is considering. In some cases, it may be necessary to go improving upon National Building Code of Canada standards and regulations to ensure the project's resilience in future climates. For more information on current and anticipated climate change risks and permafrost characterization of Nunavik communities, the proponent should refer to the maps and synthesis documents recently developed for each Nunavik village by the Centre d'études nordiques, in collaboration with the Ministère des affaires municipales et de l'habitation and the Ministère de la sécurité publique:

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/563a353574604dfaabaec67d0d116b12/page/home/>

#### Noise environment

Section 6.8.3.1 (page 6-23 of volume 1 of the impact study), on the anticipated impacts of construction and mitigation measures, mentions that the proponent will implement section 2 of Hydro-Québec's standard environmental clauses.

**QC-7.** The Commission recommends that the proponent also commits to applying and complying with the MELCC's Lignes directrices relativement aux niveaux sonores provenant d'un chantier de construction industriel

Section 6.8.3.2 (pages 6-23 to 6-30 of volume 1 of the impact study), on anticipated impacts during operation, states that "it appears that the MELCC noise criterion most appropriately applied in this circumstance is that for construction sites" [courtesy translation].

**QC-8.** The Commission asks the proponent to agree to apply and comply with MELCC instructional note 98-01 Traitement des plaintes sur le bruit et exigences aux entreprises qui le génèrent (NI 98-01).

In connection with the previous question and the sound climate modelling presented in section 6.8.3.2 (pages 6-23 to 6-30 of volume 1 of the impact study), it appears, based on the application of NI 98-01 and the data presented in Table 6-7, that in the operational phase:

- the maximum daytime limit of NI 98-01 (which is 45 dBA for such an area) will be exceeded at evaluation points 5 and 6;
- the maximum nighttime limit of 40 dBA (LAr, 1 hr) will be exceeded at assessment points 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6;
- in all cases, an exceedance will occur if a sensitive receptor is located within the identified or equivalent areas of these assessment points and operations occur during the period in question.

Based on the findings presented above, it appears that nighttime use would currently be non-compliant without mitigation measures. It also appears that daytime use would be non-compliant if sensitive receptors are located in the isophone zones in assessment points 5 and 6. In reference to these latter, an excerpt from page 6-28 of volume 1 of the impact study states that "as these locations are currently uninhabited but under consideration for subdivision, no additional mitigation measures are required at this time" [courtesy translation]. Therefore,

**QC-9.** The Commission asks the proponent to explain in depth its intentions to apply and comply with NI 98-01. Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that mitigation measures be anticipated now to meet the maximum limits of NI 98-01.

Section 6.8.3.3 (page 6-30 of volume 1 of the impact study), on the evaluation of the residual impact on the noise climate, mentions for the operational period that "the duration of the impact will be short, since it will be limited to 1 hour per month and about 30 days per year" [courtesy translation].

**QC-10.** The Commission asks the proponent to confirm its commitment to guaranteeing that this use will be in effect for the entire operating period, which is approximately 30–50 years. The proponent must indicate whether scenarios have been identified in the event that electricity requirements increase significantly over this period, for example, as a result of population growth. If it is not possible to completely rule out the possibility that the backup generating station will be used more often than 1 hour per month for approximately 30 days per year, the residual impact assessment must also consider this scenario.

**QC-11.** The Commission asks the proponent to undertake to implement a complaint management program during the construction and operation phases.

***Accident prevention measures and facility safety during operations***

Tables 8-4 and 8-5, presented in section 8.1.9 (pages 8-8 to 8-9 of volume 1 of the impact study), indicate that a considerable number of incidents stem from human error.

**QC-12.** The Commission asks the proponent to submit an action plan for training personnel assigned to the management of hazardous materials, as well as for the improvements it foresees to minimize the risk of incidents.

***Environmental monitoring and follow-up***

Page 25 of the Directive mentions that the impact study must present the list of elements requiring environmental monitoring and the characteristics of the monitoring program for each environment.

**QC-13.** The proponent must justify why no groundwater quality monitoring program has been submitted.

Section 9.2 (page 9-1, of volume 1 of the impact study) mentions that the proponent proposes to monitor the noise environment during the first year of operations. In order to validate the sound climate modelling and the hypothesis stated on page 6-26 of the impact study, according to which “the noise that will be produced by the proposed generating station in operation will not present characteristics leading to the application of correctives,” [courtesy translation]

**QC-14.** The Commission asks the proponent to file a sound climate monitoring program, covering at least the first year of operations, and it must commit to implementing this program. The sound climate monitoring program must include a description of the acoustic measurement method and the identification of corrective measures.

***Atmospheric dispersion study***

Section 2.2 (the description of equipment and simulation scenarios) mentions that the backup scenario for the 6-MW-capacity station involves the use of a single generator. The proponent must indicate whether there is a possibility that the two generators planned with the current capacity could be used in a backup situation.

**QC-15.** The Commission asks the proponent to also indicate whether the generators are likely to operate at maximum capacity. If so, these scenarios should also be modelled and filed as part of this analysis.

In Section 2.3 (air emission standards), Table 2 presents a limit value of 2.2 g/MJ for total hydrocarbons. However, since the generators will be powered by diesel, the limit value for total hydrocarbons should be 0.28 g/MJ supplied by the fuel for an engine rated at 1 MW or greater, as specified in Section 52 of the Clean Air Regulation.

**QC-16.** The Commission asks the proponent to confirm that it will consider the correct information and provide explanations and corrections as necessary.

**QC-17.** In relation to the information presented in section 3.9, concerning emission parameters, the proponent must:

- provide the publication used as a reference for odour emission rates for Group 0 diesel generators (Alberico, 2001);
- specify the data used, from the cited reference (EPA Moves2014b, 2018), to establish the ratio of hydrocarbon emission factors to calculate the odour emission rate; and
- provide the generator manufacturer's data sheets, which must include contaminant emission data based on the regime used.

Action: letter to the Administrator – Questions and Comments

## **10. Project of terminology workshop**

*Task: For discussion*

Members examined an example of list of terms to translated during the terminology workshop, received by the Chair from Glencore. The general opinion of the members is that the list will be much longer and that it would be a good time to start collecting the words in a single list. No deadline was decided.

## **11. Meeting with the Impact Assessment Act Working Group**

*Task: For discussion, decision*

Members were wondering what is the goal of this meeting. The general opinion is that the Impact Assessment Act Working Group should submit its demands in a letter so the members can evaluate the need for a meeting. The Chair will contact the Working Group.

Action : ask the Working Group to list its demands in order to evaluate the need for a meeting.

## **12. Moving of the secretariat in Kangiqsujuaq**

*For information*

La maison de fonction du secrétaire exécutif (SE) est sur le point d'être libérée. Un nettoyage et quelques rénovations mineures seront effectuées sous peu et le SE pourra y emménager.

## **13. Varia**

### **Transfer of the KEQC's archives**

*For information*

The executive secretary is waiting for Avataq Cultural Institute to send the contract before ha can ship the archives.

## **14. Next meetings**

Next meeting will be held in Kangiqsujuaq on October 20, 2021.

## **DOSSIERS UNDER ANALYSIS**

---

**Environmental monitoring report 2019 Raglan Mine Project, phases II and III by Glencore (3215-14-019)**

**Environmental monitoring report 2020 Raglan Mine Project, phases II and III by Glencore (3215-14-019)**

**Environmental and social monitoring report 2020, direct shipping ore project, project « 2a » (Goodwood) by Tata Steel Minerals Canada, (3215-14-014)**

**Raglan Mine Project, phases II and III by Glencore – follow up to conditions 1 and 3 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017 (3215-14-019)**

**Raglan Mine Project, phases II and III by Glencore - follow up to conditions 4 and 8 of the certificate of authorization of July 11, 2017 (3215-14-019)**

**Request for modification of the certificate of authorization for the Nunavik Nickel Project, Canadian Royalties Inc. Power Line and Fiber Optic Supply at the Deception Bay Camp (3215-14-007)**

**Kuujjuarapik thermal generating station capacity increase project by Hydro-Quebec (3215-10-015)**



**10. Project of terminology workshop**

*Task: For discussion*

**11. Meeting with the Impact Assessment Act Working Group**

*Task: For discussion, decision*

**12. Moving of the secretariat in Kangiqsujaq**

*For information*

**13. Varia**

**14. Next meetings**

