INPUT ON THE DISCUSSION PAPER FOR THE OPR REVIEW

June 16, 2022

1. What's working well in relation to the OPR, and its implementation, and what could be improved?

An area for improvement is more face-to-face engagement with our Metis community members. This level of communication is necessary to properly identify key areas of concern, and truly develop relationships.

2. How can the OPR contribute to the advancement of Reconciliation with Indigenous peoples?

There should be a requirement for companies who do business on the lands of Indigenous peoples to come to community and provide updates – in person – to Metis community members. Without this being a requirement, it is unlikely companies will provide this service.

3. How can the OPR contribute to the protection of heritage resources on a pipeline right-of-way during construction, and operations and maintenance activities?

Additional funding should be made available for Metis groups to create digital maps (GIS) showing traditional use of their lands, areas of environmental concern, heritage value, etc. this would improve the process of communication between companies and Indigenous peoples.

4. How can the OPR contribute to the protection of traditional land and resource use, and sites of significance for Indigenous peoples on a pipeline right-of-way, during construction, and operations and maintenance activities?

5. How can the use of Indigenous knowledge be addressed in the OPR?

Companies should be required to meet in person with Metis communities in order to learn from them **firsthand**, and implement standard based on the concerns and knowledge of community members.

6. How can the OPR address the participation of Indigenous peoples in pipeline oversight?

Again, there should be a requirement on of personnel from companies attending in-person, in order to properly engage with the community.

Li taan paasii. Li taan ki vyayn.

From our past. For our future.

7. How can the OPR support collaborative interaction between companies and those who live and work near pipelines?

Create program investments to facilitate meetings with Metis communities.

8. How could communication and engagement requirements in the OPR be improved?

Once per quarter (or another regular time interval), companies should be required to hold an 'open-house' in communities, and answer questions community members have. This would have the desired effect of providing strong engagement (face to face, taking the necessary time, etc.), as well as building a relationship between both company personnel, as well as community members who are most effected by energy activities and project.

9. How could the CER improve transparency through the OPR?

No comment

10. Gender and other intersecting identity factors may influence how people experience policies and initiatives. What should the CER consider with respect to:

a. those people implementing the OPR; or

b. those people who are impacted by the operational activities addressed in the OPR?

11. How can the OPR support a predictable and timely regulatory system that contributes to Canada's global competitiveness?

Following the adequate and full implementation of UNDRIP legislation, Canada can increase its global competitiveness by marketing itself as a nation that has successfully implemented UNDRIP.

12. How can the OPR support innovation, and the development and use of new technologies or best practices?

Support the education and development of new technologies within Indigenous communities.

13. What company-specific or industry-wide performance metrics could the CER consider to support enhanced oversight and transparency for CER-regulated facilities?

Among other things, the attendance of in-person 'open house' meetings conducted by a company within an Indigenous community.

14. Are there opportunities within the OPR for data and digital innovation that could be used by the CER and by companies regulated by the CER?

No comment

Li taan paasii. Li taan ki vyayn.

From our past. For our future.

15. How can the OPR be improved to address changing pipeline use and pipeline status?

On the Metis community level, speaking with those who live close to the project to get their input is imperative. On a broader level, making choices that are best for the environment as a whole, including transitioning to a low carbon economy, is also imperative.

16. What further clarification, in either the OPR (e.g. structure or content), or in guidance, would support company interpretation and implementation of management system requirements?

No comment

17. How should information about human and organizational factors, including how they can be integrated into a company's management system, for both employees and contractors, be provided in the OPR, and/or described in related guidance?

No comment

18. How can the OPR improve the connection between company safety manuals and the overarching Safety Management Program, for both employees and contractors?

One element of this must be educating Metis community members. Since those individuals may live within a close proximity to energy projects, and may be (a) the first individuals to observe and report any concerning, and (b) in the occurrence of a safety hazard community members will be prepared to

19. How can respect and personal workplace safety be assured at CER regulated sites?

20. How should the CER be more explicit about requirements for contractor management?

There should be a greater effort to hire contractors who are local/Indigenous peoples.

21. How should the OPR include more explicit requirements for process safety?

No comment

22. How can the OPR drive further improvement to the environmental performance of regulated companies?

Among other things, it should take into account the downstream effects of more carbon in the atmosphere, and this should factor into the CER's approval of these projects.

23. How can the connection between the Environmental Protection Plan, specific to an individual pipeline, and the company's Environmental Protection Program, designed for a company's pipeline system, be improved?

The CER should work in coordination with Environment Canada, as well as Indigenous Services Canada (and related agencies) to ensure that its parameters for environmental protections are consistent with leading scientists and Indigenous initiatives.

24. How can contaminated site management requirements be further clarified, in the OPR or in guidance?

Private companies who caused the contamination should be held liable for the damage done to the site, without quantum or time limitation.

25. Are there any matters related to the Emergency Management Program in the OPR that require clarification? If so, what are they? Are there any matters for which further guidance is required?

No comment

26. How could the requirement for a Quality Assurance Program be improved or clarified in the OPR?

No comment

27. How can the OPR incorporate the key issues identified in the Safety Advisory regarding the strength of steel and the relative strength of the weld area?

No comment

28. What are your recommendations for compliance promotion at the CER?

No comment

29. How do you want to be engaged by the CER in the development of technical guidance?

Among other things, in person meetings are preferable, especially when working with Indigenous communities.

Thank you,

President
BC Metis Federation