

Chemistry Industry Association of Canada
National Advisory Panel

May 2–3, 2011
Toronto, Ontario

HEADLINE MINUTES

1. CIAC Update

Bob Masterson updates Panel on CIAC membership, recent and noteworthy accomplishments, the renewal of Responsible Care, and some of the challenges facing the Association nationally and internationally. (p. 3)

2. Triennial Planning Process

Richard Paton discusses the Environmental Scan for CIAC's Triennial Plan: 2012–2015. He lists six issues facing the chemistry industry. Panel feels that all the issues are important but rates them in descending order, with the first being the most urgent to external stakeholders: Chemicals in Products; Value Proposition; Bio/Nanotechnology Innovation; Sustainability; Investment; and Membership Challenges. (p. 4)

3. Brief Update on Elmira Planning Issue

Panel members are interested in this case study as it helps underline the need for sites to be vigilant about activities on their perimeter and also points to a role for CIAC to advance the value of the consideration of WCS in municipal planning decision-making. (p. 6)

4. Making Sustainability Principles Real in Industry

Dave Shortt talks about implementation of the Sustainability Principles at Dow. He covers Dow's history of sustainability and presents the company's 2015 Sustainability Goals. Dow aims to achieve at least three breakthroughs that will significantly help to solve world challenges. Dave cites a number of Dow contributions to sustainability currently being produced or in the pipeline, among them DOW™ POWERHOUSE™ roof shingles, carbon dioxide capturing, water purification, vehicle light-weighting and Impaxx™ energy absorbing foam. Dow has a rigorous reporting discipline and tracks its progress in sustainability. Panel surprised at the absence of Responsible Care mentions in the presentation. (p. 6)

5. Measurement and Reporting

Bob Masterson reviews the current collective metrics at CIAC, including: emissions and wastes (NERM); employee and contractor health and safety (SHARE); transportation incidents (e-TIMS); process safety (PRIM); climate change (NERM); and all aspects of Responsible Care important to the company and/or its stakeholders. Panel raises four key questions about the Reducing Emissions report: 1) Who are the

audiences for this report? 2) The projections are timid; do you not trust your ability? 3) Is there a bigger role in local communities for this report? 4) Is the report too detailed for the local community? Should there be a simplified version for the community? (p. 8)

6. Sustainability and Risk Management

Panel discusses how to reconcile roles of innovation and new technologies with the commitment to effective risk management. They call for an honest communication of the risks and benefits of an innovation, and communication emphasizing that guidelines were followed in going forward with an innovation. (p. 10)

7. Sarnia Alerting System

The Bluewater community has invested considerable effort over many years to create a response system which has received positive comments from external reviewers. However, a number of Responsible Care verifications in the area have said that communication of the system needs to be worked on. Panel concludes that multiple mechanisms are needed to reach multiple parts of the community. (p. 11)

8. Visibility of Responsible Care

Kevin Brady of Five Winds International talks about the converging interests in more sustainable materials and products from “responsible” companies. It is suggested that visibility happens at the industry and community levels. It is noted that Responsible Care is a principled system, so the future may be marrying principles and specific programs. (p. 11)

9. Shale Gas

Greg Wilkinson of Third Oak Associates Inc. talks about shale gas, with particular attention to Marcellus Shale, which represents 50 percent of U.S. shale gas reserves. Greg explains what shale gas is, why it is important now, public concerns and implications for Canadian chemistry. Panel says that shale gas represents an amazing opportunity, but there is a lot of skepticism regarding industry behaviour. So far, says the Panel, industry has not shown a lot of responsibility. It sounds like the Panel is running up a large red flag. (p. 12)

10. Panel News

This is Jim Wakefield’s last Panel meeting. Jim says it was an honour and a privilege to have served on the Panel, and he found it a very rewarding experience. John Vincett and the Panel thank Jim for his years of effort on the Panel and wish him well in his future endeavours. (p. 13)

Next Meeting
Ottawa, Ontario
October 18, 2011 – 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.
October 19, 2011 – CIAC Annual General Meeting

Chemistry Industry Association of Canada

National Advisory Panel

May 2–3, 2011

Toronto, Ontario

National Advisory Panel:

Richard Janda
Cindy Jardine
Debra Krukowski
Brenda Lorenz
Pat McLean
Ken Ogilvie
Ron Ormson
Keith Purves
Edwin Tam
Jim Wakefield
Bruce Walker

Regrets:

Gail Krantzberg
Robin Orr

Chemistry Industry Association:

Bob Masterson
Sarah Mayes
Richard Paton
Dave Shortt (Dow Chemical)
Brian Wastle

Guests:

Kevin Brady (Five Winds International)
Joe Greulich
Mary Greulich
Kris Lee (former Panel member)
Jordan Legault (Visitor)
Alex von Knobloch (Visitor)
Greg Wilkinson (Third Oak Associates)

PDA:

Francis Gillis
John Vincett

Agenda Item 1: CIAC Update

Bob Masterson updated the Panel (Appendix 1) on the Association membership, recent and noteworthy accomplishments, the renewal of Responsible Care, and some of the challenges facing the CIAC nationally and internationally. He also presented some details about the renewal of Responsible Care in the U.S. Some of this related to a thrust towards a globally consistent program, based upon the American model and fully aligned with ISO. Concerns were raised about the potential loss of customization of the program to fit the cultures of different countries, but based upon consistent principles. It was noted that this feature had been a part of the success of the program internationally, and kept the focus on the ethical basis.

Bob asked whether the Panel would be interested in hearing a speaker from the U.S. Responsible Care program at the fall meeting in Ottawa to lay out their rationale. There were mostly nods in reply, but a number of questions were raised. As one member said, “It would be nice to exchange ideas, but what would be the value?”

It was suggested that experienced U.S. Panel members as well as Canadian NGOs be invited to make it a broader forum for discussion. Richard Paton noted that the transportation sector will be the biggest issue. Transportation companies that operate in both the U.S. and Canada are looking for a single assessment of their performance, he said.

John Vincett said there seemed to be support for exploring this topic further, and that he would work with Bob to develop a suitable item for the October meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Triennial Planning Process

Richard Paton discussed the Environmental Scan for CIAC's Triennial Plan: 2012–2015 (Appendix 2). Panel members had received this document in advance of the meeting.

Richard noted challenges currently facing the chemistry industry:

- Hundreds of millions being added to the middle class in India and other countries
- An overall positive scenario for the industry in comparison with the last two years
- Shale gas will dramatically increase the potential for viable North American chemical production
- Biofeedstocks are starting to emerge
- Shale gas could offset the biofeedstock trend, but ignoring and not taking advantage of shale gas would be a mistake
- We will see more and more regulation that is not particularly productive
- There is an evolution of “private regulation” whereby large retailers effectively become the regulator; a product can be gone, largely through expressed concern via social media, without the government even hearing about it
- Sustainability is real with marketers, which drives innovation
- The number of people whom we could engage in an association is not nearly as much as it used to be, but we are able to staff key issues

Richard asked the Panel: have we identified the key trends?

There was a suggestion that federal governments in Canada and the U.S. could withdraw significantly from policymaking due to lack of money. It was remarked that the U.S. Government is going to shift 50 percent of every tax dollar to paying off its debt.

Other issues mentioned included the aging workforce and that the Health Canada “bubble is going to burst” from the extra expenditures for the aging population; the need to be aware of mobilization of stakeholders through social media; the trend of misinformation; the “positive opportunities” of biotechnology as well as shale gas.

Richard then listed the issues now facing the chemistry industry in Canada:

1. Investment

2. Bio-based Chemistry and Innovation: what should CIAC's role be vis-à-vis biotechnology?
3. Sustainability
4. The "Chemicals in Products" Issue
5. Membership Challenges: what is the proper focus or balance of the association?
6. CIAC's Value Proposition for Members

Panel Comment:

There were a few general remarks about the six issues:

- Wal-Mart and other retailers should be working with operators where Responsible Care is the logo.
- Investment (1), Membership Challenges (5), and the Value Proposition (6) are nebulous to those outside the industry.
- Sustainability (3), Membership Challenges (5), and the Values Proposition (6) are in-house issues—these have to be an ongoing concern in growing the membership.
- Issues that involve external stakeholders include Investment (1) and Chemicals in Products (4).
- You need to get more than a toe in water on biotechnology and nanotechnology.
- Yes, nanotech is a huge issue. Get ahead of the curve and engage companies on this issue. Tackling nanotech might also increase membership.

There were a number of remarks about Sustainability (3) and Chemicals in Products (4):

- Issues 3 and 4 are driven by the public. I think you can step back from sustainability, but chemicals in products are always coming at you from a negative perspective. I think you are going to have to try to get more exposure with companies that sell consumer products.
- Yes, chemicals in products are going to be significant. The public are asking about them. There is a role for CIAC to defend these products.
- Companies already recognize the importance of sustainability in the sense of self-preservation, so Issue 3 becomes a low priority for CIAC. But Issue 4, chemicals in products, makes engaging Wal-Mart and other retailers really important. The general public is interested, so get labels out there.
- Ultimately, the consumer dictates where we're going. Industry needs to be more aware of who's going to buy a particular product. And consumers are becoming more aware of environmental issues.

At least one Panel member, however, emphasized the importance of sustainability: "A lot more should be done (in this area); it has to be more than words."

A Panel member suggested that CIAC "forget" government and move on to the consumer, the "constant in your world."

In summarizing the discussion, John Vincett noted that a case was made for all six issues.

Panel members were asked to select the three most important issues for the CIAC, from their perspective, in an exercise that is to be repeated across all Executive Leadership Groups and committees to arrive at conclusions about key areas of focus for the next Triennial period. In selecting the three issues, they ranked them in importance as follows:

- Chemicals in Products (79)
- Value Proposition (57)
- Bio/Nanotechnology Innovation (52)
- Sustainability (49)
- Investment (16)
- Membership Challenges (13)

Agenda Item 3: Brief Update on Elmira Planning Issue

Pat McLean brought the Panel up to date on the happenings at Elmira, where the perimeter of the two CIAC members in the community is being affected by a potential housing development. Currently, the issue is held up in the municipal decision-making process in that the Region and the Town feel that there are information requests outstanding and the proponent believes that permission has been granted. Meanwhile, the two companies feel that due process has not taken place. The proponent has appealed to the OMB about a lack of a decision. A scoping hearing has taken place, at which a number of irregularities were identified and the different sides were required to meet offline and agree upon a set of issues to be reviewed by the OMB.

Panel Comment:

Panel members emphasized that CIAC member facilities are responsible for securing their own buffer zones and need to remain alert to potential changes in land use and that this is a part of the Community Awareness portfolio under Responsible Care. At the same time, concern was expressed that Worst Case Scenario planning efforts by industry have been avoided by both the province and municipalities. This is a problem that could be addressed by an Official Plan Review process. It was reported that Sarnia inserted a clause about WCS planning as an important factor in zoning decisions, and that this has been helpful in dealing with the realities of the collision in use between industrial and residential sections of the community.

The Panel thought that there was room for CIAC to lobby the provincial government in Ontario on changes to planning legislation to ensure that WCS taken into consideration in municipal decision-making.

Agenda Item 4: Making Sustainability Principles Real in Industry

Dave Shortt talked about implementation of the Sustainability Principles at The Dow Chemical Company (Appendix 3). He covered Dow's history of sustainability and presented the company's 2015 Sustainability Goals. Dow aims to achieve at least three

breakthroughs that will significantly help to solve world challenges. Dave cited a number of Dow contributions to sustainability currently being produced or in the pipeline, among them DOW™ POWERHOUSE™ roof shingles, carbon dioxide capturing, water purification, vehicle light-weighting and Impaxx™ energy absorbing foam. Dow has a rigorous reporting discipline and tracks its progress in sustainability.

Dave noted that sustainability assessments are being carried out at Dow on a product-by-product basis. He indicated that there are some things the company should not be doing from an environmental perspective, but the fact of demand for these products has to be weighed against the unsustainability of that demand, while better solutions are developed.

For 133 years carbon has been basic to Dow's manufacturing. How is the company addressing that? Should the company be developing alternative manufacturing methods? Traditionally, the response to such questions has been: what is the economic risk to the company? But Dow is starting to get away from that and moving in the direction of taking the sustainability of a given product into consideration.

Panel Comment:

A Panel member asked why Dow dropped Responsible Care as the name for their sustainability effort. Dave said the company made a conscious decision to focus on sustainability. What is the relationship between sustainability and Responsible Care? As a company we haven't settled on the answer to that question. It comes back to Responsible Care is an ethic and sustainability is an imperative that we have to hold to.

Additional Panel comments:

- You have sustainability goals, and you have environment and health Responsible Care goals.
- What does sustainability mean to Dow? There are many models out there.
- Dow is giving serious thought and action to addressing the new principles; but, ironically, the presentation did not cite Responsible Care as a driving force and the company appears more comfortable with branding its own efforts than with crediting Responsible Care.
- Panel members find this to be a mysterious situation, and suggest that if Responsible Care does not seem important enough for member companies to reference, with all of their marketing heft, then it should not be surprising that Responsible Care's branding value remains unrecognized.

In summary, John Vincett suggested that the previous discussion about new kinds of regulation by retailers is relevant to the branding question, the hidden value of Responsible Care. Panel members were impressed with Dow's efforts to make the New Principles real, but were surprised at the decision not to credit Responsible Care as a part of that success.

Agenda Item 5: Measurement and Reporting

Bob Masterson reviewed the current collective metrics at CIAC, including: emissions and wastes (NERM); employee and contractor health and safety (SHARE); transportation incidents (e-TIMS); process safety (PRIM); climate change (NERM); and all aspects of Responsible Care important to the company and/or its stakeholders (Appendix 4). He noted that what gets measured does get managed.

Panel members were asked to provide advice about information that should be gathered and collectively reported to the public and other interested audiences.

The Panel commented:

- Consider reporting verifications that have been done and improvements made or suggested. In particular, how has the company improved people's lives?
- Companies should focus on performance, transparency and accountability. Transparency means accessibility to enough data to make a judgment. Verification is part of accountability. Questions a company should answer include: What's new in your sector? What are the issues (new and old) that you have to wrestle with? At the end of the day, can you show good action, especially in the community? Reducing emissions can be part of the good actions you are doing. You can show performance against the new Ethic & Principles of Responsible Care.
- It's important to get the message out that personal values fit with company values.
- In Sarnia, the chemical side of Imperial Oil Limited has achieved better detection of fugitive oil emissions. Shouldn't the IOL standard now be the CIAC baseline?
- Reporting overly precise amounts of emissions have been criticized as giving a false sense of just how measurable they are.

There was also a discussion about the five-year projections in Reducing Emissions. It was noted that CIAC members almost always improve beyond the projections shown in the book. Some Panel members felt that it would be better to leave the projections off. A Panelist remarked that the public doesn't care about the projections until a plant incident happens.

John Vincett noted that Reducing Emissions is well designed, but the issue is how to market it. A couple of Panel members noted that the Community Advisory Panels they are involved in have never seen this report. They suggested there would be value in better dissemination of the document.

A Panel member noted that most industries don't produce anything like Reducing Emissions. He suggested that, while certain stakeholders will want a detailed report, for

MPs or the local community “it’s too hard to parse the graph.” At the community level, he added, it’s important that the individual company or plant be seen to do the right thing.

Another Panel member suggested that CIAC find out who is using the report now and for what purpose. And who would like to use it. He himself has been using Reducing Emissions to push other sectors to improve their performance: “Everybody knows (the chemical industry) has set certain benchmarks.” The Panelist went on to note that “in 1985 you were dealing with a different situation. But today Dow, for example, is going ahead as it should. There is a lot of dynamic energy here.”

A Panel member commented: “I really like this report. The format is good and it shows remarkable transparency. I read it as a document rather than a PR piece. But is there a place for forward-looking and ambitious targeting, as described yesterday by Dow for example?”

John Vincett noted a number of themes in the discussion about Reducing Emissions:

- Who are the audiences for this report?
- The projections are timid; do you not trust your ability?
- Is there a bigger role in local communities for this report?
- Is the report too detailed for the local community? Should there be a simplified version for the local consumption?

John suggested that there might also be an opportunity to report on innovation among CIAC members. A Panel member noted that verifiers do collect such information but are not sure how to report it.

A member wondered if there was enough here for an annual report. After all, CIAC is about more than emissions. Perhaps a report every three years would be sufficient. Another member agreed, suggesting that additional reports on community research could be produced so that every year people see something. Another suggestion was a report on sustainability in the years when Reducing Emissions was not produced. However, there was not a general call for less frequency in the Reducing Emissions report.

Sarah Mayes noted that the on-line version of Reducing Emissions doesn’t get that much traffic. CIAC does some advertising of the document and this year produced a press release. Given that future issues of the report will only exist on line, obviously more will need to be done to inform stakeholders of the on-line availability of the report.

John noted that the Panel was responding to the paper report and the discussion of printing costs, but new on-line information can be provided in a different way that has different costs associated. Electronic mechanisms can be updated more easily, so the period of reporting is less of an issue than it was with print formats.

Agenda Item 6: Sustainability and Risk Management

The purpose of this discussion was to reconcile roles of innovation and new technologies with the commitment to effective risk management in pursuing sustainability, and to consider the implications for messaging.

A Panel member initiated discussion by noting that, if we refuse to take risks, we will not grow as a society.

We have to communicate why a risk is reasonable, said another member. Is the risk worth it to the community and to society in general?

There will inevitably be risk tradeoffs, it was observed. A main message is that innovations of the chemical industry can be a solution.

While agreeing that some risks may make sense, a member commented that some choices could have large, devastating effects on society.

A member emphasized the need for clear communication, of which context is an important element. For example, it is good to communicate emission reductions, but without proper context, a reader could look at the report and say, “Wow! Look at all the stuff we’re emitting.”

John Vincett heard the Panel calling for an honest communication of the risks and benefits of an innovation, and communication that guidelines were followed in going forward with an innovation.

There was a call for clear federal and provincial policies for risk. But companies also need to communicate clearly with communities and employees. A member noted that the Responsible Care codes include communicating risk but was not sure CIAC and its members have enough experience around innovation. A member who is involved in Responsible Care verification noted that companies check risks at various stages of production.

It was suggested that companies describe situations where decisions were taken not to go ahead, though it was remarked that it is hard to prove something did not happen because of steps taken by a company. Bob Masterson noted that a draft is being developed at CIAC on this issue.

The importance of reporting to the public about innovation was emphasized, even if there is no risk.

Agenda Item 7: Sarnia Alerting System

Some individuals in Sarnia have recently suggested that there is a need for a “world class” alerting and public notification system in the event of an incident. The Bluewater community has invested considerable effort over many years to create a response system which has received positive comments from external reviewers. However, a number of Responsible Care verifications in the area have said that communication of the system needs to be worked on.

A Panel member commented that Imperial Oil Limited, the largest facility in the area, which had an incident in February, needs to verify information about the alerting system rather than just providing one-way information. It was suggested that industry and first responders have got to find a way to get out and engage with people. However, until something serious happens, it was suggested, public apathy will be the reaction to any attempt to communicate about emergency response. That said, it was pointed out that radio and newspapers can involve the public in emergency response issues.

A Panel member, who is familiar with emergency response systems in various communities, noted that in Sarnia an incident is supposed to trigger a siren system in each community but sometimes there is indecision about whether to sound the sirens. “It’s a process problem.”

Another suggested tool for any area was “reverse 911,” which allows residents to receive emergency information over their work or home telephone numbers. Cell phones as well as social media could also play a role, it was suggested.

A member wondered what evacuations were done after the nuclear incident in Japan and whether anything learned about those evacuations could be applied in Canada and to the chemical industry.

It was concluded that multiple mechanisms are needed to reach multiple parts of the community.

Agenda Item 8: Visibility of Responsible Care

Kevin Brady of Five Winds International talked about the converging interests in more sustainable materials and products from “responsible” companies.

Bob Masterson asked if there are fora in Canada that CIAC could approach about Responsible Care versus targeting each supplier individually. Kevin noted that the International Council of Mines has initiated a dialogue between material suppliers.

A Panel member suggested that Richard Paton might want to sit down with individual industries to discuss their goals and see if they are compatible with Responsible Care. There was some discussion about the difference between the visibility of Responsible

Care that happens in the host communities and at the industry level through a national program. Bob pointed out, however, that the CIAC membership resists the promotion of Responsible Care beyond the membership

A Panel member remarked that, as Wal-Mart and other retailers look at indexes of sustainable performance, it raises the question of whether CIAC should be proactive in getting Responsible Care to be the standard. It was noted, however, that Responsible Care is quite sophisticated. The concern is that the larger ethic that underlies it will get lost in attempting to relate Responsible Care to the retail market. On the other hand, as a Panelist remarked, “if you’re not at the table you’re on the menu.”

Brian Wastle noted that Responsible Care is a principled system. He felt that the future is marrying principles and specific programs.

A Panel member wondered if good initiatives relating to the environment and the chemical industry are finally being picked up in China. There are PhD graduates starting up facilities in India and China who may apply good initiatives, but there is home grown industry there as well.

Agenda Item 9: Shale Gas

Greg Wilkinson of Third Oak Associates Inc. talked about shale gas, with particular attention to the Marcellus Shale, which represents 50 percent of U.S. shale gas reserves. Greg explained what shale gas is, why it is important now, public concerns and implications for Canadian chemistry, particularly Sarnia, which has the infrastructure available to take advantage of the feedstock (Appendix 5). He noted that companies are turning to unconventional sources of gas because conventional sources are drying up. New technology—horizontal drilling and multi-stage hydraulic fracturing (“fracking”)—have unleashed a boom in shale gas.

In concluding his presentation, Greg quoted a Talisman spokesman: “Shale gas is a game changer because there is so much of it; the challenge is how to use it effectively and responsibly.”

A Panel member remarked that shale gas is “madness” from a fossil fuel standpoint. The impact will be worse than coal. On sensible precautionary terms it is very bad news. That said, shale gas exploitation is happening. Should Responsible Care have a role in insisting on disclosure and the least harmful way of doing fracking? And shouldn’t the sources of feedstock be judged in environmental terms?

It was generally agreed that the genie is out of the bottle, but that there a role for an ethical approach to the exploitation of shale gas. One Panel member, for example, called for a life cycle analysis. A second Panel member wondered where the Environmental Assessment Process fits into this evolution of drilling technology. Another said that Canada has an opportunity to do it right—given that it will be done. John Vincett heard

the Panel saying that shale gas represents an amazing opportunity, but there is a lot of skepticism regarding industry behaviour. So far, says the Panel, industry has not shown a lot of responsibility. It sounds like the Panel is running up a large red flag.

A Panelist remarked that the genie may be out of the bottle but that does not mean we have to use every drop of gas. We can take a decision as a society to leave some material in the ground.

Additional Panel thoughts:

- Where does the contaminated water go? I'm not entirely sure that companies are not making a buck by leaving a mess in somebody else's back yard.
- We have very little experience in terms of what happens with deep exploration.
- It uses a lot of process water. I don't think CIAC wants to be caught up in it.
- Industry has been very quick to try to find a piece of the action, but there has been little or no communication with the public.
- If trust is an issue, the fact that this has been done in stealth does not bode well.
- CIAC can get information out. If companies rush into shale gas exploitation without talking to public it will mean no credibility for them.
- Is seawater an option rather than groundwater?
- Is shale gas suitable for transportation? (Greg noted that industry is asking: why not use it as car fuel? A Panel member remarked that there is great potential for car fuel, but companies want government to support transportation. Another Panelist remarked that, if shale gas makes fuel for cars, would that represent an opportunity for a carbon tax.)

Bob Masterson suggested that it might be useful to have a company who is extracting shale gas to come and talk to the Panel.

Agenda Item 10: Panel News

This was Jim Wakefield's last Panel meeting. Jim said it was an honour and a privilege to have served on the Panel, and he found it a very rewarding experience. "The chemical sector opened up a whole new world for me, and I thoroughly enjoyed this group," he said. John Vincett and the Panel thanked Jim for his years of effort on the Panel and wished him well in his future endeavours.

Bruce Walker distributed copies of a STOP newsletter that mentions his participation on the National Advisory Panel and his activities in Sarnia last fall.

Keith Purves mentioned a synergy conference recently held in the northeast region of Alberta to try to pool resources. Life in the Heartland brought together the Northeast Capital Industrial Association, Northeast Region CAER (Community Awareness Emergency Response), Alberta's Industrial Heartland Association, Land Trust Society, and Fort Air Partnership. Keith is a member of the Fort Air Partnership. A representative

of each association made a short presentation about their work. This is a good example of agencies getting together and answering people's questions.

John Vincett announced two new Panel members who will be joining us in 2012: Nadine Gudz, Director of Interface FLOR Canada in Toronto, and Michelle Adams, Director, Eco-Efficiency Centre, School for Resource and Environmental Studies at Dalhousie University in Halifax. He is also working on getting a representative of Wal-Mart to join the Panel.

John thanked Panel members for an excellent meeting.

Next Meeting
Ottawa, Ontario
October 18, 2011 – 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.
October 19, 2011 – CIAC Annual General Meeting