For A/Chief GSS: not certain which GSS unit head is responsible for addressing s.15 cases emanating from the NEB.

Cheers,
NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD:
POTENTIAL THREATS TO INFORMATION AND OPERATIONS

KEY ASSESSMENTS
CAVEAT

This report is issued under the authority of the Director, Canadian Security Intelligence Service. It is provided for the information of the recipient and colleagues of the recipient's department or agency who have the appropriate security clearance and may benefit from knowledge of its contents.

This report may be paraphrased and used in internal departmental or agency correspondence. Neither the report nor any of its contents should be disseminated outside the recipient's department or agency without prior consultation with CSIS. The Director, CSIS, should be informed of any action taken by a department or agency based on its contents.

This document constitutes a record which may be subject to mandatory exemption under the Access to Information Act or Privacy Act. The information or intelligence may also be protected by the provisions of the Canada Evidence Act. The information or intelligence must not be disclosed or used as evidence without prior consultation with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service.
MANDATE

1. This assessment has been prepared by the Intelligence Assessments Branch (IAB) of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) for the National Energy Board (NEB). The scope of this report is limited to a strategic assessment of current national security threats, within the context of CSIS's legislated mandate, which may be pertinent to the department.

2. The Service has reviewed classified and open-source reporting in addition to recent intelligence assessments relating to... to identify and assess relevant threat information. This assessment is current as of July 2012. (C)
ANNEX II

ADVANCED PERSISTENT THREATS

1. The Canadian Cyber Incident Response Centre (CCIRC) has produced a publication related to mitigation of Advanced Persistent Threats. The annex in its entirety is UNCLASSIFIED and is available on the Public Safety Canada website at:
   (U)
I was contacted last week by a former mid-manager at NRCan here in Ottawa, Rick Garber, who is now (I believe) the Security Manager and D/DSD for the NEB in Calgary (a federal department which happens to be based in The West). Rick is organizing a visit for his ADM and himself to Ottawa in mid-2012 to attend one of the Service's semi-annual classified briefings for the energy sector (coordinated by IAB I believe). While in Ottawa, NEB are interested in setting up a half-day of briefings for the ADM and D/DSD on at least the following issues (details which I could not obtain as we were on an open line):

Cheers and thanks,
Ms. Amy Cruickshank  
Royal Canadian Mounted Police  
Access to Information and Privacy Branch  
73 Leikin Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2  

Dear Ms. Cruickshank:  

This refers to your consultation letter of August 8, 2012 together with attachments, requesting recommendations for exemption under the Access to Information Act pursuant to a request for “RCMP materials and/or investigation into people or organizations opposed to the Northern Gateway Pipeline project. Memos, emails, reviews and reports, not excluding other materials, that will details RCMP investigations into organizations etc”

We recommend that the information highlighted in PINK in the attached records be exempted in order that we may address any media issues, a copy of these documents as released to the applicant would be appreciated.

It is CSIS practice not to enter section numbers for exemptions next to the deleted portions on pages released to the applicant. Therefore, for national security reasons, please ensure that this section number is not included on any of the released documents.

Should you disagree with our recommended exemptions, please advise us to that effect prior to the release of these documents.

I would also be grateful if your staff contacted [redacted] with the date on which you expect to release this material to the applicant.

Thank you for consulting with us on this matter.

Yours truly,

Coordinator  
Access to Information and Privacy  

Attachments
FACSIMILE MESSAGE
ENVOI D'UN MESSAGE
PAR TELECOPIEUR

TO
Assistant Commissioner Michaud
K Division CROPs
HQ

FOR YOUR INFO
C/Supt Barry Clark - E Division Northern District
C/Supt Pierre Parent - By Hand

ASSISTANT
Assistant Commissioner Michaud

SUBJECT
Enbridge Northern Gateway Pipeline Project

COMMENTS
National Security Criminal Intelligence (NSCI) hosted a working group meeting on 2010-08-06 at HQ.

In attendance:

K Division - C/Supt. Dan Kilham, Insp. Cleman Imgrund, Ms. Alexandra Espinosa
E Division - Insp. Ray Fast, Ms. Sofia Manolias
Criminal Intelligence - Sgt. Martin Bedard, Ms. Catherine Greenley
NSCI - Ms. Wendy Nicoll, Mr. Tim O'Neill

The objective of the meeting was to discuss the Enbridge Northern Gateway Pipeline Project, which if approved will see the building of a twinned petroleum pipeline to run from Edmonton District to Kitimat, BC.
The financial benefits of the pipeline to the Canadian (including the Alberta and BC) economies are well documented, as are the benefits to the US and possibly Asian energy markets.

Equally, there are many who oppose the construction of the pipeline and it is assessed that criminal activity will be experienced during the regulatory hearings, and subsequently if construction is approved.

Discussion:

Currently this Project is within the National Energy Board (NEB) review process, which includes NEB public hearings being conducted along the proposed corridor. The results of the NEB review will be provided to the Federal government, which has the final authority to authorize the construction of the pipeline.

There are many factors that must be considered prior to and subsequent to the final ruling.

The approval, construction, operation and maintenance of the pipeline will be completed in accordance with strictly enforced federal government regulations which will include consideration for the health and safety of Canadians, Aboriginal concerns as well as the safety of the natural environment.

There is wide support for the building of the pipeline from: the trade unions whose members will be employed, the companies that will provide the pipe for the pipeline, the support/service industries that will be used during the construction, as well as the many spin off jobs that will be created during the construction of the pipeline as well as the legacy jobs that will be created to maintain the pipeline during the life of the pipeline.

There are also many opponents of the pipeline project including those associated to: Aboriginal sovereignty concerns, a variety of environmental awareness groups and others who may be impacted during the construction and the subsequent life of the pipeline.

The Federal government's decision to either accept or reject Enbridge's proposal will not be provided within the near future, and will only be the start of the next - and lengthy - phase in the actual construction.

There is the possibility that there will be civil unrest and criminal occurrences during the NEB consultation process.

The spillage of oil associated to the Enbridge pipeline rupture in Michigan has provided opponents with added incentive to protest their oral, written and physical opposition to the Project.

There is the possibility that Enbridge's property may be subjected to vandalism and other forms of criminal activism during the NEB consultation process.

If Enbridge's proposal is approved by the Federal government, the many opponents of the Pipeline will likely utilize the courts to prevent the construction of the pipeline, resulting in many years of delay.

If Enbridge's proposal meets with success through both the regulatory and the court system, the years of pipeline construction will likely include many occurrences of civil and criminal unrest.
Recommendations:

It was agreed that:

The RCMP ("E", "K" and HQ), CSIS [redacted] collaborate in the production of classified and unclassified intelligence products for the benefit of the RCMP and other law-enforcement agencies; other federal and provincial departments, related stakeholders and not exclusively: Natural Resources Canada, Environment Canada, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Indians and Northern Affairs Canada, National Energy Board, Transport Canada, National Energy Board, Enbridge and other energy sector stakeholders.

As and if required, other stakeholders will be solicited for assistance in the production of the intelligence products.

RCMP communication between "E" and "K" Division and HQ will be completed through the Divisional CROPS and Critical Infrastructure Criminal Intelligence (National Security Criminal Investigations).

"K" Division suggests that consideration be given to a JIG being developed for this initiative.

RCMP initiatives will be initiated between "E" & "K" Divisions and HQ through Divisional CROPS and CICI. Information and intelligence sharing will be conducted directly between the HQ and Divisional CICI analysts. "E" and "K" Division CROPS will determine the appropriate reporting mechanism for the exchange of intelligence and information between EINSET and Calgary NSES and the detachments.

Divisional CROPS will ensure information and intelligence generated at the detachment level is provided to EINSET and/or Calgary NSES to assist in the development of the intelligence products.

"E" Division recommends that North District identify a dedicated resource to be the Northern Gateway Pipeline coordinator for the region. This resource would be responsible to coordinate the exchange of intelligence and information between the detachments and EINSET. This will ensure that incidents occurring in the North District are systematically reported. Each detachment would identify one member to be the equivalent of a Counter Terrorism Information Officer (CTIO) who would serve as a point of contact. EINSET with the assistance of CICI will develop a training and awareness program for these members. The CTIOs will be responsible to provide detachment members with intelligence and information from a national security and critical infrastructure protection perspective.

Passage of intelligence products to the detachments will be coordinated through the CROPS and the DIO.

Mr. Tim O’Neill will be the NSCI contact. You are welcome to contact him directly for additional information or clarification.

Regards

Gilles Michaud,
Assistant Commissioner
National Security Criminal Investigations
AUG 8  2012

Ms. [Name]
ATIP Coordinator
Canadian Security Intelligence Service
PO Box 9732. Station “T”
Ottawa ON K1G 4G4

Dear [Name],

Re: RCMP materials and/or investigation into people or organizations opposed to the Northern Gateway Pipeline project. Memos, emails, reviews and reports, not excluding other materials, that will detail RCMP investigations into organizations etc.

Access to Information Act

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police are processing a request under the Access to Information Act for information relating to the above noted subject. In reviewing the relevant records, we found 3 pages of correspondence which was either provided to the RCMP by your Department or may be of greater interest to your Department.

I would appreciate your recommendations with respect to the disclosure or protection of this information. Should you wish to deny access to any portion, please indicate the appropriate section of the Act and provide rationale. In order to meet our legislative diary date, a reply by August 28, 2012, would be appreciated.

Should you wish clarification on any matter concerning this request, contact the undersigned at 613-843-6843 or by writing at amy.cruickshank@rcmp-grc.gc.ca or to the address below. For ease of reference, please quote the file number appearing on this letter.

Yours truly,

Ms. Amy Cruickshank
Access to Information and Privacy Branch
Mailstop 061
73 Leikin Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0R2

Attach.
TO:  
Head:  
BC REGION (BCR)  

FROM:  
Intelligence Officer  
BC REGION  

FILE:  

RECORD OF MEETING  
PERSON(S) ATTENDING:  

SECRET
DATE & PLACE OF MEETING:
RCMP North Detachment
4020 Fifth Avenue
Prince George, BC

PERSONNEL ATTENDING:

ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS:

1) On 2012 06 05, attended the Counter Terrorism Information Officer (CTIO) Workshop held in Prince George from 2012 06 05 to 2012 06 07. also provided a presentation on the role and mandate of the Service. During the presentation, touched upon issues regarding information sharing and the appropriate mechanisms for disclosure.

TOPICS DISCUSSED:

2) The CTIO course covered the following topics:
a. Overview of Federal Government Anti-Terrorism Plan and National Security Criminal Investigations
b. Critical Infrastructure – Types, Their Importance / SIR program
c. National Security Criminal Investigation / Critical Infrastructure
d. National Energy Board – Role and Mandate
e. CSIS – Role and Mandate
f. Overcoming Stereotypes and sharing information

h. Phenomenon of Terrorism, Origins of Contemporary Terrorism, Motivations and Justifications of Terrorists
i. Group profiles: Al QAEDA

j. Tactics Used by Terrorists / Criminal Extremists

l. Internet & Terrorism

n. Radicalization

o. Terrorist Event Pre Planning Indicators

OPERATIONAL COMMENTS:
TAB 9
Recently Minister Oliver wrote the following:

Unfortunately, there are environmental and other radical groups that would seek to block this opportunity to diversify our trade. Their goal is to stop any major project no matter what the cost to Canadian families in lost jobs and economic growth. No forestry. No mining. No oil. No gas. No more hydro-electric dams.

These groups threaten to hijack our regulatory system to achieve their radical ideological agenda. They seek to exploit any loophole they can find, stacking public hearings with bodies to ensure that delays kill good projects. They use funding from foreign special interest groups to undermine Canada’s national economic interest.

They attract jet-setting celebrities with some of the largest personal carbon footprints in the world to lecture Canadians not to develop our natural resources. Finally, if all other avenues have failed, they will take a quintessential American approach: sue everyone and anyone to delay the project even further.

They do this because they know it can work. It works because it helps them to achieve their ultimate objective: delay a project to the point it becomes economically unviable.

Anyone looking at the record of approvals for certain major projects across Canada cannot help but come to the conclusion that many of these projects have been delayed too long. In many cases, these projects would create thousands upon thousands of jobs for Canadians, yet they can take years to get started due to the slow, complex and cumbersome federal Government approval process.

For example, the Mackenzie Valley Gas Pipeline review took more than nine years to complete. In comparison, the western expansion of the nation-building Canadian Pacific Railway under Sir John A. Macdonald took four years. Under our current system, building a temporary ice arena on a frozen pond in Banff required the approval of the federal government.
This delayed a decision by two months. Two valuable months to assess something that thousands of Canadians have been doing for over a century.

Our regulatory system must be fair, independent, consider different viewpoints including those of Aboriginal communities, review the evidence dispassionately and then make an objective determination. It must be based on science and the facts.

We believe reviews for major projects can be accomplished in a quicker and more streamlined fashion. We do not want projects that are safe, generate thousands of new jobs and open up new export markets, to die in the approval phase due to unnecessary delays.

Unfortunately, the system seems to have lost sight of this balance over the past years. It is broken. It is time to take a look at it.

I have attached three recently articles on this issue. one by Ezra Levant, where he writes:

San Francisco’s Moore Foundation has poured more than $9 million to Aboriginal groups on the north coast of B.C. to oppose resource development. Their Canadian lobby group, Ecotrust, will testify to Leggett also. According to research by Vivian Krause, the U.S. Tides Foundation and their Canadian affiliate have poured millions of dollars into 38 cookie-cutter groups to oppose Canadian resource industries. They all sound so local and real -- the Dogwood Initiative, the Rainforest Action Network, the Natural Resources Defence Council, etc. But they’re just tentacles of the same foreign foundation.

Radical groups’ spur Tories to speed pipeline review process
john ibbitson
OTTAWA- From Monday’s Globe and Mail
Published Monday, Jan. 09, 2012 4:00AM EST
The Conservative government will bring forward new rules to greatly shorten environmental reviews of pipelines and other major projects, arguing that “radical groups” are exploiting the reviews to block proposals vital to Canada’s economic future.

On the eve of hearings into the proposed Northern Gateway oil pipeline from Alberta to the Pacific coast, Natural Resources Minister Joe Oliver released a strongly-worded open letter Monday condemning some opponents of the pipeline. A copy of the letter was provided in advance to The Globe and Mail.

More related to this story
Oil-sands pipeline hits its highest hurdle
An open letter from Natural Resources Minister Joe Oliver
"Foreign money" could gum up pipeline approval, Harper warns

Infographic
How the Northern Gateway pipeline intersects with B.C.'s First Nations

Video
Harper concerned about Gateway pipeline hearings

The letter warns of "environmental and other radical groups" including "jet-setting celebrities" funded by foreign special interest groups who "threaten to hijack our regulatory system to achieve their radical ideological ends."

They system "is broken," Mr. Oliver concludes in the letter. "It's time to take a look at it."

In an interview Sunday, the minister said his department is examining the existing rules around the environmental review process to prevent the same objections from being made repeatedly by different people or groups.

"What we are looking at is providing definitive timelines from start to finish on the regulatory process," said Mr. Oliver.

"The objective should be that these reviews would no longer go on for many, many years. They would have a definitive timeline that would provide certainty to the participants who are sponsoring the project."

Such changes could not be easily or quickly imposed. "There may be a need for legislation," Mr. Oliver acknowledged, though he couldn't say when such legislation would be introduced.

The minister would not comment on whether the legislation could affect the environmental review of the Gateway itself.

On Friday, Prime Minister Stephen Harper himself warned of "the use of foreign money to really overload the public consultation phase" of the pipeline review, promising his government "will be taking a close look" to ensure "our regulatory processes are effective and deliver decisions in a reasonable amount of time."

Environmentalists as well as agricultural interests and both state and federal politicians succeeded in forcing the Obama administration to delay a decision on the proposed Keystone XL pipeline from Alberta to the southern United States.

Partly in response to that delay, the Harper government is determined to open the market for Alberta oil to China and other Asian markets. The Conservatives see the Northern Gateway pipeline as essential to that goal.

But it isn't outside interests who are raising the greatest objection to the project. Canadian environmental and aboriginal groups are also strongly opposed, claiming that spills from the pipeline and from ships
carrying the oil from B.C. could wreak enormous environmental damage to fish and wildlife.

The Conservatives say they are not looking for laxer regulations, just quicker decisions. They tout the work of the Major Projects Management Office, a committee of deputy ministers they created that meets regularly to cut through the regulatory red tape on major projects.

The government claims that this has reduced the regulatory approvals process for many projects from four years to 22 months.

The Warning
An open letter from Natural Resources Minister Joe Oliver
From Monday's Globe and Mail
Published Monday, Jan. 09, 2012 4:00AM EST
Last updated Monday, Jan. 09, 2012 7:47AM EST
10 comments Email Print/License Decrease text size
Increase text size Canada is on the edge of an historic choice: to diversify our energy markets away from our traditional trading partner in the United States or to continue with the status quo.

Virtually all our energy exports go to the US. As a country, we must seek new markets for our products and services and the booming Asia-Pacific economies have shown great interest in our oil, gas, metals and minerals.

More related to this story
• 'Radical groups' spur Tories to speed pipeline review process
• 'Foreign money' could gum up pipeline approval, Harper warns
• Nearly half B.C. residents support Northern Gateway: poll

Video
Harper concerned about Gateway pipeline hearings For our government, the choice is clear: we need to diversify our markets in order to create jobs and economic growth for Canadians across this country. We must expand our trade with the fast growing Asian economies.

We know that increasing trade will help ensure the financial security of Canadians and their families.

Unfortunately, there are environmental and other radical groups that would seek to block this opportunity to diversify our trade. Their goal is to stop any major project no matter what the cost to Canadian families in lost jobs and economic growth.

No forestry. No mining. No oil. No gas. No more hydro-electric dams.

These groups threaten to hijack our regulatory system to achieve their radical ideological agenda. They seek to exploit any loophole they can find, stacking public hearings with bodies to ensure that delays kill good projects. They use funding from foreign special interest groups to undermine Canada’s national economic interest.
They attract jet-setting celebrities with some of the largest personal carbon footprints in the world to lecture Canadians not to develop our natural resources. Finally, if all other avenues have failed, they will take a quintessential American approach: sue everyone and anyone to delay the project even further.

They do this because they know it can work. It works because it helps them to achieve their ultimate objective: delay a project to the point it becomes economically unviable.

Anyone looking at the record of approvals for certain major projects across Canada cannot help but come to the conclusion that many of these projects have been delayed too long. In many cases, these projects would create thousands upon thousands of jobs for Canadians, yet they can take years to get started due to the slow, complex and cumbersome federal Government approval process.

For example, the Mackenzie Valley Gas Pipeline review took more than nine years to complete. In comparison, the western expansion of the nation-building Canadian Pacific Railway under Sir John A. Macdonald took four years. Under our current system, building a temporary ice arena on a frozen pond in Banff required the approval of the federal government. This delayed a decision by two months. Two valuable months to assess something that thousands of Canadians have been doing for over a century.

Our regulatory system must be fair, independent, consider different viewpoints including those of Aboriginal communities, review the evidence dispassionately and then make an objective determination. It must be based on science and the facts.

We believe reviews for major projects can be accomplished in a quicker and more streamlined fashion. We do not want projects that are safe, generate thousands of new jobs and open up new export markets, to die in the approval phase due to unnecessary delays.

Unfortunately, the system seems to have lost sight of this balance over the past years. It is broken. It is time to take a look at it.

It is an urgent matter of Canada's national interest.

'Foreign money' could gum up pipeline approval, Harper warns

OTTAWA—Globe and Mail Update

Posted on Friday, January 6, 2012 4:32PM EST

1466 comments Email Print/License Decrease text size Increase text size

The Prime Minister is threatening to prevent foreign environmental interests from delaying the approval of a pipeline that would take bitumen from the Alberta oil sands to the West Coast for shipment to Asian markets.

The petroleum lobby group EthicalOil.org, which wants "foreigners and foreign groups" to be excluded from hearings on the proposed Northern
Gateway pipeline that are to begin next week, appears to have a sympathetic ear in Stephen Harper.

More related to this story
• China’s oil-sands deal will have lasting impact
• Of Beijing, bitumen and Ottawa’s foreign-takeover review
• Canada ‘very serious’ about selling its oil to China, Harper says

Video
Harper concerned about Gateway pipeline hearings
Video
Enbridge pipeline could face uphill battle
Infographic
Map of the Northern Gateway pipeline "Growing concern has been expressed to me about the use of foreign money to really overload the public consultation phase of regulatory hearings just for the purpose of slowing down the process," the Prime Minister told reporters Friday in Edmonton.

"This is something that is not good for the Canadian economy and the government of Canada will be taking a close look at how we can ensure that our regulatory processes are effective and deliver decisions in a reasonable amount of time."

On Thursday, Kathryn Marshall, a spokesperson for EthicalOil.org, said Canadians have much at stake in the construction of the pipeline and "must take a stand against foreigners and their lobbying groups interfering in our decision."

The group says the organizations registered to give testimony at the pipeline hearings include companies owned by foreign interests including Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez’s oil company, CITGO.

Mr. Harper said the government would not interfere in the regulatory process.

But, particularly in light of decisions made in the United States, where the construction of TransCanada’s Keystone XL pipeline has been threatened by the lobbying of environmentalists, Mr. Harper said his government is clear about the necessity for broadening Canada’s markets for energy products.

"I think it is particularly essential for this country that, over time, we have the capacity to sell our energy products into the growing markets of Asia," he said.

"We want to ensure in Canada that we have a regulator system that protects our environment and obviously protects worker safety and various other community interests," Mr. Harper said. "At the same time, though, we have to have processes in Canada that come to a decision in a reasonable amount of time and processes that cannot be hijacked."

Mike Hudema, a climate and energy campaigner for Greenpeace Canada, said it is refreshing to know that environmentalists, community groups, indigenous groups and average people concerned about health, water, land
and a global climate crisis can both worry and stop the largest, dirtiest, multinational oil companies.

"Tar sands companies with multimillion dollar public relations budgets backed by a government that takes its talking points from a former tobacco lobbyist are feeling the pain of the toxic truth about what they are doing to the planet," said Mr. Hudema. "It is time for the Harper government to pull its head out of the tar sands and look at who the true climate criminals are."

The Prime Minister was also asked about a proposal by Alberta Premier Alison Redford to create a national energy strategy that would pull together Alberta's oil sands, the hydro power of British Columbia, offshore oil in the Atlantic and Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty's green-energy agenda.

Mr. Harper said he has been broached by Ms. Redford about the idea and is anticipating a meeting in the near future with Alberta and with several other provinces to get more details.

"The approach of the federal government for some years has been to have an energy sector that is primarily driven by market demand," the Prime Minister said. "That policy I think generally has served this part of the country and served the country as a whole quite well."

The Conservative government has made it clear it considers the oil sands to be critical to Canada's economic growth and job creation.

On Friday, Statistics Canada said 17,500 new jobs were created in this country in December.

Mr. Harper said that was good news as were the job numbers from the United States where 200,000 more people were working last month than in November.

"This has been one of the things that has been lacking over the past couple of years," he said. "We have seen 600,000 net new jobs created in Canada, but we haven't been seeing the kind of job growth we need in the United States to help with our trade."
Illustration:  photo by Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

Website Pipeline review panel chair Sheila Leggett, centre, toured parts of the proposed project route, along with other board members, above, by helicopter in late September and early October.

Who should decide whether Canada should build an oil pipeline to our west coast -- Canadian citizens or foreign interests?

That's what the fight over the Northern Gateway pipeline is about. Sure, it's also about $20 billion a year for the Canadian economy and thousands of jobs. It's about opening up export markets in Asia. It's about enough new tax dollars to pay for countless hospitals and schools.

But it's really about Canadian sovereignty. Do we get to make our own national decisions, or will we let foreign interests interfere?

The answer should be obvious to any self-respecting Canadian: This is a Canadian matter, and Canadians should decide it. Unlike the proposed Keystone XL pipeline that would have crossed into the U.S., we don't need another country's permission. It's all Canada.

The federal government's review panel begins public hearings this week.

But the bureaucrat in charge, Sheila Leggett, has done something bizarre: She opened up the hearings to foreign citizens, foreign lobbyists and even foreign governments.

Here's what Leggett says on her website: "Our job is to make sure that everyone who wants to talk to us about this project has an opportunity to be heard," she says. "We'll take whatever time it takes to ensure that everybody's views are heard."

The world's Canada-bashers laughed, then signed up to testify. Almost 5,000 of them. Including Hugo Chavez's state-owned oil company, CITGO. Including foreigners from Uruguay to Louisiana to Italy to Austria. Then something really crazy happened. To ensure all those foreigners have time to talk, Leggett announced she was adding an extra year to her review.

Instead of telling foreigners to butt out, Leggett told Canadian workers to learn on their shovels while she listens to people who don't live here, work here or have any connection here.

It's not just foreigners. A classroom of children from Tahayghen Elementary School signed up. Maybe Leggett will build in nap time and snack time to her hearings.

Captain Jack Sparrow has signed up. Seriously. So has "Cave Man." And 20 different people, all with the same e-mail address: sawyer@hayduke.ca.

John Stevenson signed up under his own name. Then he signed up again as J. Stevenson. Same address. And on and on.

It's a circus. But the biggest threat isn't the clowns. It's the well-paid foreign professional lobbyists who used Leggett's weakness to take over the process.

Like the New York-based Rockefeller Foundation. They've hired the West Coast Environmental Law Foundation to "prevent the development of a pipeline and tanker port" in B.C.

That lobby group took $200,000 to do the Rockefellers' bidding. They're signed up to speak at the hearings.

COOKIE-CUTTER GROUPS

San Francisco's Moore Foundation has poured in more than $9 million to Aboriginal groups on the north coast of B.C. to oppose resource development.

Their Canadian lobby group, EcoTrust, will testify to Leggett also.
According to research by Vivian Krause, the U.S. Tides Foundation and their Canadian affiliate have poured millions of dollars into 36 cookie-cutter groups to oppose Canadian resource industries. They all sound so local and real -- the Dogwood Initiative, the Rainforest Action Network, the Natural Resources Defence Council, etc. But they're just tentacles of the same foreign foundation. I don't blame foreign billionaires like the Rockefellers. It's normal for them to want to control other people, even other countries.

CANADIAN PUPPETS
I blame their Canadian puppets for taking money to undermine their own country's interests.

One group, the Pembina Institute, was recently caught soliciting money from a foreign embassy to fight against Canada (they got $60,000). On Friday, Stephen Harper warned that the pipeline review "cannot be hijacked (by) foreign money to really overload the public consultation phase of the regulatory hearings, just for the purpose of slowing down the process." So who's going to win? Foreign billionaires? Or Canada?

The prime minister has now taken sides publicly. It will be fascinating to see if Leggett listens to him -- or to Hugo Chavez and the Rockefellers instead.

Supplier: SunMedia
CSIS comment:

Your comments are essential to ensure the relevance of CSIS Intelligence Reports being provided to your department/agency.
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OPS-702-1 PROCEDURES - HUMAN SOURCES - CASE MANAGEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

Scope

1.1 These procedures outline the considerations, approval authorities and reporting requirements related to the validation, recruitment and management of a human source.

Definitions

1.2 For definitions of specific terms used in procedures, refer to "Glossary of Terms and Definitions".

Temporary Authority

1.3 Unless otherwise specified, when a specific position or title is mentioned in procedures, the authorities and responsibilities bestowed on that position or title apply to any employee performing the duties of the position or title in an acting capacity.

Delegation of Authority

1.4 Where identified in procedures, the term "or designate" denotes the option to delegate an authority to an assigned individual or position.

1.4.1 Notwithstanding any delegation of authority contained within these procedures, any issue that is likely to cause embarrassment or controversy for the Government of Canada (GoC) overrides the delegated authority and must be immediately reported to the appropriate Service Executives via Human Sources and Operations Security (HSOS).

2. VALIDATION PROCESS

2.1 The validation process comprises an assessment of:

a) the information provided by a human source;

b) any other information provided by a human source;

c) a human source's access to relevant information;

d) and

e) and

f) and

New publication
Corroboration of Reported Information

2.7 An employee can corroborate a human source's reporting by either confirming and/or substantiating the information.

2.8 Notwithstanding a human source's and reporting history, an employee qualifies the reported information as to its accuracy as part of the human source validation process.

2.9

2.10

Reporting History
For additional information and guidance on the refer to OPS-702-3, "Procedures - Human Sources - Case Management - Source Evaluation" and for the refer to OPS-702-4, "Procedures - Human Sources - Case Management".

For additional information and guidance on the human source précis refer to OPS-702-8, "Procedures - Human Sources - Case Management - Human Source Précis".
For additional information and guidance on the human source precis, refer to OPS-702-8, "Procedures - Human Sources - Case Management - Human Source Precis".

3. RECRUITMENT APPROACH

3.1 Employees should be familiar with the provisions of section 4 of OPS-702, "Human Sources - Case Management" and OPS-703, "Human Sources - Special Provisions" prior to making a recruitment approach.

Approval Authorities

3.2 The approval authorities identified in OPS-703-L, "Procedures - Human Sources - Special Provisions", the Regional Director General (RDG) approves a recruitment approach to an individual when there is a potential that a recruitment approach may have adverse impact.

3.3 When there is a potential that a recruitment approach may have adverse impact, the Director will notify the Minister as per paragraph 2.2 of OPS-701, "Human Sources - Human Source Program".

4. Approval Authorities

4.1 Approval Authorities should be familiar with the provisions of paragraph 6.3 of OPS-702, "Human Sources - Case Management" and section 6 of OPS-706, "Human Sources" prior to seeking approval to provide a human source.

5. Approval Authorities

5.1 Approval Authorities should be familiar with the provisions of section 6 of OPS-702, "Human Sources - Case Management" prior to directing a human source to participate in activities.

New publication
5.2 The RDG approves directing a human source to participate in activities.
Reporting Requirements

5.3 [Redacted] which condition(s) of paragraph 6.5 of OPS-702, "Human Sources - Case Management" apply.

6.  

6.1 [Redacted] should be familiar with the provisions of section 6 of OPS-702, "Human Sources - Case Management" prior to seeking approval for an operation [Redacted].

Approval Authorities

6.2 [Redacted]

7.  SAFETY

7.1 A [Redacted] believes that a human source's safety and/or security is at risk should advise his/her supervisor [Redacted] immediately [Redacted].

7.2 [Redacted]

7.3 [Redacted]

7.4 [Redacted]

8. [Redacted]

New publication
8.1

8.2

Approval Authorities

9.1 Employees should be familiar with the provisions of section 10 of OPS-702, "Human Sources - Case Management" and OPS-707, "Human Sources - Compensation" prior to conducting an

9.2

9.3 The can provide an payment during the . Refer to OPS-707, "Human Sources - Compensation" for guidance on payments.

9.4
Disclosure of Assistance

9.5 HSOS employee should ask the human source whether he/she wishes his/her identity to be protected in perpetuity or accept that it may be revealed after the 125-year retention period.

Approval Authorities

9.7

9.8

Reporting Requirements

9.9

9.10
10. should be familiar with the provisions of section 11 of OPS-702, "Human Sources - Case Management" and OPS-704, "Human Sources - Conduct prior to..."

10.2 as outlined in section 3 of OPS-704, "Human Sources - Conduct..."

10.3 Approval Authorities

10.4

10.5

10.6 Reporting Requirements

OPS-703, "Human Sources - Special Provisions".

11. HUMAN SOURCE LITIGATION

11.1 All litigation matters involving human sources must be brought to the attention of the DG HSOS...
as soon as possible.

Approval Authorities

11.2 The DG HSOS approves all human source
RECORD OF MEETING

PERSON(S) ATTENDING:

Conference of approximately 100 representatives of Energy Sector Stakeholders. The main contacts pertinent to the meeting included:

Adriana POLOZ, RCMP Criminal Intelligence

Please refer to [redacted] for further contact information.

DATE & PLACE OF MEETING:

 Classified Briefing for Energy Sector Stakeholders. Reception on 2010 05 11 at the Chateau Laurier, Ottawa. Conference at CSIS HQ, 1941 Ogilvie, Road, Ottawa, ON, 2010 05 12.

PERSONNEL ATTENDING:

[redacted]

TOPICS DISCUSSED:

The following presentations were given:

[redacted]
- RCMP Suspicious Incident Reporting (SIR) update. Presentation by Irene LAMERE and Wendy NICOL, RCMP.

- Debrief of Vancouver 2010 Olympic games. Presentation by Adriana POLOZ, RCMP.

- Electricity Infrastructure Protection During the 2010 Olympic Games. Presentation by Doug POWELL, BC Hydro.

- G8 / G20 updates. Presentation by [redacted], CSIS.

- World Energy Conference (WEC) update. The WEC will be held in Montreal from Sept 12 - 16. Presentation by Jean-Guy OUIMET, Hydro-Quebec.

This conference was an excellent networking opportunity for [redacted] and provided real insight into the security practices in the energy sector and avenues for cooperation between CSIS and energy infrastructure partners.

OPERATIONAL COMMENTS:

A request has been made for copies of the a/n presentations. Detailed information on issues pertinent to [redacted] desks will be forwarded when it is received.

ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS:

All attendees of this conference were cleared to SECRET and presentation material was up to that level. This was a CSIS conference and copies of the presentations should be made available.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 To state the principles and directives governing the approval process for an initial request, a renewal, an upgrade, a downgrade or a termination of a targeting level pursuant to the CSIS Act.

Scope

1.2 This policy and related procedures outline the principles, as well as the organizational and functional responsibilities, pertaining to targeting.

1.3 Procedures for the preparation of an Assessment Report to initiate, renew, modify, or terminate a targeting level are covered in OPS-100-1, “Procedures - Targeting - Requests for Approval”.

Policy Centre

1.4 The policy centre for this policy is the Targeting and Warrants Section (TWS) of the Deputy Director of Operations (DDO) Secretariat.

Authorities and References

1.5 CSIS Act
1.6 Anti-terrorism Act
1.7 Ministerial Direction - CSIS Operations (2008 10 29)
1.8 OPS-201, “Conduct of Operations - General”
1.9 OPS-209, “Warrant Acquisition - Section 12”
1.10 OPS-501, “Operational Reporting”
1.11 OPS-601 to OPS-603, “Authorized Disclosure of Operational Information and Intelligence”
1.12 CSIS Operational Message System (COMS) User Manual

Definitions

1.13 For definitions of specific terms used in this policy, readers should refer to OPS-700 “Glossary of Terms and Definitions”.

1.14 For the purpose of targeting policies and procedures, the term “targeting decision” refers to the final determination made by the approving authority of an Assessment Report requesting to initiate, renew, upgrade, downgrade or terminate a targeting level.
1.15 Unless otherwise specified, when a specific position or title is mentioned in this policy, the authorities and responsibilities bestowed on that position or title apply to any employee performing the duties of the position or title in an acting capacity.

2. POLICY STATEMENT

2.1 The Targeting Policy is established under the authority of the Director pursuant to subsection 6(1), CSIS Act, and directs the Service's targeting process.

2.2 Further to a Memorandum from Cabinet of national intelligence collection priorities the Minister of Public Safety issues a Ministerial Directive outlining general collection requirements. The DDO then provides a strategic directive to operationalize the Ministerial Directive.

2.3 Targeting will be governed by the following fundamental principles:
   a) the rule of law must be observed;
   b) the means must be proportional to the gravity and imminence of the threat;
   c) the greater the risk associated with a particular activity, the higher the authority required for approval; and
   d) with regard to the use of intrusive techniques:
      i) the need for their use must be weighed against possible damage to civil liberties and to Canadian fundamental institutions;
      ii) the least intrusive techniques must be used first, except in emergency situations or where less intrusive techniques would not be proportionate to the gravity and imminence of the threat; and
      iii) the level of authority required for approving their use must be commensurate with their intrusiveness and with any risks associated to using them.

2.4 Lawful advocacy, protest or dissent may not be investigated unless such activities are carried out in conjunction with threats as defined in section 2, CSIS Act.

2.5 When there is uncertainty concerning the lawfulness of an operation, technique or action, the issue must be referred to the appropriate Director General (DG) for direction.

2.6 When approving an Assessment Report, a Headquarters (HQ) DG or Regional Director General (RDG) must consider the intrusiveness of each technique allowed under the approved targeting level and may impose special restrictions if deemed appropriate considering the gravity and imminence of the threat.

2.7
3. RESPONSIBILITIES

Directors General

3.1 An HQ DG or RDG is responsible for:

a) approving a targeting decision;

b) ensuring targeting decisions are consistent with the Service’s mandate and policies, and current Government of Canada (GoC) intelligence requirements;

c) ensuring that consultation between Regions and the appropriate HQ Branch(es) has taken place on all targeting decisions;

d) assessing the intrusiveness of the techniques to be used to collect information and intelligence;

e) assessing the reliability of the information in an Assessment Report;

f) assessing the implications, magnitude, seriousness and immediacy of the activities suspected of constituting the threat; and

g) appointing a Targeting Coordinator.

Chief, Deputy Director Operations Secretariat

3.2 The Chief DDO Secretariat is responsible for:

a) providing the DDO, Assistant Director Operations (ADO), and the Assistant Director Legal Services, within five (5) working days from the date of approval, written confirmation of all targeting decisions pursuant to this policy;

b) updating the targeting database within three (3) working days from the receipt of a notification of a targeting decision from a Region or HQ Branch;

c) maintaining the targeting database including all active and inactive targets;

d) providing advice and guidance to the Targeting Coordinators in HQ and the Regions to ensure the consistent application of the targeting policy;

e) providing Security Screening Branch, on a regular basis, an updated list of targeting decisions;

f) maintaining statistical information and producing, on request, accounts of targeting decisions;

g) performing other administrative functions as directed by the DDO.
3.3 [Redacted]

3.4 The DDO is responsible for:
   a) managing the application of this policy and providing direction to resolve issues arising from its implementation; and
   b) ensuring that targeting decisions are consistent with the Service’s mandate and policies, and current GoC intelligence requirements.

Director

3.5 Only the Director can approve targeting pursuant to subsection 2(d), CSIS Act.

3.6 The Director is responsible for reporting to the Minister of Public Safety where:
   a) there is a well-founded risk of serious violence;
   b) there is a potential that a CSIS activity may have significant adverse impact on Canadian interests, such as:
      i) discrediting the Service or the Government of Canada;
      ii) giving rise to public controversy;
      iii) a clear risk to human life;
      iv) affecting domestic interdepartmental or intergovernmental relations;
      v) affecting Canadian relations with any country or international organization of states; and/or,
      vi) contravening any of the guidelines set out in the Ministerial Direction on CSIS Operations with respect to the management of the Service.

4. TARGETS OF THE SERVICE

4.1 Information from a foreign state or agency may be used when submitting an Assessment Report, taking into consideration the human rights record of that foreign state or agency and the specific circumstances under which the information was obtained.

Persons

4.2 A targeting level may be approved by an RDG or an HQ DG to collect information and intelligence on the activities of persons who may on reasonable grounds be suspected of constituting a threat to the security of Canada pursuant to s. 2, CSIS Act.
Groups and Organizations

4.3 A targeting level may be approved by an HQ DG to collect information and intelligence on the activities of a group of persons or an organization, including its general membership, where there are reasonable grounds to suspect:

a) the objectives or activities of the group or organization constitute a threat to the security of Canada pursuant to s. 2, CSIS Act; and

b) participants in the group or organization understand and sympathize with threat-related objectives or activities.

4.3.1 Collection of information and intelligence on a group of persons or an organization may be used to determine:

a) the elements, structure, policies or plans of the group or organization as they relate to threats to the security of Canada; and

b) a person’s relationship with, or role within, a group or organization.

4.4 Once a determination has been made that a member of a group or of an organization is involved in a threat-related activity and that further information and intelligence on that person is necessary, a separate targeting level on that person will be obtained.

Issues or Events

4.5 A targeting level may be approved to collect information and intelligence on the activities associated with an issue or event in relation to which the Service has reasonable grounds to suspect these activities constitute a threat to the security of Canada.

4.6 Once a determination has been made that a person, a group of persons, or an organization is involved in a threat-related activity associated to an issue or event, and that further information and intelligence on that person, group of persons or organization is necessary, a separate targeting level on that person, group of persons or organization will be obtained.

5. GENERAL AUTHORITY

5.1 The following activities do not require a targeting level and are exempt from this policy:

a) collecting incidental information which may be disclosed pursuant to subsection 19.2(a) to (d), CSIS Act;

b) collecting information pursuant to s. 15 and s. 16, CSIS Act;

c) conducting internal investigations pursuant to s. 8 and s. 20, CSIS Act;

d) 

e) 
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f) researching and using internal records and databanks;
g) researching and using open information;
h) accepting and reporting unsolicited information; and

i) placing individuals on watch lists, e.g. the Citizenship and Immigration Canada Enforcement Information Index (ElI).

5.1.1 Employees reporting unsolicited information are responsible for ensuring the information is reported on the appropriate file and retained in the appropriate database. It is also the employees' responsibility to assess the origin and reliability of the information and the need to report it if the information originates from a foreign organization with a poor human rights record (see OPS-501 "Operational Reporting").
8. COOPERATION WITH DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN AGENCIES

8.1 Collection of information and intelligence by the Service pursuant to s 12, CSIS Act, in cooperation with a Canadian federal, provincial or a territorial government department, a Canadian law enforcement authority, or a foreign police, security or intelligence organization, will only be undertaken when approved under the terms of this policy.

8.1.1 The collection of information and intelligence described above will be in compliance with all other Service policies.
1. INTRODUCTION

Scope

1.1 To provide guidance for the preparation and dissemination of an Assessment Report.

1.2 For authorities and responsibilities related to a specific targeting level, employees will refer to OPS-101, “Targeting Section 12 - Level 1” and OPS-102, “Targeting Section 12 - Level 2”.

Governing Policy

1.3 OPS-100, “Targeting - Section 12 CSIS Act”.

2. DIRECTIVES ON ASSESSMENT REPORT

2.1 Prior to completing an Assessment Report, employees will consult with their supervisor or targeting coordinator to ensure they use the current edition of [redacted].

2.1.1 Where there is some question as to the appropriate format for a request or the content required, supervisors, targeting coordinator and/or the policy centre should be consulted.

2.2 An Assessment Report provides a brief written review of the threat related activities of a person, group, issue or event, and assesses whether:

- the collection activities remain in compliance with Service policies.

2.3 An Assessment Report will be submitted:

2.3.1 Reporting file

2.4 Assessment Reports are not required for an initial request, for the renewal or for the termination of reporting files approved by a Headquarters (HQ) Director General (DG).

3. CONTENT

3.1 An Assessment Report should include:
3.2 All Assessment Reports should clearly separate and distinguish:
   a) facts;
   b) analyses and/or opinions; and
   c) the request or recommendation.

3.3 All factual information used to request a targeting level must be attributable to documented sources and contained in supporting documents retained.

3.4 If the activities suspected of constituting a threat are carried out in conjunction with lawful advocacy, protest or dissent, the circumstances must be fully explained in the Assessment Report.

4. PROCEDURE

4.1 When completing an Assessment Report, employees will use the appropriate template and will ensure that the information included in the applicable paragraphs is accurately reported.

4.2 Prior to forwarding the request, the employee must ensure that the Assessment Report accurately reflects the current position of each signing officer including acting positions.

4.3 The information submitted should include:
4.6 Requests for targeting a group or organization should include the following additional details:

Groups and Organizations

Issues or Events
5. DISSEMINATION

5.1
From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]

Date: 2005-07-06 5:42:38 PM
Subject: Fw: Re: MEETING WITH NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

In-absence....Tks**

Cheers and thanks,

I will PA the correspondence on [Redacted]

---

Classification: Secret
Not for PA / Ne pas Classer
Let us know.

Cheers.

I hope this help.
I don't have an immediate solution, but it is an interesting string on which to tug.

Please keep me informed.
Cheers.

Further to various correspondence regarding a request for assistance by the National Energy Board (NEB) located in Calgary, the
following is a summary of discussions with the NEB locally.

On 2005 05 16 I met with Leo Jansen and Jamie Kereluk (both of Operations Compliance) at the NEB office in Calgary. For the uninitiated, the NEB is an federal agency headquartered in Calgary (as opposed to Ottawa) which regulates the pipeline industry and energy development in Canada. They are responsible for compliance (and as of recently, security) issues when pipelines cross provincial or national boundaries, for hydroelectric issues when they cross international borders, etc. The purpose of our meeting was to discuss the roles and tasks of both the NEB and the Service (they were unfamiliar with details of our role) and establish contact locally. Both Jansen and Kereluk hold level II clearances.

The NEB, as a federal agency, is independent, but answers to Parliament through the Minister of Natural Resources (NRCan). Given that they are located in Calgary, the NEB often feel 'left out' of discussions with federal partners, yet feel a need to have some link into the federal security apparatus.

The NEB recently completed a study of critical infrastructure under their purview across Canada. They are now wondering what to do with the report given its classification (Confidential). I suggested they may wish to speak with PSEPC on the matter.

For our purposes, the NEB advised that they currently receive only unclassified ITAC reports (via PSEPC in Edmonton), and these through a secure fax in their Calgary office. They do not receive applicable Laser reporting or classified ITAC reports, and currently do not have any electronic means of receiving them (save the fax). Jansen requested that the Service consider a way in which Laser reporting could be provided to them and advised that they have secure facilities to store up to TS (I am not aware who completed the certification).

As the NEB is a federal agency with a specific security mandate, it is logical that they should be included in Laser dissemination when the reporting refers to threats to the energy sector. Given the potential difficulty of transmitting classified documents to them electronically at this time, Calgary District will undertake to provide hard copies locally if so directed by PR and HQ.

Cheers:

PS: Pardon the delay in filing this note as we were awaiting assignment of a file number.
From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Date: 2005-06-08 9:19:25 AM
Subject: Fwd: Re: MEETING WITH NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

Classification: Secret
Classification: Secret
Not for PA / Ne pas Classer

I will PA the correspondence on [redacted]

Classification: Secret
Classification: Secret
Not for PA / Ne pas Classer

Cheers,

Classification: Secret
Classification: Secret
Not for PA / Ne pas Classer
Let us know.

Cheers.

I hope this help.

Any questions, please drop in.

Thanks.

Cheers,

Tab/Onglet 1
I don't have an immediate solution, but it is an interesting string on which to tug.

Please keep me informed.

Cheers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/06/05</td>
<td>5:04 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/05</td>
<td>2:41 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification: Secret
Not for PA / Ne pas Classer
Further to various correspondance regarding a request for assistance by the National Energy Board (NEB) located in Calgary, the following is a summary of discussions with the NEB locally.

On 2005 05 16 I met with Leo Jansen and Jamie Kereluk (both of Operations Compliance) at the NEB office in Calgary. For the uninitiated, the NEB is an federal agency headquartered in Calgary (as opposed to Ottawa) which regulates the pipeline industry and energy development in Canada. They are responsible for compliance (and as of recently, security) issues when pipelines cross provincial or national boundaries, for hydroelectric issues when they cross international borders, etc. The purpose of our meeting was to discuss the roles and tasks of both the NEB and the Service (they were unfamiliar with details of our role) and establish contact locally. Both Jansen and Kereluk hold level II clearances.

The NEB, as a federal agency, is independent, but answers to Parliament through the Minister of Natural Resources (NRCan). Given that they are located in Calgary, the NEB often feel 'left out' of discussions with federal partners, yet feel a need to have some link into the federal security apparatus.

The NEB recently completed a study of critical infrastructure under their purview across Canada. They are now wondering what to do with the report given its classification (Confidential). I suggested they may wish to speak with PSEPC on the matter.

For our purposes, the NEB advised that they currently receive only unclassified ITAC reports (via PSEPC in Edmonton), and these through a secure fax in their Calgary office. They do not receive applicable Laser reporting or classified ITAC reports, and currently do not have any electronic means of receiving them (save the fax). Jansen requested that the Service consider a way in which Laser reporting could be provided to them and advised that they have secure facilities to store up to TS (I am not aware who completed the certification).

As the NEB is a federal agency with a specific security mandate, it is logical that they should be included in Laser dissemination when the reporting refers to threats to the energy sector. Given the potential difficulty of transmitting classified documents to them electronically at this time, Calgary District will undertake to provide hard copies locally if so directed by PR and HQ.

Cheers,

PS: Pardon the delay in filing this note as we were awaiting assignment of a file number.
TAB 1
SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

PROTECTED
when completed

SECRET
when completed

TOP SECRET
when completed

IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCLA
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section 41 of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date:

SIRC File # 1500-457
SIRC Case # 146

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>CSIS</th>
<th>SIRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BOD V01 1972 (white)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BOD V01 2002 (white)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supplemental BOD (white)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 | | 10 | blank |

Exhibit CSIS 7A remains @ CSIS office

1 of 108 AGC1050
Pre-Hearing conference - Mon 20, 2015

2. Case Management Conf - July 24, 2015

3. In Camera Hearing - Aug 12, 2015


5. Ex Parte Hearing - Day 1 - Jan 28, 2016

#60 Ex Parte Hearing Day 2 - Mon 22, 2016
1. Did the Service collect, by investigation or otherwise, information or intelligence about groups [Leadnow, ForestEthics Advocacy Association, Council of Canadians, Dogwood Initiative, EcoSociety, Sierra Club of British Columbia, Idle No More] or individuals for their activities in relation to the Northern Gateway Pipeline Project?

2. If yes, was the collection of information or intelligence lawful?

3. Did the Service provide information relating to individuals or groups [Leadnow, ForestEthics Advocacy Association, Council of Canadians, the Dogwood Initiative, EcoSociety, Sierra Club of British Columbia, Idle No More] opposed to the Northern Gateway Pipeline Project to the National Energy Board or non-government members of the petroleum industry?

4. If yes, was it lawful to provide this information?

The Service intends on calling three witnesses to testify at the ex parte hearing:

1. [Redacted] former Chief Counter Intelligence / Counter Proliferation (CI/CP), will testify on the Service’s domestic intelligence, as well as operational reports in the issues identified above.

2. [Redacted] Strategic Analyst, Assessment Branch (IAB), will testify on the IAB and his role in delivering briefings and reports to Government of Canada and other partners as well as the Service’s involvement in the biannual National Resources Canada classified briefings.

3. [Redacted] Strategic Analyst, IAB, will testify on information sharing with the energy sector and National Resources Canada’s biannual classified briefings.

The Service does not intend on calling [Redacted] has informed us that she has never spoke or exchanged emails with Rick Garber or the National Energy Board. However, if the Committee is of the view that [Redacted] testimony would be useful in the Committee’s investigation, the Service is prepared to have her testify either orally or in writing.

[Redacted]
**SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**IN THE MATTER** of a complaint filed by **BCCLA**

pursuant to section IV of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

**Date:** May 20, 2015  **SIRC File #** 1500-481  **SIRC Case #** 1410

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member</th>
<th>Yves Fortier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIRC's Senior Counsel</td>
<td>Sylvie Roussel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRC's Counsel</td>
<td>Chantalle Renaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRC's Registrar</td>
<td>Shayna Stanwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer</td>
<td>Neil Reelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainant</td>
<td>P.CCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>Paul Champ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td>Stephanie Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness [ CSIS ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness [ CSIS ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer [ ]</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer [ ]</td>
<td>[LOSE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer [ ]</td>
<td>[LOSE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer [ ]</td>
<td>[LOSE]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGC1050
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by RCCUA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: May 20, 2015

SIRC File # C181

SIRC Case # K-160

F/U TIME PARTY DH @ 10 am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Why was there a lack of investigation?</td>
<td>- The investigation could be wider than just monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Call by investigator</td>
<td>- More than just monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did investigating</td>
<td>- &quot;Monitor&quot; included as part of 12 of CSIS Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were groups or individuals targeted?</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;Confing,&quot; members of petroleum industry is limited to private sector industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does it go broke the 2014 complaint</td>
<td>- Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date:

SIRC File #

SIRC Case #

Page 2 of 3

... Continued

D 13 is excluded from this

4. New Brunswick protests refused to as background not intended to include this as part of the complaint daily NGO in complaint

Document Disclosure only on or Dec 31, 2009. When NGO was announced

→ Oral Hearing

Witnesses

Champ Dear 3 witnesses. Can identity confirm and date of

hearing first

→ 2-3 days

Doc witness for income

(NGPS mandate etc see next for exact wording) identity con

He confirmed

→ 12 days

Page 229 of 320
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IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section
of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: 
F/U TIME PARTY

SIRC File # 

SIRC Case # 
Page 5 of 5

Location: Vancouver.

Date: August 12th, 1994
B. am: pro-filing (Fri)

M. am: pro-filing (Fri)

Exp: 2 p.m. July 5th
Dos: July 13th

exp: & hearing requested by
B. for reasons of national
security

Excuses: for and June 22

Other issues:

- newspaper article: "Can we say object

to same due to articles having

-

Nancy issue:

to do

- B. (need to wait to hear from person

- B. (wants to see)

- B. transcript
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THE SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by the

pursuant to section 41 of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2015, at
10:00 a.m.

Honourable L. Yves Fortier, P.C., C.C., O.Q., Q.C., Presiding Member

AGENDA

1. Introduction and identification of the parties
2. Purpose of the conference
3. Identification of the document(s) setting out the complaint
4. Allegation(s) of the complaint to be investigated
5. Format of hearing: in writing or orally
6. Number and identity of witnesses including a brief summary of the nature of their testimony
7. Number of days for testimony
8. Hearing date(s) and place of hearing
9. Use of electronic devices
10. Schedule for filing of documents prior to hearing
11. Need for an interpreter and/or simultaneous translation
12. Request for ex parte hearing
13. Written submissions
14. Any other matters
Dear Counsel:

RE: COMPLAINT AGAINST THE CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE PURSUANT TO SECTION 41 OF THE CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE ACT

I am writing on behalf of the Presiding member, the Hon. Yves Fortier, P.C., C.C., O.Q., Q.C. The Presiding member has considered the letter of complaint dated February 6, 2014 and the correspondence dated September 22, 2014, March 25, 2015, and April 7, 9 and 15, 2015. With respect to the proposed issues to be examined as part of the complaint as set out by Ms. Dion in her letter dated April 15, 2015, the Presiding member has raised the following questions which the parties are invited to consider and address during the pre-hearing conference to be conducted on May 20, 2015:

1) Given the wording of section 12 of the CSIS Act which provides that the Service "shall collect, by investigation or otherwise" and the allegations in the letter of complaint to the effect that the Service is "gathering information" and "monitoring and surveillance", what meaning shall be attributed to the words "investigate" and "investigation" in the April 15th letter?

2) Whether the "groups or individuals" referred to in questions 1 and 3 of the April 15th letter are those set out on pages 2 and 6 of the letter of complaint?

BY COURIER

Mr. Paul Champ
Counsel
Champ & Associates
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6

Ms. Stéphanie Dion
Counsel
National Security Litigation & Advisory Group
Department of Justice Canada
PO Box 8127, Station T
Ottawa, ON K1G 3H6
3) Whether the expression “non-government members of the petroleum industry” is limited to the private-sector industry?

4) While the issues to be examined in the April 15th letter only refer to the Northern Gateway Project, the March 25th letter refers to “protests concerning the petroleum industry, including the Northern Gateway Project” and the attachment to the letter refers to hydraulic fracturing protests in New Brunswick. What is the intended purpose of the references to the protests in New Brunswick?

Should you have any questions with respect to the foregoing, please do not hesitate to contact me at (613) 990-6319.

Yours sincerely,

Shayna Stawicki
Registrar
FYI

From: Confer oring Service [mailto:SGTReservations.GTReservations@ssc-spcc.gc.ca]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 10:07 AM
To: Karolyne Chenier
Subject: Operator Assisted Confirmation 4216364

Operator Assisted Service Confirmation: 4216364

Special instructions

Thank you for using Government Teleconferencing Service.

1 800 226-6338 / 613 941-9554
SGTReservations.GTReservations@ssc-spcc.gc.ca

Conference call details
Conference date: 20-May-2015
Conference time: 10:00AM
Duration (minutes): 60
Call type: Operator Assisted
Time zone: (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
Number of lines: 4

Participants
Local / toll-free (Canada/U.S) 613-954-4096 / 866-333-5268
dial-in number(s):
International dial-in numbers:

Contact details
Department name: Security Intelligence Review Committee
Moderator file number: 1639182
Moderator name: Mme Sylvie Rousseau
Telephone number: 613-991-0157
Contact name: Ms. Karolyne Chenier
Billing code: 9690306

Conference
Language: English call
Title:

Recording
Conference recording: NO
Click here to access and retrieve your recording.

Introduction

Announce Participants:
Roll call: NO

Participant restrictions
Authorized participants:
Operators will obtain the following information from callers:

Participant list
Send to:
Will be sent by:

Guest speakers
Guest speaker(s) should be prepared to join the conference ___ minutes prior to the conference start time.

List of participants to dial-out
Call Moderator: First

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Telephone number</th>
<th>Alternate number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sylvie</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>613-991-0157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Yves</td>
<td>Fortier</td>
<td>514-286-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul</td>
<td>Champ</td>
<td>613-237-2441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stephanie</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>613-842-1356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a list of Teleconferencing telephone key pad commands visit http://www.alpmedia.gc.ca/wiki/GTS_WebEx.

Click here to discover how you can reduce Green House Gas emissions by using conferencing for your next meeting.

NOTICE: This message is confidential, privileged and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any other person is strictly prohibited from disclosing, distributing or reproducing it. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify us immediately by telephone and delete all copies.
SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA before SIRC pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: July 24, 2015 SIRC File # 481 SIRC Case # 14-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member</th>
<th>Cues Fortier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIRC's Senior Counsel</td>
<td>Chantelle Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRC's Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRC's Registrar</td>
<td>Shayan Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer</td>
<td>Noel Reiley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainant</td>
<td>Patrick Champ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>Stephanie Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ CSIS ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ CSIS ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnesses</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>[ CSIS ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>[ LOSE ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>[ LOSE ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>[ LOSE ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: July 24, 2005
SIRC File # 481
SIRC Case # 446

F/U TIME PARTY

Case management telecon requested by Paul Champ. Unhappy to witness disclosure from CSIS.

Start time 11:30 am

Champ concerns CSIS will not be presenting any evidence in the in camera hearing related to their complaint.

Dion - CSIS has national security issues so will not confirm for delay in open setting whether info on particular org was collected.

Dion requests that names of CSIS employees remain confidential and unmentioned.

Page 242 of 326
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 20 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: July 29, 2015

Champs he has submitted does not prove that info was collected so the "neither confirm nor deny" argument doesn't apply.

Did not prove that CSIS is the one stored info. Shows simply that CSIS was consulted.
Hi Shayna,

Here is the revised reservation for tomorrow. I told them that as they will be calling you first (in the hearing room) that you would let them know if Chantelle needs to be called on her cell or if she is present with you.

Manon Vincent
Executive Assistant / Adjointe exécutive
Security Intelligence Review Committee
Comité de surveillance des activités de renseignement de sécurité
Tel: 613-991-9111
Fax: 613-990-3230
manon.vincent@src-c src.gc.ca

Operator Assisted Service Confirmation: 4221442

Special instructions
Revised confirmation.

We have noted that Ms. Bowers might be with Ms. Stawicki.

Thank you
Thank you for using Government Teleconferencing Service.

1 800 226-6338 / 613 941-9554
SGTReservations.GTSReservations@asc-spc.gc.ca.

**Conference call details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference date:</th>
<th>24-Jul-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference time:</td>
<td>11:30AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (minutes):</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local / toll-free (Canada/US)</th>
<th>613-954-4096 / 866-333-5268</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International dial-in numbers:</td>
<td>613-954-4096 / 866-333-5268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department name:</th>
<th>Security Intelligence Review Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderator file number:</td>
<td>1540509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator name:</td>
<td>Ms. Chantelle Bowes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name:</td>
<td>Mme Manon Vincent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing code:</td>
<td>9990308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language:</th>
<th>English call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recording**

Conference recording: NO

Click here to access and retrieve your recording.

**Introduction**

Announce Participants: NO

**Participant restrictions**

Authorized participants:
Participants will be prompted for the following details:

**Participant list**

Send to:
Will be sent by:

**Guest speakers**
Guest speaker(s) should be prepared to join the conference .... minutes prior to the conference start time.

List of participants to dial-out
Call Moderator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Telephone number</th>
<th>Alternate number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shayna</td>
<td>Stawicki</td>
<td>613-991-0157</td>
<td>first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chantelle</td>
<td>Bowers</td>
<td>613-863-9112</td>
<td>cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul</td>
<td>Champ</td>
<td>613-816-2441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stephanie</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>613-842-1356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Yves</td>
<td>Fortier</td>
<td>514-286-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WebEx Web conferencing
*Recording: NO
*Monitoring: NO
URL:
Meeting/Session/Event number:
Meeting/Session/Event password:

For a list of Teleconferencing telephone key pad commands visit http://www.gc.ca/gs/tns/webex.

Click here to discover how you can reduce Green House Gas emissions by using conferencing for your next meeting.

NOTICE: This message is confidential, privileged and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any other person is strictly prohibited from disclosing, distributing or reproducing it. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify us immediately by telephone and delete all copies.
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA before SIRC pursuant to section 44 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Aug 12, 2015  SIRC File #: 1500-1521  SIRC Case #: 14-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member</th>
<th>Yuey Fortier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIRC’s Senior Counsel</td>
<td>Chantelle Bowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRC’s Registrar</td>
<td>Shayna Stawicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer</td>
<td>Noel Keely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainant</td>
<td>JOSH PETERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>Paule Champ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>Biloc Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ CSIS ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ CSIS ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hull, Alastair

From: Shayna Stawicki <Shayna.Stawicki@sirc-csars.gc.ca>
Sent: August 12, 2015 12:27 PM
To: Hull, Alastair
Subject: Fw: complaint 1500-481

As discussed

Ty!!
Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Dion, Stéphanie <Stéphanie.Dion@justice.gc.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 12:56 PM
To: Shayna Stawicki
Cc: Chantell Bowers; [redacted]
Subject: complaint 1500-481

Good afternoon,

It has come to our attention that the complainant intends on providing recaps of the witnesses testimonies given at the in camera hearings (https://bccla.org/don’t-spy-on-me/). This is concerning from a Service perspective and appears to contravene subsection 48(1) of the CSIS Act which provides that the investigations are conducted in private.

We would like to discuss this issue with you at your earliest convenience.

Stéphanie Dion
Avocate | Counsel
Groupe litiges et conseils en sécurité nationale | National Security Litigation & Advisory Group
stéphanie.dion@justice.gc.ca
Téléphone | Telephone: 613-942-1356
SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Aug 12, 2017

SIRC File # 1500-481
SIRC Case # 140

Page 1 of

F/U TIME PARTY

Start Time: 2 pm - 4:30 pm
SIRC Notes - 481
Champ scrawls tender 3rd floor Allister will bring them to CSIS.
SIRC Tender 7th floor 8th flor will bring us down to 7th floor.

Start 2:05 pm

Decision Issue
BCCLA website incl. recap of this hearing's witnesses testimony
(Keenulf seeking private hearing reype)
No summary of evidence vs media

Opening statement from Champ
One of organizations are criminal
Orgs thru intimidation CSIS surveillance
Supporting arms lawful groups
Anti-violence Anti-criminal

Special issues brief incl. public interest group
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BECLA
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Aug 12, 2015
SIRC File #: 481
SIRC Case #: 146

Page 2 of

BECLA itself has no opinion on Northern Gateway Pipeline at all. However, they do believe strongly that anyone spray painting at risk to freedom of speech cannot be

T. witness leg whitenot say have his testimony provided by way of written affidavit permit of speaking in person? Champlin's opening statements span. There was no act of they done by

Third info that BECLA has is that they committed CSIS and educate CSIS reg. CSIS witness in case. Knows nothing re: this particular case.
THE SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

In the matter of a Complaint filed by the
BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION
pursuant to section 41 of the
Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, RSC 1985, c.C-23

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION

- and -

THE CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF JOSH PATERSON
(Pursuant to Rule 15.01(1)(b) of the SIRC Rules of Procedure)

JOSH PATERSON is the Executive Director of the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association ("BCCLA"), the Complainant in this matter. Without limiting the scope of his evidence or the Complainant’s rights before the Committee in this regard, it is anticipated that the substance of Mr Paterson’s evidence to the Committee will include the following:

1. Mr Paterson will testify about the BCCLA as an organization and its history of defending the democratic rights of protest and dissent.

2. Mr Paterson will introduce and testify about government documents obtained under the Access to Information Act which indicate that several groups opposed to the Northern Gateway Pipeline have been monitored and surveilled by CSIS, and that this information has been shared with petroleum industry actors and
the National Energy Board. The groups are identified in the complaint and most of the documents to be introduced are referred to in the complaint and subsequent correspondence with the Committee.

3. Mr Paterson will testify about the groups identified in the complaint - Leadnow, ForestEthics Advocacy Association, the Council of Canadians, the Dogwood Initiative, EcoSociety, the Sierra Club of British Columbia, and Idle No More - and what he knows about their organization and their activities. He will testify that to the best of his knowledge those organizations have not been involved in violent activities.

4. In addition to the evidence described above, Mr Paterson will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may support the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

Dated at Ottawa, this 17th day of June, 2015.

[Signature]

Paul Champ

CHAMP & ASSOCIATES
Barristers & Solicitors
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6
T: 613-237-4740
F: 613-232-2680
E: pchamp@champlaw.ca
Solicitors for the Complainant
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by B.C. L.A.
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section 44 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Aug 12, 2015  SIRC File #: 4181  SIRC Case #: 1460

Page 5 of

Exhibits entered:
1. BRO 13 1062
2. BRO 13 2062
3. BRA 2062
4. CSIR
5. CIC

Witness #1: Peterson (Sicca)
- Felt frequent interrogations in Supreme Court of Canada.
- Stated that all prisoners are well known nonviolent Griffin.

4:05 PM
- Examination by Dr. B.
- 275 from Brown./re Agg.
- 275 from member.

End @ 4:25
Hello Shayna. I'm back today and confirm that you have courtroom #701 for the dates indicated below. I will be again on holidays starting Monday for 2 weeks, but I'm sure my colleagues Julie or Alastair would be able to show your up to the courtroom so you can do any arranging necessary. Our registry opens at 8:30 am, so any time after that you could come to the 3rd floor and ask for an SRO.

Thanks

Melissa Netley
Senior Registry Officer
Courts Administration Service
3rd floor – 701 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, BC
Tel: 604-666-6200
Fax: 604-666-8181

From: Shayna Stawicki [mailto:Shayna.Stawicki@sic-csacs.gc.ca]
Sent: August-06-15 7:53 AM
To: VAN-SRO
Subject: RE: 1500-481: Contract for Vancouver Federal Court

Could you please respond in Melissa's absence?

Thank you.

Shayna Stawicki
Registrar- Senior Legal Assistant/ Greffière- Adjointe juridique principale
Security Intelligence Review Committee/ Comité de surveillance des activités de renseignement de sécurité
(613) 990-6319

From: Shayna Stawicki
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 10:40 AM
To: 'Netley, Melissa'
Cc: Chantelle Bowers
Subject: 1500-481: Contract for Vancouver Federal Court

Good morning Melissa,

Could you please confirm the following before my departure for Vancouver on Tuesday, August 11, 2015:

The Committee has Courtroom # 701 at the Vancouver Federal Court available to us on the following dates:
August 12th: from 2 pm- 4:30 pm
August 13th: from 9 am - 8:30 pm
August 14th: from 9 am - 12:00 pm

Also, would it be possible for me to meet with someone from your office on August 12th prior to the hearing to introduce myself and ensure that the room is set-up for our needs?

Many thanks,

Shayna Stawicki
Registrar-Senior Legal Assistant/ Greffe- Adjointe juridique principale
Security Intelligence Review Committee/ Comité de surveillance des activités de renseignement de sécurité
(613) 990-6319
Shayna Stawicki

From: Registrar-Greffier
Sent: Friday, August 07, 2015 9:34 AM
To: Shayna Stawicki
Subject: 1500-481: Order of witnesses In Camera

PROTECTED B

Champ:

Josh Paterson - Client (CECA)
Celine Trojand
Terry Dance-Bennink
Caitlyn Vernon
Nikki Skuce
Jamie Biggar
Reg Whitaker

After testifying, Mr Paterson will remain with myself and Mr Roy as the instructing client.

CSIS: Robert
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA before SIRC pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Aug 13, 2015  SIRC File # 1500-451  SIRC Case # 146

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Member</td>
<td>Yves Fortier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRC’s Senior Counsel</td>
<td>Chantelle Bowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRC’s Registrar</td>
<td>Shayne Stannick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer</td>
<td>Neil Keely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complainant Counsel</td>
<td>Josh Peterson - BCCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>Paul Champ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td>Sperandio Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Céline Trépanier (BCCLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Terry Drape-Cunning (BCCLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Jamie Brigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Caitlyn Keanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[LOSE]
THE SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

In the matter of a Complaint filed by the
BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION
pursuant to section 41 of the
Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, RSC 1985, c.C-23

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION

- and -

THE CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Complainant

and

Respondent

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF CÉLINE TROJAND
(Pursuant to Rule 15.01(1)(b) of the SIRC Rules of Procedure)

CÉLINE TROJAND is Director of Organizing with Dogwood Initiative, one of the groups identified by the Complainant in SIRC File No. 1500-481. Without limiting the scope of her evidence or the Complainant’s rights before the Committee in this regard, it is anticipated that the substance of Ms Trojand’s evidence to the Committee will include the following:

1. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to her background and history of activism, including her involvement with Dogwood Initiative and her interest in environmental and energy policy matters.

2. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to her work as Director of Organizing with Dogwood Initiative, including the methods by which Dogwood Initiative carries out its organizing, engagement, and advocacy activities.
3. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to the history, mandate, structure, membership, and activities of Dogwood Initiative. Ms Trojand will testify that Dogwood Initiative was founded in 1999, and presently identifies approximately 315,000 supporters, of whom approximately 2,200 are active volunteers.

4. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to the demographics of Dogwood Initiative’s supporters, as well as participation rates in various Dogwood Initiative campaigns and events.

5. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to Dogwood Initiative’s activities in relation to the Northern Gateway project and the proceedings of the National Energy Board’s joint review panel. In particular, Ms Trojand will testify that Dogwood Initiative did not participate directly in the NEB’s Northern Gateway hearings, but will testify with respect to Dogwood Initiative’s other activities, including promoting and encouraging individual participation, organizing and/or supporting public campaigns, rallies, seminars, letter-writing, and online/social media activities, relating to the NEB’s Northern Gateway hearings.

6. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to the concerns expressed by current and prospective Dogwood Initiative members and supporters regarding reports of increased scrutiny by security agencies like CSIS. For example:

   a) Dogwood Initiative staff have frequently received comments and inquiries from supporters and members of the public, expressing concerns that they may become a target or “end up on a list” because of their support for or involvement with Dogwood Initiative;

   b) Dogwood Initiative’s organizers and local teams have become increasingly concerned about internal security, expressing concerns about the possible monitoring of Dogwood-related emails, meetings, and correspondence;
c) Dogwood Initiative’s regional organizers have expressed concerns about the impact of monitoring and surveillance activities by government and law enforcement agencies on their efforts to develop and maintain engagement with members and other community members, noting that prospective members are frequently apprehensive about the possibility that they may become “targets”;

d) Dogwood Initiative’s supporters and community organizers frequently voice concerns about having their photos taken and published, and carefully review and revise written materials out of concern that provocative language may attract the attention of government and law enforcement agencies;

e) Community organizers have reported being photographed while out canvassing (for example, at West Hills mall on July 1, 2014), and have expressed reluctance to stand or walk in prominent locations at rallies or other community gatherings; and

f) A community organizer in Port Hardy ceased her activities with Dogwood Initiative following news reports of CSIS and RCMP spying, indicating that she felt “too vulnerable” as an immigrant to Canada.

7. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to the impact of increased scrutiny by government and/or law enforcement agencies on Dogwood Initiative’s activities. Ms Trojand will state that these concerns have resulted in a noticeable “chill” in Dogwood Initiative’s organizing efforts, membership engagement, fundraising, and participation in campaigns and events.

8. Ms Trojand will testify that she attended the NEB hearings in Kelowna and Comox, providing communications and other activities on behalf of Dogwood Initiative.
9. Ms Trojand will testify with respect to an incident which took place outside the NEB hearings in Comox on March 31, 2012, in which law enforcement and/or security officers accessed her laptop and reviewed her Facebook account.

10. Ms Trojand will testify that she participated in a workshop and training session presented by Leadnow and Dogwood Initiative in Kelowna on January 27, 2013. The event featured sessions on storytelling, engagement tactics, and creative design in conjunction with the NEB hearing the following day.

11. In addition to the evidence described above, Ms Trojand will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may support the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

12. In giving her evidence to the Committee, Ms Trojand will refer to documents included in the complainants’ Book of Documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to her attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.

Dated at Ottawa, this 17th day of June, 2015.

[Signature]

Paul Champ

CHAMP & ASSOCIATES
Barristers & Solicitors
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6
T: 613-237-4740
F: 613-232-2680
E: pchamp@champlaw.ca
Solicitors for the Complainant
[Start Time: 9 am. - 8 pm]

Start @ 9:10 am

Witness 2: Céline Trajano (Deputy
Founder of Dogwood Initiative
(formerly known as Forest Fighters
"ve generally discourage civil disobedience
- Do re policy on protocol for utilizing
civil disobedience as activism mech.
- Dogwood\'s work in energy
- Energy policy matters
- Do signed up >1000 ppl to testify vs.
  NEB northern Gateway project review
  panel? coached them

10:05

Redirect from camp

Break from 10:20 - 10:25 am

Witness 3: Jenny Davis-Berman (Deputy
Vice President)
- Researc organizer to fit intercultural lens
  Sand

"why can we have a pipeline from SDN?" not
out for water - isn\'t because first nations"
SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF TERRY DANCE-BENNINK
(Pursuant to Rule 15.01(1)(b) of the SIRC Rules of Procedure)

TERRY DANCE-BENNINK is Regional Organizer - Vancouver Island South with Dogwood Initiative, one of the groups identified by the Complainant in SIRC File No. 1500-481. Without limiting the scope of her evidence or the Complainant’s rights before the Committee in this regard, it is anticipated that the substance of Ms Dance-Bennink’s evidence to the Committee will include the following:

1. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify with respect to her personal and professional background and history of community engagement and activism, including her involvement with Dogwood Initiative and her interest in environmental and energy policy matters.
2. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify that, prior to joining Dogwood Initiative in 2013, she travelled to the tarsands and participated in the National Energy Board's public hearings regarding the Northern Gateway project as a private citizen.

3. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify with respect to her work as volunteer Regional Organizer - Vancouver Island South with Dogwood Initiative, including her organizing, engagement, and advocacy activities on behalf of Dogwood Initiative.

4. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify that she joined Dogwood Initiative as a Regional Organizer for Vancouver Island South in December 2013. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify that Dogwood Initiative has more than 100 volunteers in this region, and that the overwhelming majority of these volunteers are over the age of 60.

5. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify with respect to the impact of increased scrutiny by government and/or law enforcement agencies on Dogwood Initiative's organizing activities. Ms Dance-Bennink will state that these concerns have resulted in a noticeable "chill" in Dogwood Initiative's organizing efforts, membership engagement, and participation in campaigns and events.

6. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify with respect to her concerns about new volunteers who seem interested in escalating Dogwood's activities. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify that it is always her practice to emphasize that Dogwood's focus is on grassroots organizing and advocacy through democratic processes.

7. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify with respect to her concerns about internal security within Dogwood Initiative, including the potential monitoring of communications, correspondence, and events.

8. Ms Dance-Bennink will testify that she and other Dogwood organizers and supporters have become reluctant to stand or walk in prominent locations at rallies or other community gatherings, due to concerns about being identified or photographed. In particular, Ms Dance-Bennink will testify with respect to an
incident in which she and other organizers were photographed while canvassing outside the West Hills mall on July 1, 2014.

9. In addition to the evidence described above, Ms Dance-Bennink will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may support the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

10. In giving her evidence to the Committee, Ms Dance-Bennink will refer to documents included in the complainants' Book of Documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to her attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.

Dated at Ottawa, this 26th day of June, 2015.

[Signature]
Paul Champ

CHAMP & ASSOCIATES
Barristers & Solicitors
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6

T: 613-237-4740
F: 613-232-2680
E: pchamp@champlaw.ca
brov@champlaw.ca

Solicitors for the Complainant
In the matter of a Complaint filed by the BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION pursuant to section 41 of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, RSC 1985, c.C-23

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION

- and -

THE CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF REG WHITAKER
(Pursuant to Rule 15.01(1)(b) of the SIRC Rules of Procedure)

REG WHITAKER is a Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus in the Department of Political Science at York University and an adjunct professor of Political Science at the University of Victoria. Without limiting the scope of his evidence or the Complainant's rights before the Committee in this regard, it is anticipated that the substance of Professor Whitaker's evidence to the Committee will include the following:

1. Professor Whitaker has studied the security and intelligence activities of RCMP and CSIS for nearly forty years. He is a leading authority on the history of security and intelligence activity in Canada, including the targets of security and intelligence investigations.
2. Professor Whitaker will explain the history of choosing targets for intelligence investigations in Canada. For most of Canada's history, there has been no clear demarcation between legitimate and illegitimate targets for investigation. A royal commission in 1977 discovered that the RCMP security service maintained a name index with 1.3-million entries, representing 800,000 files on individuals.

3. Beyond protecting the country from espionage, sabotage, terrorism, political violence, and covert foreign interference - threats generally recognized as reasonable targets for intelligence investigations - RCMP and CSIS has also targeted groups and individuals said to be "subversive", a vague and elusive term that can take many forms in the minds of those hunting it. These targets of RCMP and CSIS surveillance for "subversive" activities have often been those engaged in what might be described as 'left wing' activism, or those who appear to challenge the political/economic status quo. Those targeted over the years in Canada include workers striking for higher wages and better working conditions, refugees fleeing political conflict and persecution abroad, gay men and lesbian women, religious sects like Doukhobors and Jehovah's Witnesses, democratic socialists, Quebec separatists, First Nations activists, anti-globalization activists, and so on.

4. Historically, intelligence investigations in Canada have involved undercover agents and other secret sources of information within 'private' associations in civil society.

5. CSIS was created in large part to address the problems of improper targeting in security investigations. Operating under a statutory mandate that imposes restraints on its reach and methods, CSIS has shed some, but not all, of the ideological baggage of the RCMP. In many cases, CSIS operates under the same sort of bias towards those who challenge the economic or political status quo, and Service investigations have in some cases extended beyond genuine threats
to security to encompass those suspected of the subverting the established order.

Dated at Ottawa, this 26th day of June, 2015.

Paul Champ

CHAMP & ASSOCIATES
Barristers & Solicitors
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6
T: 613-237-4740
F: 613-232-2680
E: pchamp@champlaw.ca
Solicitors for the Complainant
SIRC File No. 1500-481

THE SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

In the matter of a Complaint filed by the
BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION
pursuant to section 41 of the
Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, RSC 1985, c.C-23

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION
Complainant

- and -

THE CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE
Respondent

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF JAMIE BIGGAR
(Pursuant to Rule 15.01(1)(b) of the SIRC Rules of Procedure)

JAMIE BIGGAR is Campaigns Director with Leadnow, one of the groups identified by
the Complainant in SIRC File No. 1500-481. Without limiting the scope of his evidence
or the Complainant’s rights before the Committee in this regard, it is anticipated that
the substance of Mr Biggar’s evidence to the Committee will include the following:

1. Mr Biggar will testify with respect to his background and history of activism,
   including his involvement with Leadnow and his interest in environmental and
   energy policy matters.

2. Mr Biggar will testify with respect to his work as Campaigns Director with
   Leadnow, including the methods by which Leadnow carries out its organizing,
   engagement, and advocacy activities.
3. Mr Biggar will testify with respect to the history, mandate, structure, membership, and activities of Leadnow. Mr Biggar will testify that Leadnow is an independent advocacy organization that runs campaigns on major issues, engages people in participatory decision-making, and organizes in communities across Canada.

4. Mr Biggar will testify with respect to Leadnow’s activities in relation to the Northern Gateway project and the proceedings of the National Energy Board’s joint review panel. In particular, Mr Biggar will testify that Leadnow did not participate directly in the NEB’s Northern Gateway hearings, but will testify with respect to Leadnow’s other activities, including promoting and encouraging individual participation, organizing and/or supporting public campaigns, rallies, seminars, letter-writing, and online/social media activities, relating to the NEB’s Northern Gateway hearings.

5. Mr Biggar will testify with respect to the impact of increased scrutiny by government and/or law enforcement agencies on Leadnow’s activities, and the concerns these activities have raised among Leadnow staff and supporters. Mr Biggar will state that these concerns have resulted in a noticeable “chill” in Leadnow’s organizing efforts, membership engagement, and participation in campaigns and events. For example, Leadnow has:

   a) Received inquiries from supporters expressing concerns that they may become a target or “end up on a list” because of their support for or involvement with Leadnow;

   b) Become increasingly concerned about internal security and the monitoring of Leadnow-related emails, meetings, and correspondence;

   c) Become concerns about the impact of monitoring and surveillance activities by government and law enforcement agencies on their efforts to develop and maintain engagement with members and other
community members, noting that prospective members are frequently apprehensive about the possibility that they may become "targets"; and

d) Become concerned that simply drawing attention to the fact that law enforcement agencies have identified Leadnow as an organization of interest will adversely effect engagement and participation with their organization.

6. Mr Biggar will testify that Leadnow participated with Dogwood Initiative in a workshop and training session in Kelowna on January 27, 2013. The event featured sessions on storytelling, engagement tactics, and creative design in conjunction with the NEB hearing the following day.

7. In addition to the evidence described above, Mr Biggar will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may support the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

8. In giving his evidence to the Committee, Mr Biggar will refer to documents included in the complainants' Book of Documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to his attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.

Dated at Ottawa, this 17th day of June, 2015.

Paul Champ

CHAMP & ASSOCIATES
Barristers & Solicitors
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by [Redacted] before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 91 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: July 13, 2015
F/U Time

After seeing the conditions resulted from airport screening, she left.

Aftermath concern from initial airport intake, avoided subsequent to go on to second process, volunteering covering & in fear of being put on a "guest list."

11:00 a.m. X-exam by Dr. ("Case is contravening its own regulations on collective sharing info [patient protected]."

11:15 a.m. Completed W-interview.

No witnesses present until 1 p.m.*

11:30 a.m. Bishop next witnesses 
- 2 other
- 3 p.m. Test witnesses

Break until 1:30 p.m.

Exam. August 27th - due date for written affidavit for ex-witnesses.

Witnesse[s] not named.

* Deputy Director in charge

C
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THE SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

In the matter of a Complaint filed by the
BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION
pursuant to section 41 of the
Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, RSC 1985, c.C-23

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION

- and -

THE CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF CAITLYN VERNON
(Pursuant to Rule 15.01(1)(b) of the SIRC Rules of Procedure)

CAITLYN VERNON is Campaigns Director with Sierra Club of BC Foundation ("Sierra Club BC"), one of the groups identified by the Complainant in SIRC File No. 1500-481. Without limiting the scope of her evidence or the Complainant's rights before the Committee in this regard, it is anticipated that the substance of Ms Vernon's evidence to the Committee will include the following:

1. Ms Vernon will testify with respect to her background and history of activism, including her involvement with Sierra Club BC and her interest in environmental matters.

2. Ms Vernon will testify with respect to her work as Campaigns Director with Sierra Club BC, including the methods by which Sierra Club BC carries out its education and public awareness-raising activities.
3. Ms Vernon will testify with respect to the history, mandate, structure, membership, and activities of Sierra Club BC. In particular, Ms Vernon will testify that Sierra Club BC was formed in 1969 and is a registered charity. Sierra Club BC has played a major role in numerous campaigns, agreements, and court victories which have helped protect BC’s wilderness. Sierra Club BC also has a longstanding tradition of providing nature education for young children both within and outside BC’s school system.

4. Ms Vernon will testify that Sierra Club BC’s mission is to protect, conserve, and educate the public about British Columbia’s wilderness, species and ecosystems, within the urgent context of climate change impacts. To this end, Sierra Club BC works collaboratively with communities, youth, First Nations, workers, government, businesses, and NGOs.

5. Ms Vernon will testify with respect to Sierra Club BC’s activities in relation to the Northern Gateway project and the proceedings of the National Energy Board’s joint review panel. In particular, Ms Vernon will testify that Sierra Club BC’s campaign involved raising public awareness of the ecological values at stake, litigation, rallies, and providing support and assistance to First Nations and individuals who were expressing concerns about the Enbridge pipeline and oil tankers project.

6. Ms Vernon will testify that Sierra Club BC did not participate in the NEB’s review process as an intervener. Sierra Club BC did, however, provide backgrounders and support to individuals who wished to provide written or oral presentations to the joint review panel.

7. Ms Vernon will testify with respect to the concerns expressed by Sierra Club BC board, staff and supporters regarding reports of surveillance and information sharing by security agencies like CSIS. In particular, Sierra Club BC board, staff and supporters felt a “chill” and expressed concerns about internal security
and feelings of shock and distress that Sierra Club BC's lawful activities would be regarded as a national security matter.

8. Ms Vernon will testify that Sierra Club BC is concerned that surveillance and information sharing by security agencies including CSIS will impede its public awareness-raising efforts, making it increasingly difficult for Sierra Club BC to engage members of the public in meaningful public debate and discussion regarding environmental issues.

9. In addition to the evidence described above, Ms Vernon will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may support the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

10. In giving her evidence to the Committee, Ms Vernon will refer to documents included in the complainants' Book of Documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to her attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.

Dated at Ottawa, this 17th day of June, 2015.

Paul Champ

CHAMP & ASSOCIATES
Barristers & Solicitors
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6
T: 613-237-4740
F: 613-232-2680
E: pchamp@champlaw.ca
Solicitors for the Complainant
SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF NIKKI SKUCE
(Pursuant to Rule 15.01(1)(b) of the SIRC Rules of Procedure)

NIKKI SKUCE is former Senior Energy Campaigner with ForestEthics Advocacy Association ("ForestEthics"), one of the groups identified by the Complainant in SIRC File No. 1500-481. Without limiting the scope of her evidence or the Complainant’s rights before the Committee in this regard, it is anticipated that the substance of Ms Skuce’s evidence to the Committee will include the following:

1. Ms Skuce will testify with respect to her background and history of activism, including her involvement with ForestEthics and her interest in environmental and energy policy matters.

2. Ms Skuce will testify with respect to her work as Senior Energy Campaigner with ForestEthics Advocacy Association until November 2014, including her role in ForestEthics’ education and advocacy activities.
3. Ms Skuce will testify with respect to the history, mandate, structure, membership, and activities of ForestEthics. Ms Skuce will testify that ForestEthics was founded in April 2012 to support the conservation and protection of the natural environments of Canada while allowing for their sustainable use.

4. Ms Skuce will testify with respect to ForestEthics's activities in relation to the Northern Gateway project and the proceedings of the National Energy Board's joint review panel. In particular, Ms Skuce will testify that ForestEthics's campaign involved education/awareness outreach, letter-writing, meeting with governments, litigation, rallies, and direct participation in public processes including the NEB's joint review panel.

5. Ms Skuce will testify that she registered ForestEthics to become an intervener in the Northern Gateway hearings, along with Raincoast Conservation Foundation and Living Oceans Society (collectively, the “Sustainability Coalition”), with legal representation from EcoJustice. Ms Skuce conducted research, worked with experts, prepared submissions, and participated actively throughout the process.

6. Ms Skuce will testify that ForestEthics attended the NEB's technical hearings in Edmonton, Prince George, and Prince Rupert, as well as community hearings in several locations throughout the NEB proceedings. Ms Skuce testified at the hearing in Prince George, BC on November 26, 2012.

7. Ms Skuce will testify with respect to the concerns expressed by ForestEthics staff and supporters regarding reports of increased scrutiny by security agencies like CSIS. In particular, ForestEthics staff and supporters felt a “chill” and expressed feelings of anxiety regarding ForestEthics' lawful activities as allegations that ForestEthics was perceived as potential security threat were published in the media. Staff whose families included members who had
immigrated from other countries were especially fearful that serious repercussions may result from ongoing involvement with ForestEthics’ advocacy work. Ms Skuce will also testify that these concerns prompted efforts to identify more secure means of internal communications for staff.

8. In addition to the evidence described above, Ms Skuce will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may support the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

9. In giving her evidence to the Committee, Ms Skuce will refer to documents included in the complainants’ Book of Documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to her attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.

Dated at Ottawa, this 17th day of June, 2015.

[Signature]

Paul Champ

CHAMP & ASSOCIATES
Barristers & Solicitors
Equity Chambers
43 Florence Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0W6
T: 613-237-4740
F: 613-232-2680
E: pchamp@champlaw.ca
Solicitors for the Complainant
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by PLA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 1 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date:  
SIRC File #  
SIRC Case #  
F/U TIME PARTY

Break from 110 pm-11:30 pm

Witness #5: Caitlin Vickers (Senior Campaigns Director, Sierra Club BC Foundation)

“environmenal activist, produce, science, research, education, outreach, courtlitigations

“social deviance & clean policy

“impact of “CSIS investigation

“feel that the federal govt is going to audits them & severe statute of "charitable

“currently being assinated by CSIS

2pm: Q: be examined by C:

“seen doing something outside of their scope

2pm: elicit my change

2pm: witness #6: L.K., Sierra (ForestsEthics)

“manager in ForestEthics now used to be senior energy campaigner in ForestEthics
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June 17, 2015

BY MAIL

Ms. Shayna Stawicki
Registrar
Security Intelligence Review Committee
Jackson Building
122 Bank Street, 4th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5N6

Dear Ms. Stawicki

Re: BCCLA – Complaint against CSIS Pursuant to Section 41 of the CSIS Act
Your File 1500-481

I am writing further to the pre-hearing conference call held on May 20th, 2015.

The Service intends to call one witness for the in camera hearing scheduled to take place on August 13 and 14, 2015. The Service intends to call Robert, a senior manager within the British Columbia Region. Robert will speak generally about the definition of “threats to the security of Canada” found at section 2 of the CSIS Act and the section 12 mandate.

The witness will give his testimony in English.
should you require further information, please contact the undersigned at (613) 842-1356.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stéphanie Dion

51000-677

c.c. Paul Champ;

ER&L
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by PoCCLA
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: SIRC File # SIRC Case #
F/U TIME PARTY

---

Recent Federal Court decision on protection of the national environments of Canada.

Still had troubleshooting joint reviews panel (JPR) for R&D claim that they had talked a few of them at the meeting for media purposes.

NEC determined that Gateway project allowed R&D to meet and conditions to meet before building.

Respn X examined by JPR, SIRC question.

3pm end.

Break 20 min until 3:30pm.

3:30pm:

CSIS witnesses: "Bob" or "Robert"

- LD CSIS BC region.
- Bill of costs, efforts, revenue, risk.
- CSIS report on summary of risk assessment briefing, etc.
- 12.18 report, which CSIS co.
- 26-1 to 15 govt.
- Classified report: NECN briefing.

Direct bus to national briefing in CSIS building to discuss.
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by [Redacted] before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 16 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date:  
F/U  
TIME  
PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Vaccine but [Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interests of [Redacted] who defends interests of [Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ministerial directive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | "[Redacted] had "very superficial knowledge of "groups mentioned in complaint."

5:30  
End of [Redacted]

5:35  
Direct by [Redacted]

1 question

5:35  
End of witness

C.A. 11
595
3000
3400
3500
3600
3700
3800
3900
4000
4100
4200
4300
4400
4500
4600
4700
4800
4900
5000
5100
5200
5300
5400
5500
5600
5700
5800
5900
6000
6100
6200
6300
6400
6500
6600
6700
6800
6900
7000
7100
7200
7300
7400
7500
7600
7700
7800
7900
8000
8100
8200
8300
8400
8500
8600
8700
8800
8900
9000
9100
9200
9300
9400
9500
9600
9700
9800
9900
10000
10100
10200
10300
10400
10500
10600
10700
10800

end of hearing @ 5:45 pm
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by D.C.C.A

pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R. S. C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Jan 28, 2010

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Location: Ottawa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIRC’s Senior Counsel</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIRC’s Counsel</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIRC’s Registrar</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stenographer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSIS Counsel</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSIS Counsel</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Page 296 of 326

AGC1050
SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION
Complainant

- and -

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE
Respondent

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF

1. [Redacted] began his employment with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS or the Service) in 2008. He is an analyst within the [Redacted] of the Intelligence and Assessments Branch (IAB) of the Service at Headquarters (HQ).

2. [Redacted] will testify on IAB’s mandate which is to provide timely and relevant intelligence which meets the Government of Canada’s (GoC) stated requirements and priorities. Within the Service, IAB is responsible for prioritizing and integrating intelligence requirements from all sources in cooperation with core Operations and for providing subject-matter expertise in support of collection, reporting and Executive briefing needs.

3. [Redacted] will provide an overview IAB’s responsibilities which include:
   - Actively engaging with the GoC to identify its intelligence needs and deliver briefings, assessments and reports which meet the strategic requirements of GoC senior policy-makers.
   - Providing subject-matter expertise in support of operational and administrative programs.
Protection Division of NRCan and have been held bi-annually since 2005 and that he has been personally involved in them since 2010.

4. [Redacted] will give an overview of the topics discussed at past NRCan classified briefings for energy and utilities sector stakeholders and the people who attended.

5. On the issue of the NRCan classified briefings, [Redacted] will also be referring the Committee to a review conducted by the Committee in 2011 entitled Review of CSIS's Private Sector Relationships where it was found that "the NRCan bi-annual classified briefings are a good example of how the Service can participate in a public-private relationship between its federal government partner (NRCan) and the private sector on a security issue."

6. Finally, [Redacted] will be providing context to the email of Timothy O'Neil (RCMP) dated April 19, 2013 found at pp. A0008929_14-000014 and A000892915-000015 of Tab 4 of the Complaint's book of documents (Exhibit C-1).

7. In addition to the evidence described above, [Redacted] will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may respond to the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

8. In giving his evidence to the Committee, [Redacted] will refer to documents included in the Service's classified book of documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to his attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.
November 26, 2015

BY HAND

Ms. Shayna Stawicki
Registrar
Security Intelligence Review Committee
Jackson Building
122 Bank Street, 4th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5N6

Dear Ms. Stawicki:

RE: BCCLA – Complaint against CSIS Pursuant to Section 41 of the CSIS Act
Your File 1500-481

This is further to my correspondence of October 29, 2015, setting out the timelines for the above-mentioned matter.

Please find enclosed the summaries of anticipated evidence of [redacted].

Should you require further information, please contact the undersigned at (613) 842-1356.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stéphanie Dion
Counsel

Encl.

cc: BR&L

51000-677
SECRET

File No. 1500-481

SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION
Complainant

- and -

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE
Respondent

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF

1. [Redacted] joined the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS or the Service) in 2009 as a Strategic Analyst for [Redacted] Intelligence Assessments Branch (IAB).

2. [Redacted] will testify on his responsibilities which include the assessment of...

3. [Redacted] will testify on the Department of National Resources’ (NRCan) classified briefings for energy and utilities sector stakeholders mentioned in the complaint letter. [Redacted] the Energy Infrastructure...
- Preparing Threat and Risk Assessments (TRAs).
- Providing outreach and education to GoC consumers.

4. [Redacted] will testify on the different type of IAB intelligence publications that are prepared and whom they may be disseminated to.

5. [Redacted] will further testify that since December 31, 2009, he has prepared several intelligence products and briefings on the issue of domestic extremism and more specifically [Redacted] will also be testifying as to specific IAB products prepared after December 31, 2009 that [Redacted]

6. [Redacted] will also provide the Committee with an overview of the work IAB does in the area of domain awareness. Domain awareness is done in part to ascertain potential triggers and flashpoints, and in part to ensure that CSIS is aware of what is happening should a threat arise. On this issue, [Redacted] will refer the Committee to the study conducted by the Committee entitled CSIS Activities Related to Domestic Investigations and Emerging Threats.

7. [Redacted] will further provide a sample of briefings that he has delivered to various stakeholders (private and public sector) on the issues of domestic extremism.

8. On the issue of the delivery of briefings to the private sector, [Redacted] will also be referring the Committee to a review conducted by the Committee in 2011 entitled Review of CSIS’s Private Sector Relationships.

9. Finally [Redacted] will provide information relating to his participation to the Department of National Resources’ (NRCan)-classified briefings for energy and utilities sector stakeholders which are mentioned in the complaint letter.

10. In addition to the evidence described above, [Redacted] will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may respond to the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.
11. In giving his evidence to the Committee, [REDACTED] will refer to documents included in the Service's classified books of documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to his attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.

Per: Stéphanie Dion
Department of Justice Canada
National Security Litigation & Advisory Group
P.O. Box 8127, Station T
Ottawa, Ontario, K1G 3H6

Tel: 613-842-1356
Fax: 613-842-1345

Counsel for the Respondent
4. As former Chief [REDACTED] will testify that she has an overall knowledge of the Service investigations that were ongoing while she was in that position, she will also testify to have reviewed the list of targets under the domestic threat certificates that have been the subject of an investigation within that unit since December 31, 2009.

5. [REDACTED] will provide information on the individuals, groups, organizations or events that were and are targeted under these certificates.

6. [REDACTED] will provide explanation on some occurrences in opposition to the Northern Gateway Pipeline project.

7. [REDACTED] will also testify on several Service policies, including policies that provide guidance on issues of lawful advocacy, protest and dissent.

8. In addition to the evidence described above, [REDACTED] will provide such further and additional testimony and documentary evidence as may respond to the allegations set out in this complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

9. In giving her evidence to the Committee [REDACTED] will refer to documents included in the Service’s classified books of documents, as well as any additional relevant documents which may come to her attention before or during the hearing of this complaint.

Per: Stéphanie Dion  
Department of Justice Canada  
National Security Litigation & Advisory Group  
P.O. Box 8127, Station T  
Ottawa, Ontario, K1G 3H6  
Tel: 613-842-1356  
Fax: 613-842-1345  
Counsel for the Respondent
SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION Complainant

and

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE Respondent

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF

1. [Redacted] began her career at the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS or the Service) as an Intelligence Officer (IO) in 2001. She currently holds the position of Executive Assistant to the Assistant-Director of Operations (ADO) at Headquarters (HQ). Between November 2013 and January 2015, [Redacted] was Chief of the

2. [Redacted] will testify on the role of the [Redacted] which is responsible for managing the collection programs directed at domestic extremism.

3. [Redacted] will testify on the certificates under which domestic threats were being and are being investigated.
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Jan 28 2016

(Signature)

3 witnesses

Start @ 9:35 am

Exhibits entered
CSIS 8A-Vol 1a CSIS 8A-Vol 1a
3A-Vol 1a
4A-Vol 1c
5A-Vol 2
6A-Vol 3
7A-Vol 4
8A-Vol 5

1st witness @ 9:55 am

Exhibit CSIS 8A

(Handwritten notes)

2nd witness discussed how they prior to hearing
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IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Jan 28, 2016

SIRC File # 1500-481
SIRC Case # 144

Page 7 of

Focus of investigation has to be
founded on threat not ...

"Page 73: Dian at 5:50. SIC will be
quoted before mass from ..."
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCC CN before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 44 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Jan 25, 2006

F/U Time Party

CSIS mandate is to protect individual CAN. citizens whether their in private sectors or not.
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCUA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: Jan 25 - 2010

F/U Time Party
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IN THE
MATTER of a complaint filed by C.C. A.
before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to
section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: 28-27

SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

PROTECTED
SECRET
TOP SECRET
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IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCCLA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23.

Date: Jan 26, 2016

SIRC File # 181

SIRC Case # 1416
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IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by BCLA before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 8 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F/U</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Dato:** [Date]

**IN THE MATTER** of a complaint filed by **BCCLA** before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to section 3 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23.

---

**SIRC File #**

**SIRC Case #**

---

Page 8 of ___
end of witness 3:30 pm

Break 3:30 pm - 3:50 pm

end of witness 3:50 pm

Exhibit entered
CSIS 9A - warrants

*sent to us by mail on Feb 2 as part of undertaking
IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by [REDACTED]
before SIRC
pursuant to section 41 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: March 22-2014
Time: 1:10 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presiding Member</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIRC’s Senior Counsel</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIRC’s Registrar</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stenographer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSIS Counsel</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSIS Counsel</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>In Camera</th>
<th>Ex Porte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IN THE MATTER of a complaint filed by

before the Security Intelligence Review Committee pursuant to

section 4 of the CSIS Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-23

Date: March 22, 2014

SiRC File # 4181

SiRC Case #

Page 1 of

Ex parte Doug Z.

witness

to dropped BDD (gpg, nsa, etc)

Sent time at 4:40 pm

 Summon of witness CSIS

Rt. Reps as head of CSIS in BC from 2010-2013

Spewahed at a lot of the allegedly target groups

the law & principel (CSIS) don't allow them to investigate

9:35 pm Kevin Luskennell

Helped him in the dinner waste C3

Transcript 133, minutes Aug 13

Writs from Gormelle 9:35 pm
March 14, 2016

BY HAND

Ms. Shayna Stawicki
Registrar
Security Intelligence Review Committee
Jackson Building
122 Bank Street, 4th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5N6

Dear Ms. Stawicki:

RE:  *BCCLA – Complaint against CSIS Pursuant to Section 41 of the CSIS Act*

Your File 1590-481

This is further to your correspondence of March 2nd, 2016, setting out the timelines for the above-mentioned matter.

Please find enclosed the summary of anticipated evidence of [REDACTED].

Should you require further information, please contact the undersigned at (613) 842-1356.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stephanie Dion
Counsel

Encl.

cc:  ER&L

[REDACTED] 51000-677

Canada
SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

BETWEEN:

BRITISH COLUMBIA CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION  
Complainant

- and -

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE  
Respondent

SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED EVIDENCE OF [REDACTED]

1. [REDACTED] will be testifying upon the Committee's request to hear testimony from an investigator in the British Columbia Region (BCR) for the years relevant to this complaint.

2. [REDACTED] began his career at the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS or the Service) as an Intelligence Officer (IO) in [REDACTED]. He currently holds the position of Head of the [REDACTED] in BCR. The unit is responsible for conducting interviews, [REDACTED] occupied various positions within the BCR between 1998-2004 and 2008 to present. More specifically, between 2010 and 2013, [REDACTED] was the supervisor for the Unit responsible for [REDACTED].

3. [REDACTED] will testify that [REDACTED]
4. [Redacted] will provide such further and additional testimony and
documentary evidence as may respond to the allegations set out in this
complaint or as may be requested by the Committee.

5. In giving his evidence to the Committee, [Redacted] will refer to documents
included in the Service's classified books of documents, as well as any
additional relevant documents which may come to his attention before or
during the hearing of this complaint.

[Signature]

Per: Stéphanie Dion
Department of Justice Canada
National Security Litigation &
Advisory Group
P.O. Box 8127, Station T
Ottawa, Ontario, K1G 3H6

Tel: 613-842-1356
Fax: 613-842-1345

Counsel for the Respondent
December 4, 2015

BY HAND

Ms. Shayna Stawicki
Registrar
Security Intelligence Review Committee
Jackson Building
122 Bank Street, 4th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5N6

Dear Ms. Stawicki:

RE:  BCCLA – Complaint against CSIS Pursuant to Section 41 of the CSIS Act
Your File 1500-481

This is further to Ms. Bowers correspondence of November 30, 2015, confirming the deadline for the production of the Service’s Books of Documents for the January ex parte hearing in the above-mentioned matter.

Please find enclosed the Service’s Books of Documents:

- Volumes 1A, 1B and 1C: contain all BRS reporting found in

These volumes are provided for the Committee’s ease of reference in the conduct of its investigation. The Service does not intend on relying on these volumes for the purpose of the hearing. The documents that will be relied upon by the Service’s witnesses are found at volumes 2 and 3.

- Volume 2 contains Ministerial Direction on Intelligence Priorities, Directional Statements, operational reporting, targeting information, and Service policies.

Canada
Volume 3 contains documentation in relation to exchanges with the National Energy Board and the private sector; it includes a sampling of Intelligence Assessments Branch (IAB) products, briefings and information relating to the NRCan classified briefings mentioned in the complaint letter.

Please note that an additional book containing sensitive information is also being prepared in preparation for the hearing. It will be stored in our offices and will be available for the Committee's consultation as per the usual practice.

Should you require further information, please contact the undersigned at (613) 842-1356.

Sincerely,

Stéphanie Dion
Counsel

cc: ER&L

51000-677
TAB
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TAB 5