

Reply to the Attention of: Robin Junger
Direct Line: 778.329.7523
Email Address: robin.junger@mcmillan.ca
Our File No.: 298105
Date: May 10, 2023

EMAIL AND COURIER

The Honourable Josie Osborne
Room 325, Parliament Buildings
Victoria, BC V8V 1X4
EMPR.minister@gov.bc.ca /
EMLI.minister@gov.bc.ca

Dear Minister,

Re: **Taranis Resources Inc. permitting delay**

We are counsel for Taranis Resources Inc. ("**Taranis**") and have been provided a copy of the Lower Kootenay Band of the Ktunaxa Nation (the "**Ktunaxa Nation**") letter to you dated March 17, 2023 (the "**Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter**"), regarding the Ktunaxa Nation's lack of support for the Thor Project notice of work permit application submitted on August 31, 2022 (the "**Notice of Work Application**"). If you have legal counsel in respect of this matter, we ask that you so advise us and refer this letter to your counsel.

Taranis offers the following comments in response to the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter:

- Taranis has been issued a number of notices of work for the Thor Project, two of which are currently active. It also holds 27 Crown Grants that carry legal mineral title, many of which also carry surface title. Throughout Taranis' ownership of such notices of work and Crown Grants, it has engaged in diligent and meaningful consultation with Indigenous groups, and has developed management plans that address the types of concerns noted in the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter.
- The Ktunaxa Nation's opposition to the present Notice of Work Application is not itself a basis upon which the Crown can deny or unduly delay issuing the corresponding notice of work permit (the "**Notice of Work Permit**"). As the Supreme Court of Canada stated in *Haida Nation v British Columbia*, 2004 SCC 73 ("*Haida*"):

[48] This process does not give Aboriginal groups a veto over what can be done with land.... Rather, what is required is a process of balancing interests, of give and take.

Courts have repeatedly confirmed this principle. For example:

[83] ...[S]. 35 does not give unsatisfied claimants a veto over development. Where adequate consultation has occurred, a development may proceed without the consent of an Indigenous group. (*Ktunaxa Nation v British Columbia (Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations)*, 2017 SCC 54 (“*Ktunaxa*”))

[29] An important component of the duty to consult is a requirement that good faith be shown by both the Crown and the Aboriginal people in question... Both parties must take a reasonable and fair approach in their dealings. The duty does not require that an agreement be reached, nor does it give Aboriginal peoples a veto... (*Behn v Moulton Contracting Ltd*, 2013 SCC 26)

[65] “[T]he focus ... is not on the outcome, but on the process of consultation and accommodation”.... The duty to consult and accommodate does not afford First Nations a “veto” over the proposed activity... (*Prophet River First Nation v British Columbia (Minister of the Environment)*, 2017 BCCA 58, citing *Haida* at para 63)

[45] Accommodation is ultimately a process of seeking compromise and balancing competing societal interests with Aboriginal and treaty rights – the process does not give the impacted First Nation a veto, and there is no duty to reach an agreement... (*Redmond v British Columbia (Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development)*, 2020 BCSC 561).

[100] The duty to consult and accommodate does not mean that First Nations possess a veto over governmental decision making (*Adams Lake Indian Band v British Columbia (Minister of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations)*, 2013 BCSC 877).

- The Ktunaxa Nation’s sweeping suggestion that the Notice of Work Permit would infringe upon its rights is made without any basis or supporting information as to how the Notice of Work Permit, as contemplated, could cause such an impact. As courts have repeatedly stated, it is incumbent upon Indigenous groups to express concerns about potential impacts with sufficient detail and specificity. For example, in *Ktunaxa*, the Supreme Court of Canada stated:

[80] The duty to consult and, if appropriate, accommodate the Aboriginal interest is a two-way street. The obligations on the Crown are to provide notice and information on the project, and to consult with the Aboriginal group about its concerns. The obligations on the Aboriginal group include: defining the elements of the claim with clarity...; not frustrating the Crown’s reasonable good faith attempts; and not taking unreasonable positions to

thwart the Crown from making decisions or acting where, despite meaningful consultation, agreement is not reached....

- The Crown's duty to consult does not require or guarantee that an Indigenous group's concerns will be fully addressed. As the Supreme Court of Canada further stated in *Ktunaxa*:

[114] The s. 35 right to consultation and accommodation is a right to a process, not a right to a particular outcome... While the goal of the process is reconciliation of the Aboriginal and state interest, in some cases this may not be possible. The process is one of "give and take", and outcomes are not guaranteed.

Our client advises that Taranis filed its Notice of Work Application over seven months ago and it has been subject to numerous delays, as outlined in Appendix A. It is now time for the Crown to bring an end to this process and issue the Notice of Work Permit. As Justice Binnie stated in the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Beckman v Little Salmon/Carmacks First Nation*, 2010 SCC 53 "[s]omebody has to bring consultation to an end and to weigh up the respective interests..." [emphasis in original]

If the Crown takes issue with any of the above analysis or believes that there is any basis to require further consultation, we respectfully ask that it set out its position in sufficient detail and the reason(s) for it. The Crown must not seek to avoid these important legal issues merely by citing broad statements of principle related to reconciliation. To the contrary, the Crown's proper discharge of the legal duty to consult – using the *Haida* test and related balancing of interests – is an inherent part of reconciliation. As the Supreme Court of Canada stated in *Haida*, "... the duty to consult and accommodate is part of a process of fair dealing and reconciliation..."

In this regard, we note that last week, on May 4, 2023, you issued a statement on Mining Month that included the following statement:

First Nations have a crucial role in British Columbia's mining sector. Our approach to natural-resource development must be done in collaboration and partnership **with the rightful owners of the land.**¹ [emphasis added]

It is difficult to reconcile the reference to First Nations being "the rightful owners of the land" with the Crown grants held by our client, the *Mineral Tenure Act*, the *Mines Act*, existing Indigenous rights jurisprudence or the Oath taken by you as a member of the Executive Council when assuming your ministerial duties. As you know, in that Oath you affirmed that you "will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen of Canada, Her Heirs

¹ Energy, Mines and Low Carbon Innovation, News Release, "Ministers statement on Mining Month 2023" (4 May 2023), online: <https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2023EMLI0027-000651>.

and Successors, according to Law² and that you will “serve Her Majesty duly and faithfully, and to the best of [your] ability fulfill the responsibilities and trust granted to [you] as a Member of the Executive Council of British Columbia.”³ Those responsibilities include responsibility for the *Mines Act*, the *Mineral Tenure Act* and two dozen other laws.⁴

Therefore, we respectfully request that you confirm that your statement on May 4, 2023 does not reflect the Crown’s actual position on the ownership of lands and related mineral rights in British Columbia where Aboriginal title has yet to be proven, and that you specify what steps will be taken to ensure none of the staff or statutory decision-makers within your ministry will be improperly influenced by it. If, on the other hand, the Crown stands by that statement, we respectfully ask that you clarify what policy guidance your staff has received or will receive in respect of that view as they complete their statutory decision-making duties.

Finally, we wish to put the Crown on notice that these undue delays have had – and continue to have – adverse financial impacts on Taranis. While it is Taranis’ genuine hope that litigation against the Crown is not required in this matter, it has obligations to its shareholders and investors that cannot be ignored. In this regard, we encourage you to seek a briefing on the Office of the Ombudsperson’s involvement with Taranis’ previous 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit application, as this is unfortunately not the first time our client has been treated unfairly by EMLI in the face of competing Ktunaxa Nation interests.

Yours truly,



Robin Junger*
*Law Corporation

Cc: Client

² This Oath is mandated by the *Constitution Act*, RSBC 1996, c 66, s 24(1); see “Josie Osborne, “Oath for Member of the Executive Council” (25 February 2022), online: https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/government/ministries-organizations/premier-cabinet-mlas/minister-oath/oath_osborne.pdf [Josie Osborne Oath].

³ See *Josie Osborne Oath*, *supra* note 2.

⁴ “Acts/Ministers’ Responsibilities – Listed by Minister”, online: <https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/amr/amr/1352408671>.

APPENDIX "A"

Chronology of Events

Chronology of Relevant Events Prior to the Notice of Work Application	
Date	Description
October 15, 2018	Taranis submitted a 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit application to the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources (" MEMPR ") (as it was then known).
October 2019 – June 25, 2020	In October 2019, John Gardiner was informed by Engineers and Geoscientists BC that a member of EMLI's Technical Review Committee (Tara Cadeau) had filed a Professional Complaint against him, without any prior discussion with Mr. Gardiner. This complaint led to an eight-month delay in EMLI's review of the 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit application. On June 25, 2020, Mr. Gardiner received a letter from Engineers and Geoscientists BC absolving him of any wrongdoing. However, the process associated with the professional review caused substantial delays to permitting.
December 10, 2019	<p>As part of the 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit application, Taranis commissioned a third party, Ursus Heritage Consulting, to undertake an archaeological overview assessment of the Thor Project and the surrounding area as part of its 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit application.</p> <p>This assessment noted that there were seven areas of high archaeological potential identified in the study area, but that each site was located more than one kilometer away from proposed drilling areas. The assessment also identified that there were no roads that access those sites that will be utilized for drilling, so accidental interference was minimal.</p>
January 21, 2020	After further delays and procedural inconsistencies for the 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit application, Taranis filed a complaint with the B.C. Office of the Ombudsperson. After review, the B.C. Office of the Ombudsperson launched an investigation into Taranis' complaint.
March 12, 2020	Taranis filed a <i>Joint Environmental Management Act and Mines Act</i> (" JEMA ") application for the Thor Project with the Chief Permitting Officer of EMLI in the Cranbrook office. This application included a Mine Plan and a Reclamation Program, including numerous third party reports pertaining to the application, as required under the JEMA format.
June 26, 2020	<p>Heather Wiltse, Ombudsperson Officer of the B.C. Office of the Ombudsperson, wrote to Taranis following Taranis' complaint about the MEMPR.</p> <p>Ms. Wiltse stated that, due to the Ombudsperson's Office's investigation, MEMPR agreed to resolve Taranis' complaint by taking a number of steps including, among other things:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) Acknowledging that Taranis' Project is in Technical Review;</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) Providing Taranis with an appropriate technical contact to provide ongoing feedback, as required, to Taranis' engineer to support finalization of the Final Site Plan. Further, MEMPR will seek to complete the process within a specified timeframe; (c) Setting up a MDRC meeting to bring committee members together to update the Project information ahead of finalization, and launching the MDRC meeting as soon as possible; (d) Sending the current proposed Reclamation Plan for feedback and comments; (e) Presenting the Sealed Site Plan to MDRC for comments by August 31, 2020 and, if this timeline is not met, a new reasonable timeframe; (f) Replacing the committee member E.M. with an alternate geotechnical specialist committee member and requiring review and approval of all written correspondence or Technical Review comments provided by T.C.; (g) Finalizing the draft policy and information bulletin: Permitting Custom and Pilot Mill Operations and publishing it to MEMPR's website; and (h) Finalizing the new Fact Sheet for bulk samples and publishing it to MEMPR's website. <p>The Project Chair, Kathie Wagar, continued the permit's Technical Review. However, one of the technical reviewers, Ms. Cadeau, provided commentary that the permit was only in pre-screening and not the Technical Review stage, as Ms. Wiltse acknowledged in her letter. Ms. Wiltse's letter provided that all of Ms. Cadeau's ongoing participation in the Technical Review was subject to review by her supervisors. Mr. Gardiner pointed out to the Project Chair that Ms. Cadeau's written comments were in violation of Ms. Wiltse's letter and demanded that Ms. Cadeau be removed from the Technical Review Committee.</p>
<p>February 2021</p>	<p>Taranis responded to Technical Reviewer's comments concerning the 10,000 bulk sample permit application including, among other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) How surface runoff and infiltration through the Coarse Reject Storage Facility will be collected and managed; (b) A design for the encapsulation of the Coarse Reject Storage Facility at Closure; (c) A geochemical characterization for all materials stored at the Project site; (d) A detailed Metal Leaching, Acid Rock Drainage Management Plan; (e) Details on the methods and assumptions of the HydroCAD calculation in the Water Management Plan; (f) Water quality predictions for discharge water quality in the influent, effluent and receiving environment; (g) A detailed design of the water treatment facility;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (h) Information on the Coarse Reject Storage Facility base liner; (i) Clarification on certain points in the Knight Piesold report; (j) A summary of the impact that the Project will have on the wider site and environment; (k) Background information on the True Fissure Creek; (l) A Construction Environmental Management Plan; (m) A Reclamation and Closure Plan; (n) Further detail on catchments A3 and A5 and potential contaminants in those catchments; (o) Stormwater runoff collection, treatment and potential contaminants of concern; (p) Inflow runoff rates; (q) Pumping capacity; (r) Water discharge testing and treatment; (s) Flow rates; (t) Water treatment plant usage; (u) Total catchment area; (v) If non-metallic ore will be processed on the Project site; (w) Where coarse rejects will be deposited; and (x) Effluent amounts.
<p>July 21, 2021</p>	<p>EMLI issued a <i>Mines Act</i> permit to Taranis for the Thor Project (pertaining to the 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit). The <i>Mines Act</i> permit (originally issued June 25, 2007) was amended on July 21, 2021 to allow for the bulk sample permit.</p> <p>This permit authorized certain mining activities as outlined in the Mine Plan and Reclamation Program applied for in March 12, 2020, and outlined various requirements that Taranis was required to meet, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) A Mine emergency Response Plan; (b) Reporting; (c) Site stability; (d) Design; (e) Environmental protection; (f) Invasive plant species; (g) Erosion and sediment control; (h) Metal leaching and acid rock drainage; (i) Mountain caribou; (j) Reclamation security; (k) Reclamation obligations; (l) Reclamation monitoring; and (m) Re-vegetation.
<p>March 16, 2022</p>	<p>Taranis wrote a letter to the Honourable Murray Rankin, Minister of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation to proactively assess the degree of uncertainty of legal title to Taranis' Crown Grants at the Thor Project in light of the Crown's treaty negotiations with the Ktunaxa Nation.</p>
<p>April 12, 2022</p>	<p>Ashley Bodnar, Chief Negotiator, responded to Taranis' letter dated March 16, 2022.</p>

	<p>Ms. Bodnar identified that BC, Canada and the Ktunaxa Nation signed the <i>Core Treaty and Rights Recognition Memorandum of Understanding</i> (the “MOU”) to transition from Stage 4 to Stage 5 of the BC treaty process. Ms. Bodnar also stated that the “Ktunaxa Lands” in the MOU relate to treaty lands that the Ktunaxa Nation will own in fee simple, none of which are in the Trout Lake area.</p> <p>Ms. Bodnar stated that the Province will continue to honour any pre-existing tenures, whether surface or subsurface, or negotiate with a willing vendor the transfer of fee-simple rights or Crown tenures held by third parties. She also noted that tenures or fee-simple interests that continue on the effective date of a treaty are listed in an appendix to that treaty.</p>
May 3, 2022	As part of its ongoing exploration efforts on the Thor Project, Taranis completed an airborne geophysical survey of its mining property and identified a “porphyry-style” target that required construction of additional drill roads and accompanying drill sites to test the new target. This work is the basis for the currently outstanding Notice of Work Permit.
August 15, 2022	The Association for Mineral Exploration British Columbia announced that it was working closely with EMLI on piloting a notice of work intake batching process for new applications to expedite notice of work applications within one month of submission.
August 31, 2022	<p>Taranis submitted the present Notice of Work Application that is the subject of the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter to EMLI Cranbrook, which included a detailed plan for construction of drill roads and a drill site, as well as other items pertaining to exploration drilling for the porphyry target discovered in May 2022.</p> <p>The entire area contemplated by the Notice of Work Application fell within mineral tenures 100% owned by Taranis, and much of the exploration activity fell within the 27 contiguous Crown Grants owned by Taranis.</p>
Chronology of Events Following the Notice of Work Application	
November 11, 2022	<p>After winding down its 2022 field exploration at the Thor Project in late October 2022, Taranis immediately contacted EMLI Cranbrook to inquire why the Notice of Work Application had not yet been evaluated as per the batching schedule that had been announced on August 15, 2022, which was specifically made to address industry concerns with province-wide delays associated with notice of work permit applications.</p> <p>Taranis stated in a phone call with Amanda Koshlay (a Mine Inspector at EMLI Cranbrook) that, according to the batching schedule, the Notice of Work Application should have been reviewed before the end of September. Taranis flagged that this EMLI delay jeopardized Taranis’ exploration operations, could impact its exploration activities, and have detrimental impact to its shareholders.</p>

	<p>Ms. Koshlay responded via phone call, three months after the Notice of Work Application was received by EMLI Cranbrook, verbally apologizing for not processing the Notice of Work Application in a timely fashion, but acknowledged that it was important to do so.</p>
December 1, 2022	<p>EMLI set up a video call to discuss issues with advancing the Notice of Work Application. Ms. Wagar, Ms. Koshlay, Mr. Gardiner and Johnathon Buchanan, Vice President of Policy and Advocacy at the Association for Mineral Exploration, attended.</p> <p>Mr. Buchanan, who was involved in the implementation of the batching schedule with EMLI, felt it was important to be involved in this discussion, as it was an immediate failure of the implementation of the batching process. There was considerable discussion concerning EMLI's use of an Issues Tracker for the Notice of Work Application, as this format is typically only used for complex permitting issues such as commercial mine applications.</p> <p>Taranis questioned the need of such complex permitting formats, but reluctantly agreed to its use, hoping that it would expedite the Notice of Work Application.</p> <p>Mr. Buchanan remarked in a follow-up phone call that a number of the concerns raised by EMLI about the Notice of Work Application were not relevant, and were compliance or enforcement issues pertaining to old notices of work on the Thor Project. EMLI removed these items upon Taranis' request.</p>
December 12 – 19, 2022	<p>Taranis addressed all issues identified in the Issues Tracker by EMLI.</p>
December 13, 2022	<p>Taranis was asked to comment on water rights related to the Thor Project. Taranis supplied EMLI with notarized copies of Crown Grant certificates that showed ownership of water rights for the purposes of mining.</p> <p>Taranis reviewed water usage calculations, revised them and provided them to Ms. Koshlay. Taranis had previously conducted extensive water-flow metering from Fissure Creek and Broadview Creek, and identified its ownership of water rights under two Crown Grants that it owned.</p>
January 11, 2023	<p>EMLI notified Taranis that the Notice of Work Application was perfected and finalized, and had been sent to other government resource agencies and Indigenous groups for consultation.</p>
March 13, 2023	<p>EMLI emailed Taranis and stated that consultation on the Thor Project was quiet, but that they were expecting comments from the Ktunaxa Nation.</p> <p>EMLI provided comments from the Shuswap Band to Taranis at this time, which were minimal and were addressed by Taranis in an email to Ms. Koshlay. Mr. Gardiner asked when EMLI expected to hear back from the Ktunaxa Nation, as Taranis had a financing arranged to</p>

	undertake exploration on the Thor Project that could not be closed until the Notice of Work Permit for exploration drilling was issued.
March 17, 2023	The Ktunaxa Nation sent a letter dated March 17, 2023 to EMLI. This letter was not addressed to Taranis, nor was it provided to Taranis at this time.
March 21, 2023	Two months after EMLI sent the Notice of Work Application to Indigenous groups for consultation, the Okanagan Indian Band sent a letter to EMLI and Taranis, referencing an invoice dated January 13, 2023 to conduct a preliminary review of the Notice of Work Application and to state that such invoice had not been paid. Taranis had not seen this invoice before receiving the Okanagan Indian Band's letter.
March 22, 2023	<p>The Okanagan Indian Band sent a further letter to EMLI and Taranis that was dated March 2, 2023, requesting a \$315 "processing fee" to review the Notice of Work Application.</p> <p>Taranis questioned the appropriateness of paying a fee for review of a Notice of Work Application, but agreed to pay the "processing fee" to the Okanagan Indian Band to expedite its review of the Notice of Work Application.</p> <p>However, Taranis has not received any updates pertaining to the Okanagan Indian Band's review of the Notice of Work Application from EMLI nor the Okanagan Indian Band, and the status of the review remains unknown.</p>
March 23, 2023	<p>Ms. Koshlay contacted Taranis, informing Taranis that a meeting between the Ktunaxa Nation Council and the Yagan Nu?kiy Council (planned for March 23, 2023) had been rescheduled for April 27, 2023. EMLI stated that it would keep Taranis informed and better understand what its concerns were.</p> <p>EMLI had the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter in their possession for one week at this time, but had not informed Taranis of its existence.</p>
March 31, 2023	Taranis emailed Ms. Wagar to discuss the status of its request to obtain a two-year extension to its five-year 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit and to inquire whether this request was referred to First Nations for consultation.
April 1, 2023	<p>Ms. Wagar responded to Taranis' March 31, 2023 email and stated that Mr. Neuvonen will look into Taranis' question and respond.</p> <p>Taranis then followed up with Mr. Neuvonen, confirming that he would follow up with the company.</p>
April 1, 2023	<p>Taranis became aware of the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter 16 days after EMLI had received the letter and asked Mr. Neuvonen to provide a copy.</p> <p>Ms. Wagar responded to the email, stating that she will make sure that Mr. Neuvonen had a copy of the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter and that Ms. Wagar would respond to the letter next week. Taranis</p>

	<p>has no knowledge of any response by Ms. Wagar to the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter.</p> <p>Taranis expressed the need to respond to any concerns raised by the Ktunaxa Nation immediately, as the Notice of Work Permit's status had important commercial implications for the company. Taranis also stated that delay with the Notice of Work Application consultation was a serious concern to the company.</p> <p>Taranis also asked for clarification on the First Nation consultation status of its formal request for a two-year extension of its 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit that had been presented to EMLI in August 2022.</p> <p>Taranis expressly noted that, given the submission date of the Notice of Work Application, EMLI's repeated delays and the delays associated with consultation, it had urgency for getting the Notice of Work Application decision completed, and stated that EMLI needed to accelerate the finalization of the application decision, as such a decision impacts Taranis' ability to operate as an exploration company in British Columbia.</p>
April 3, 2023	<p>Taranis had a phone call with Mr. Neuvonen in which Mr. Neuvonen told Taranis that the Ktunaxa Nation do not approve of exploration at the Thor Project because they would never approve a mine.</p>
April 3, 2023	<p>Taranis contacted Mr. Neuvonen again, requesting that EMLI immediately provide the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter to Taranis, noting that such a letter may be extremely material to Taranis.</p> <p>Taranis also attached a letter sent to it on April 12, 2022 from the Office of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation. Taranis asked how EMLI could justify non-issuance or delay of the five-year Multi-Year Area-Based permit application when the letter noted that the "Ktunaxa Lands" in the MOU do not include any lands in the Trout Lake area.</p> <p>Taranis also noted that shareholders would need to be notified on the impact of this matter, depending on what was in the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter.</p>
April 3, 2023	<p>Mr. Neuvonen responded, stating that he "reached out to the First Nation to request to share the letter provided and hope to get a response soon in order for Taranis to understand the scope of the concerns."</p> <p>Mr. Neuvonen stated that he would provide Taranis with an update once they heard back from the First Nation.</p>
April 6, 2023	<p>Mr. Neuvonen provided the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter to Taranis, 20 days after the Ktunaxa had sent it to EMLI via email.</p> <p>Taranis had a phone call with Mr. Neuvonen, whereby Taranis raised concerns with the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter. Taranis indicated</p>

	<p>that it had previously developed and filed policies to address concerns raised in the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter.</p> <p>Mr. Neuvonen acknowledged that the Ktunaxa Nation also had the two-year extension amendment for the 10,000 tonne bulk sample permit. Mr. Neuvonen noted that it is strange that the Ktunaxa Nation was not aware of what has been done at the Thor Project, and that all of their concerns raised in the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter had previously been addressed by EMLI and Taranis. Mr. Neuvonen also stated that the Ktunaxa Nation had Taranis' management plans relevant to the various issues raised in the Ktunaxa Nation Objection Letter.</p>
<p>May 2023</p>	<p>EMLI has not provided any updates concerning the Notice of Work Application. The impact of this direct and measurable on Taranis, as many of its shareholders have become upset at the lack of information.</p> <p>Taranis has been repeatedly contacted by its shareholders, consultants and other interested participants in financing the 2023 exploration activities and has been unable to provide updates regarding either of these permitting activities.</p>