

Introduction and Summary

The integrated regulatory system in the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA) is administered by the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC), Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB or Board), and the Nunavut Water Board (NWB). The NPC, NIRB, and NWB are responsible for the management and/or regulation of land use, development impacts, and inland waters, respectively. The NIRB is responsible for conducting impact assessments with screening, review, and monitoring functions within the NSA and the Outer Land Fast Ice Zone off of the eastern coast of Baffin Island.

The NIRB's submission to the Expert Panel provides background on Nunavut's regulatory system and the NIRB's environmental assessment process at both the screening and review levels, including the role of parties to the process. In reviewing the Expert Panel's guidelines for submissions and associated themes, the NIRB has focused its submission on transboundary considerations and coordination, engagement, and scope of the assessment. Process specific information is provided for each category followed by a list of best practices utilized by the NIRB as relates to:

- coordination and engagement with transboundary parties;
- public engagement;
- incorporating Inuit Qaujimaningit and other types of traditional knowledge into the decision making process; and
- determination of scope.

Overview of the regulatory process in Nunavut

Nunavut is unique amongst Canadian jurisdictions: the Agreement Between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement; previously referred to as the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement)¹ established an integrated resource management system for land use planning, impact assessment, and land and water licensing under a single land claim. The integrated regulatory system in Nunavut is further defined by the *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act* and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* (NuPPAA). Required coordination and cooperation amongst the three (3) institutions of public government (IPGs) – the NPC, NIRB, and NWB – is a unique feature of the Nunavut Agreement, while the allowances for potential coordination of territorial and federal governments with adjacent jurisdictions is an acknowledgement to the many neighbours of the NSA. The NPC, NIRB, and NWB are responsible for the management and/or regulation of land use, development impacts, and inland waters, respectively.

The NPC is responsible for the development, implementation, and monitoring of land use plans that guide and direct resource use and development within the NSA. There are currently two (2) approved land use plans in Nunavut: the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan (2000) and the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan (2000). The NPC is presently developing a territory-wide land use plan which would replace the North Baffin and Keewatin regional land use plans when finalized. Pursuant to the NuPPAA, a project proposal must first be submitted to the NPC to determine:

¹ Eetoolook, J., Acting President, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Letter to NIRB Re: Changes to terminology related to the Agreement Between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada. November 24, 2016.

- Whether a project proposal located within a region with an approved land use plan conforms to the applicable land use plan (i.e., conformity determination); and
- Whether a project proposal located both within and outside of a region with an approved land use plan should be exempt from NIRB screening.

If the NPC determines that a project is not exempt from the requirement for screening, or that although exempt the potential cumulative impacts that might arise warrant further assessment, the NPC would refer the project proposal to the NIRB for screening along with an accompanying positive conformity determination for any applicable land use plans. The NIRB screening process commences only when the NIRB receives a project proposal from the NPC. The Board is not authorized to screen a project if the NPC has determined that a project is not in conformity with the applicable land use plan(s) and no minor variance or ministerial exemption have been granted.

In 2008, Article 12 of the Nunavut Agreement was amended to include provision 12.12.7, expressly excluding the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (the Act), and any successor legislation replacing the Act, from applying within the NSA. Consequently, the NIRB's jurisdiction as the sole permanent body in Nunavut charged with conducting impact assessment in the NSA and the Outer Land Fast Ice Zone off of the eastern coast of Baffin Island was clearly established.

The NIRB is structured in a co-management fashion: Board members are nominated and appointed by the federal and territorial governments as well as by designated Inuit organizations. The costs of the NIRB are the responsibility of the Government of Canada, through implementation of the Nunavut Agreement. The Board members are responsible for making all determinations, recommendations, and decisions of the NIRB, reporting directly to responsible government Ministers at the conclusion of screening and review assessments. The scope of the Board's jurisdiction is also unique, in that:

- the NIRB's assessment of project proposals involves consideration of both ecosystemic (biophysical) and socio-economic impacts (social and economic);
- the Board conducts impact assessments through a 45 day screening process and through a comprehensive environmental review process, similar to panel reviews in other Canadian jurisdictions; and
- the NIRB has an on-going role with respect to previously assessed projects, as the Board has responsibility for issuing Project Certificates for projects approved following a Review, and establishing monitoring programs that may encompass the full lifecycle for a development.

Territorial and federal regulatory authorities as well as regional Inuit associations provide the Board and other participants in the assessment process with: specialist knowledge and project specific technical advice; background and understanding regarding their respective mandate, jurisdiction and regulatory role; and information on their role in on-going project monitoring and/or enforcement activities following the licensing/permitting stages. Regulatory authorities are expressly prohibited from issuing licence, permit, or other approvals in respect of a proposed project until the assessment of the project has been completed by the NPC and the NIRB, as may be required.

The NWB is responsible for regulating, managing, and monitoring freshwater in Nunavut through the issuance of water licences. The NIRB and the NWB have developed a detailed agreement for coordination of NIRB Reviews with consideration of Type A water licence applications by the NWB

(Detailed Coordinated Process Framework), allowing the NWB licensing process to run concurrently with the NIRB impact assessment process up to potentially holding joint public hearings. This agreement is designed to meet legislated requirements for coordination and to address project specific requests from proponents to proceed in a coordinated manner for greater overall regulatory time savings. This approach is intended to coordinate the NIRB and NWB timelines and information requirements wherever practical to increase efficiencies for reviewers and the public while continuing to respect the information requirements and discrete decision-making of both processes. NWB water licences may not be issued until following the successful conclusion of a NIRB assessment, and following the responsible Minister(s) acceptance of the NIRB's final report.

The NIRB's Screening and Review Processes

The NIRB undertakes screening and review level assessments in accordance with Article 12 of the Nunavut Agreement and sections 86 to 114 of the NuPPAA. During a NIRB Screening, the Board considers the potential for project-induced effects to determine if a more in-depth review level assessment is required. A NIRB Review is initiated if, in the Board's opinion, the project may have significant adverse effects on the ecosystem, significant adverse socio-economic effects, or if there is significant public concern.

To determine the significance of potential project-induced impacts, the Board must take into account the following factors (NuPPAA section 90):

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) the size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts; | g) the frequency and duration of the impacts; |
| b) the ecosystemic sensitivity of that area; | h) the reversibility or irreversibility of the impacts; |
| c) the historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area; | i) the cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out; and |
| d) the size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts; | j) any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts. |
| e) the nature, magnitude and complexity of the impacts; | |
| f) the probability of the impacts occurring; | |

If the Board determines that a review level assessment of a project proposal is required, the responsible Minister(s) has jurisdictional responsibility to determine whether the proposal is to proceed to a NIRB Review, and in such a case, the type of review to be conducted (i.e. NIRB –led Review or Federal Panel-led Review). Reviews conducted by a federal environmental assessment panel are to be undertaken on an 'exceptional basis' only and are reserved for projects involving matters of 'important national interest' (see section 12.4.7 of the Nunavut Agreement); since the coming into force of the Nunavut Agreement, no Federal Panel-led Reviews have been undertaken in Nunavut. A NIRB Review consists of three (3) phases: Scoping and Guidelines Creation, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and Final Environmental Impact Statement. In conducting a review of a project, the NIRB takes into account the following factors (NuPPAA section 103(1)):

- a) the purpose of the project and the need for the project;
- b) whether, and to what extent, the project would protect and enhance the existing and future well-being of the residents and communities of the designated area, taking into account the interests of other Canadians;
- c) whether the project reflects the priorities and values of the residents of the designated area;
- d) the anticipated effects of the environment on the project, including effects associated with natural phenomena, such as meteorological and seismological activity, and climate change;
- e) the anticipated ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts of the project, including those arising from the effects referred to in paragraph (d);
- f) the cumulative ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out;
- g) whether the impacts referred to in paragraphs (e) and (f) would unduly prejudice the ecosystemic integrity of the designated area;
- h) the measures, including those proposed by the Proponent, that should be taken to
- (i) avoid and mitigate adverse ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts, including contingency plans,
- (ii) optimize the benefits of the project, with specific consideration given to expressed community and regional preferences in regard to benefits,
- (iii) compensate persons whose interests are adversely affected by the project, and
- (iv) restore ecosystemic integrity after the permanent closure of the project;
 - i) the significance of the impacts referred to in paragraphs (e) and (f), taking into account the measures referred to in paragraph (h);
 - j) the capacity of renewable resources that are likely to be significantly affected by the project to meet the existing and future needs of the residents of the designated area;
 - k) any monitoring program of the project's ecosystemic and socio-economic impacts that should be established, including one proposed by the Proponent;
 - l) the interests in land and waters that the Proponent has acquired or seeks to acquire;
 - m) the options for carrying out the project that are technically and economically feasible and the anticipated ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts of such options;
 - n) the posting of performance bonds; the particular issues or concerns identified under subsection 96(1); and
 - o) any other matter within the Board's jurisdiction that, in its opinion, should be considered.

When assessing the significance of potential impacts during a NIRB Review, the Board must take into account the factors prescribed in section 90 as well as any traditional or community knowledge provided (NuPPAA section 103(3)). To do so, the Board relies on evidence submitted and presented through both written and oral communications. In accordance with Nunavut Agreement Section 12.2.24(a)(ii), the

Board must “give due regard and weight to the tradition of Inuit oral communication and decision-making”. The NIRB’s Rules of Procedure reflect this standard.

Transboundary Considerations in the NIRB Process

Under both screening and review level assessments, the NIRB considers project proposals to have transboundary implications as a result of two (2) scenarios:

1. A proposed project to be carried out solely within the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA) could potentially result in negative ecosystemic and/or socio-economic impacts outside of the NSA; or
2. Components of a proposed project would be located both within and outside of the NSA.

The NIRB proactively engages with various transboundary groups and organizations that could be potentially impacted by, or interested in, a specific project proposal, including: community members; municipal, territorial, federal, and/or Aboriginal organizations and governments; regulatory authorities; and/or other environmental assessment agencies. Transboundary parties are identified by overlaying a distribution list with known contacts from adjacent jurisdictions with the geographic extent of the project proposal, with consideration for areas of traditional use, as well as providing opportunities for self-identification through the NIRB’s online public registry. Transboundary parties may participate in the NIRB process as: public commenters, intervenors, regulatory authorities, and as agencies undertaking independent processes.

During the periods of direct public consultation, transboundary parties are invited to ask questions and share comments and/or traditional knowledge as well as other types of information pertaining to all aspects of a proposed project. Regulatory authorities are provided with opportunities to ensure their individual requirements would be met as well as to provide ecosystemic, socio-economic, and/or regulatory expertise to the NIRB.

Given the geographic applicability of Article 12 of the Nunavut Agreement, project proposals with components located both within and outside of the NSA and within other jurisdictions are subject to the environmental assessment processes of other authorities as well as the NIRB’s. For such projects, the NIRB has coordinated its process with other applicable environmental assessment processes by cross-referencing each process and respective responsibilities as well as the limits of each jurisdiction (e.g., NIRB Screening: Arctic Fibre Submarine Cable, File No. 13UN045). Any follow-up monitoring functions would be the responsibility of the respective environmental assessment agency and confined to the components, activities, and effects within their respective jurisdiction, unless otherwise agreed upon. The NIRB has also developed Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with several adjacent jurisdictions to guide coordination of transboundary assessments.

Pursuant to Article 12, Part 11 of the Nunavut Agreement and section 159(1) of the NuPPAA, the NIRB may – upon request by the federal government or Designated Inuit Authority, with consent of the federal government – review project proposals to be located outside of the NSA if there is potential for project impacts to result in significant adverse ecosystemic or socio-economic effects within the NSA. As described in Section 12.6.1 of the Nunavut Agreement and section 160 of the NuPPAA, the Minister of Environment may further appoint members of a federal environmental assessment panel or enter into agreement with the NIRB and any other authorities with powers, duties, or functions to undertake a review level assessment

NIRB Best Practices for Coordination

Through multiple and diverse experiences coordinating with transboundary parties, the NIRB has developed best practices with respect to transboundary coordination by analyzing optimal outcomes and lessons learned, including the following:

- a) To ensure relevancy and transparency, project specific distribution lists comprised of regulatory authorities, communities, and organizations include identified transboundary parties.
- b) All parties to an assessment, including transboundary parties, are kept informed of respective assessment activities and NIRB processes, available project-specific information, and opportunities to participate.
- c) All parties to an assessment, including transboundary parties, are provided with multiple opportunities to become involved. The NIRB may hold public meetings in potentially affected communities outside of the NSA and representatives of these communities may be invited to attend public hearings and participate as intervenors and/or in the associated community roundtable. For example, NIRB staff held community information sessions for the proposed Kiggavik Uranium Mine Project (NIRB Review, File No. 09MN003) in the Athabasca Denesuline communities of Wollaston Lake-Hatchet Lake, Black Lake, and Fond du Lac, located in Saskatchewan. Community representatives from these communities were invited to participate in the final hearing for the proposed project as both intervenors and community representatives. In such cases, the NIRB provides simultaneous interpretation for indigenous languages where appropriate, and in addition to standard Nunavut-specific requirements for English, French, Inuktitut and/or Inuinnaqtun.
- d) As mentioned above, the NIRB has entered into memorandums of understanding with various transboundary parties to assist in facilitating and improving communication and coordination. These agreements generally address the exchange and sharing of information and resources between the NIRB and transboundary organizations.
- e) The NIRB is adamant about respecting languages and requests that written submissions by proponents and intervenors include translations of content into applicable languages (at a minimum, into Inuktitut and/or Inuinnaqtun). The NIRB holds itself to this standard and ensures that when communicating with transboundary communities and organizations, the Board translates applicable documents and correspondences into the applicable language and dialect. The NIRB further provides simultaneous interpretation during public meetings and hearings into the language(s) and dialect(s) of both the local and transboundary communities represented.

Engagement

Pursuant to section 103 of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* (NuPPAA) (factors to be considered), “in its review of a project, the Board must take into account any traditional knowledge or community knowledge provided to it”. This definition of traditional knowledge is a narrower definition than the term ‘Inuit Qaujimaningit’ (which is favored by the Board), and may be more temporally limited to traditional ways of life rather than contemporary use and knowledge of the land and social customs and values. However, the NIRB’s by-laws and Rules of Procedure reflect Inuit Qaujimaningit pursuant to the Agreement Between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (the Nunavut Agreement).

The Board incorporates Inuit Qaujimaningit and other types of traditional knowledge shared into its decision making practices. The Board functions in respect of the following 10 Inuit Qaujimaningit principles in both its collection and consideration of traditional knowledge:

- *The input of all parties*, including stakeholders, government and Inuit organizations, the public, industry, Board members and staff.
- *The integrity of the Environmental Impact Assessment Process.*
- *Cooperation and coordination* with external stakeholders to facilitate efficient and timely impact assessments.
- *Transparency and accountability.* The Board and staff are accountable to the people of Nunavut, government, external stakeholders, and industry.
- *Accuracy and consistency* in our predictions, recommendations and decisions, as well as our general communications.
- *Flexibility in our operations and procedures* to meet changing environmental conditions without compromising integrity.
- *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and the use of Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun.*
- *Our Board members and staff*, their knowledge, skills and ability as well as their continued professionalism and dedication to the NIRB and its mandate.
- *Respect for all participants in the NIRB's processes.*
- *Sustainable development* which benefits Nunavummiut.
- *Objectivity*, which leads to fair and objective decision making, free of conflicts of interest.

NIRB Best Practices for Public Engagement

Since its inception, the NIRB has developed multiple best practices with respect to public engagement by analyzing both optimal outcomes and lessons learned, including the following:

- a) The NIRB's internal practices, guidelines, and policies reflect all relevant legislation, particularly the Nunavut Agreement and the NuPPAA.
- b) The NIRB emphasizes early and ongoing engagement of parties to ensure that the public's input is incorporated throughout the assessment process. Proponents are encouraged to engage all potentially affected communities, including transboundary indigenous groups, First nations, organizations, and communities, when developing project proposals as well as undertaking post assessment activities (e.g., sharing research and monitoring results).
- c) The NIRB is currently developing audience-specific technical guides to assist in the meaningful engagement of Inuit throughout the planning and assessment processes of a project.
- d) Through multiple methods, including the use of technology, past interest, and self-determination through the online public registry, the NIRB distributes project specific notifications to a distribution list comprised of regulatory authorities, communities, organizations and individuals. Distribution lists are developed once a NIRB screening or

review level assessment commences and are revised at each phase of a Review and when considerable time has passed between correspondences. The NIRB does not select who should be consulted, rather casts a wide net based on inclusion, allowing individuals to confirm, or decline, participation. Importantly, the NIRB's online public registry allows any interested member of the public to subscribe to receive alerts for all updates associated with ongoing NIRB assessments and monitoring programs.

- e) To ensure transparency, all NIRB produced documents intended for public use are available and accessible on the NIRB's public website and associated public registry. The NIRB's public registry is kept up-to-date and includes information provided by all parties, including the proponent, intervenors, and the public. Only very limited items marked as confidential information are not posted online by the NIRB (e.g. coordinates for sensitive archaeological sites).
- f) Parties are provided with multiple opportunities to share both *written* and *oral* feedback through various types of public consultation:
 - Opportunity to provide written comments occurs at least once during the 45 days screening level assessment process – with additional consultation when warranted – and throughout each of the three (3) phases of review level assessments;
 - Emphasis on oral communication has resulted in the Board focusing on in-person engagement and consultation. During each of the three (3) phases of review level assessments, NIRB staff conducts in-person community consultations in all potentially affected communities within and outside of the NSA;
 - Parties are encouraged to speak to NIRB staff members via telephone and an Inuktitut interpreter is available in-house to interpret when needed. If calling a unilingual speaker, staff will ensure interpretation is available and used.
 - Community representatives of each potentially effected community are invited to attend and participate in a community roundtable at pre-hearing conferences and public/final hearings associated with NIRB reviews. Through a community roundtable, community members are provided the opportunity to question the proponent and registered intervenors as well as to provide feedback to all parties, including the Board.
 - Board members use all evidence provided to them during screening and review level assessments to inform their decision-making;
 - Public hearings are held in one or more of the project-specific potentially impacted communities within the NSA; and
 - Since 2014, the NIRB has been conducting community update sessions associated with monitoring files with ongoing activities (i.e., active operations and/or amendments undergoing NIRB assessment).
- g) In the absence of legislated timelines for NIRB-led events (e.g., holding update meetings with regards to monitoring files), the Board strives to use minimum notification requirements as stipulated in the NuPPAA. Pursuant to the NIRB's Rules of Procedure, notification must be made 25 days prior to public meetings and 60 days prior to public hearings.

- h) The NIRB utilizes multiple types of notification for upcoming meetings and hearings, including: posting advertisements of meetings on its public registry, in local newspapers, and on local radio and cable stations; enlisting local community members to place flyers throughout the communities; and sending notification via email to the project specific distribution list.
- i) The NIRB attempts to hold meetings on days that would not overlap with other community activities, such as Bingo and sports nights, by consulting with local organizations when planning activities. The NIRB further holds afternoon open houses and evening sessions to accommodate community members with varying schedules and to reach a wider audience. Unless in extenuating circumstances, the NIRB does not hold meetings on Sundays.
- j) Pursuant to the principles of Inuit Qaujimaningit, Elders are given priority when speaking during meetings and public hearings. The need for respect of process and of all participants is always stated at the beginning of a public meeting or hearing and exemplified by Board members and staff.
- k) The NIRB directly funds community representatives to attend public hearings and to participate in community roundtables. While Nunavut has yet to realize a formal participant funding program, the NuPPAA does allow for one to be put into place. At present, the Board is able to provide funding for transportation and accommodation costs associated with public hearings, but is unable to provide financial support to the technical review of documents (e.g., to hire consultants).
- l) To support independent and objective decision-making, the NIRB does not participate in processes to select community representatives for pre-hearing conferences and public hearings. Rather, the NIRB invites multiple community organizations and governments to select individuals to represent their respective communities. The NIRB strives to have representation of Elders, harvesters, women, and youth from each potentially affected community and contacts specific community organizations to facilitate this.
- m) When holding regular Board meetings not related to ongoing assessments (which are held in Nunavut communities and rotate throughout the Kivalliq, Kitikmeot, and Qikiqtani regions) the NIRB typically holds open houses to share non-project specific and process-related information with the public.
- n) Whenever possible, the NIRB uses plain language in all written and oral communications. When technical language cannot be substituted, specific terminology is followed by a plain language description.

NIRB Best Practices for Incorporating Inuit Qaujimaningit and other types of Traditional Knowledge into the Decision Making Process

Informed by the relative legislation, the NIRB has developed best practices with respect to incorporating Inuit Qaujimaningit and other types of traditional knowledge into the decision making process, including the following:

- a) Project specific information is required to be available in plain language in all applicable languages (depending on the region and community within the NSA, English and/or Inuktitut, Inuinnaqtun, and/or French and the applicable language and dialect in communities outside of the NSA).

- b) The NIRB focuses on consistency in both the type and method of communications. The NIRB has developed templates and internal procedures to ensure the same type and level of information is included within assessment materials and in NIRB-produced documents. The NIRB also places considerable attention on streamlining the terminology used in its translations. To improve consistency in translations, the NIRB strives to have documents translated by the same interpreters and translators with a focus on regional dialects of the specific audience. The NIRB's Interpreter/Translator works on communicating and streamlining terminology with English-Inuktitut translators across Nunavut.
- c) Project-specific Inuit Qaujimaningit and traditional knowledge as well as public comments shared with the Board are highlighted in each Board Memo and Screening Decision Report for screening projects and hearing decision reports for review and reconsideration projects. All relevant information shared is used to assess the potential project effects and effectiveness of proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. The reports highlight the weighting of evidence by discussing the Inuit Qaujimaningit provided and considered and how it contributed to the respective decision.
- d) The Board makes each decision and recommendation via consensus decision-making, and with respect for the Inuit tradition of oral communication.

Project Scope

Pursuant to section 99(1) of the NuPPAA, the NIRB must determine the scope of a project during a Review and analyze the potential project-induced impacts. Scoping is a process that identifies:

- the proposed physical works and activities associated with a proposed project;
- the potential environmental impacts;
- alternative means of carrying out the project (including technical and technological alternatives);
- potential effects on the sustainability of resources in the project area; and
- mitigation measures that will be analyzed through the environmental assessment process.

Any work or activity that the Board considers sufficiently related to a proposed project must be included within part of the project scope (NuPPAA section 99(1)(a)) and any work or activity identified that is considered insufficiently related to a proposed project as to form part of it must be excluded (NuPPAA section 99(1)(ab)). The NIRB may only make an inclusion or exclusion within the scope of a project proposal after consulting with the Proponent and taking into account any resulting comments (NuPPAA section 99(2)). If the NIRB determines that an inclusion within the scope of the project proposal is required, the Board must not proceed with the review of the project proposal until NPC issues a positive conformity determination and the responsible Minister agrees to the inclusion.

The scoping process involves soliciting input from the proponent and interested parties, including territorial and federal government departments, regional Inuit associations, and members of the public both within and outside of the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA), in order to determine:

- which project components and activities will be included in the review;
- the temporal (time-related) and spatial (physical) boundaries of the project;

- the issues and concerns to be considered in the review, including but not limited to the issues highlighted in the Minister's referral; and
- any other requirements for the assessment of the project.

Determination of Scope

In providing continuity with other best practices, many of which are identified above, the NIRB has developed the following best practices with respect to the determination of project and assessment scope:

- e) The NIRB conducts scoping sessions in each potentially affected community both within and outside of the NSA. Feedback from community members is used to scope in valued ecosystemic and socio-economic components to be assessed during the NIRB's Review and used in the development of guidelines for project-specific environmental impact statements. Scoping sessions are also used to verify whether the NIRB is asking the right questions to address issues of most concern to the public.
- f) The NIRB spends one (1) to two (2) days in each potentially affected community when conducting scoping sessions for NIRB Reviews, which include open houses and presentations providing a summary of the NIRB process, the project currently being reviewed, and how community members can be involved in the review process.
- g) The NIRB further determines scope by distributing a draft scoping list to the distribution list for comment prior to finalizing the scope of the proposal.