

DE BEERS GROUP

Tara Arko
Technical Director
Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB)
P.O. Box 1360
Cambridge Bay, NU
X0B 0C0

August 22, 2022

Re: De Beers comments on the Chidliak Revised *Draft* Scope of the Project, Scope of the Assessment, and Impact Statement Guidelines

Dear Ms. Arko,

De Beers is pleased to provide the following comments and recommendations regarding the *Revised Draft Scope of the Project* and *Revised Draft Scope of the Assessment* as well as the *Revised Draft Impact Statement Guidelines* for the Chidliak Project, which were released for public comment by the NIRB on July 28, 2023.

Table 1.0 provides additional comments, recommendations, and rationale and related to the *Revised Scope of the Project* and the *Revised Scope of the Assessment*.

Table 2.0 provides additional comments, recommendations, and rationale related to the revisions made by NIRB in response to earlier comments and recommendations from stakeholders on the *Draft Impact Guidelines*.

Table 3.0 provides new comments, recommendations, and rationale regarding the new sections added to the *Revised Draft Impact Statement Guidelines* by NIRB on July 28, 2023.

We look forward to discussing these documents with NIRB staff and other stakeholders at the Guidelines workshop on August 28 and 29, 2023 in Iqaluit.

Should you have any questions or require clarification on our recommendations, please do not hesitate to contact me at sarah.mclean@debeersgroup.com or 867-688-9227.

Sincerely,



Sarah McLean
Environment and Permitting Manager

De Beers Canada inc.

1601 Airport Road NE Suite 300 Calgary Alberta T2E 6Z8
Tel + 1 403 930 0991 | www.debeersgroup.com/canada | info.canada@debeersgroup.com
Incorporated in Canada | Registration number 889569596

A member of the Anglo American plc group

DE BEERS GROUP

Table 1.0 Additional comments, recommendations, and rationale related to the *Revised Scope of the Project (July 28, 2023)* and *Revised Scope of the Assessment (July 28, 2023)*.

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
1	Project Components	De Beers	Fuel storage, water use, and waste volumes are not yet finalized, and will not be finalized until later stages of the process.	No Edits Made	The NIRB is using the information supplied by De Beers in its Project Proposal as maximums (scoped as up to XX) that would be required for the proposed project. this maximum number in Impact Assessment allows flexibility for the Proponent in its assessment.	<p>De Beers requests that the quantities listed in the Draft Scope List Item 2) for Fuel Storage ‘up to 24,551,600L of diesel, up to 5,000 L of gasoline and up to 30,000L of aviation fuel’, as well as the water use limit of ‘up to 10,000 cubic meters per day’ and the waste disposal limits ‘200kg/day of organic waste, and 200 cubic meters per day of greywater’, are removed.</p> <p>De Beers suggests that the scope list include the use of these fuels and water and the deposit of the waste, but without specifying quantities.</p> <p>De Beers provided rough estimates of quantities for several parameters (fuel storage, water use, and waste volumes) within the NIRB on-line application portal (September 7, 2022). These values were input because they were mandatory fields. The NIRB portal did not allow the application to be submitted without quantities. NIRB subsequently included the rough estimates of quantities provided via the portal in the Draft Scope List issued on March 21, 2023. De Beers responded to</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
						<p>the Draft Scope list, indicating that these values should not be seen as maximums and should not be included in the draft guidelines (April 12, 2023) and we reiterated that position on July 14, 2023. Unfortunately, the <i>Revised Draft Guidelines</i> that NIRB released on July 28, 2023 continue to include these values. It is worth noting, that these values were not included in De Beers Project Proposal, but are rather an artifact of the on-line portal forced fields.</p> <p>While we appreciate NIRB's intent to provide flexibility for the Proponent, we feel that inclusion of maximum quantities in the scope document does not provide that flexibility. It instead sets limits on quantities. If NIRB elects to include these values, then De Beers agrees with CIRNAC's suggestion that NIRB adjust the guidelines to indicate that quantities may increase or decreases.</p>
2	Quantity of Fuel Storage, Water Use and Grey Water Generated	CIRNAC	CIRNAC recommends that the Board rephrase the wording in the Draft Scope List to reflect that the quantities for fuel storage, water use and grey water	No Edit Made	As noted to De Beers, the NIRB is using the information supplied by De Beers in its Project Proposal as maximums that would be required by the proposed project	<p>As described in item 1 above, De Beers agrees with CIRNAC's suggestion, and requests reconsideration by the NIRB.</p> <p>Quantities will be provided at the time of the Draft Impact Statement, following additional engineering and design work appropriate for that</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
			generated could increase or decrease when the Proponent submits their Impact Statement.		and this allows flexibility for the Proponent in its assessment	stage of the process. Development of the Scope List and Guidelines is not the right stage of the process to set limits on quantities of things like fuel use, water use, and waste.
3	Draft Scope List – Water Use and withdrawal	DFO	DFO recommends clarity be provided in the Draft Scope regarding water use (i.e., if water use is proposed only for drinking in the accommodations or also for operational needs) and water withdrawal rates (i.e., if it is 10,000 m ³ /day for each waterbody or combined). DFO recommends bullet point be modified as follows “Up to 10,000 m ³ /day withdrawn each/combined from Qamaniruluk Y Lake, Qamanialuk Lake, Sunrise Lake, Glacier Lake, McKeand River and other waterbodies, not exceeding 10% of the available	Edit made where applicable	Edit made for the first comment, but the second comment no edits were made as this was not part of the proponent’s application.	De Beers does not agree with text inserted by NIRB into the guidelines that there will be ‘ up to 10,000 cubic meters per day withdrawn combined from ’ multiple sources. De Beers does not support setting a limit for water use at this time. Similarly, De Beers has not yet determined the volume of food waste to be generated per day or the amount of greywater that will be produced and does not support setting an upward limit on those quantities at this time. De Beers recommends not including specific quantities of these parameters in the guidelines, but rather require that De Beers provides estimates of such quantities as part of the Impact Statement.

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
			water volume, or 10% of the watercourse instantaneous flow			
4	2) Project Components	De Beers	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>De Beers requests that the following bullet is added to Section 2) Project Components: Components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Processed Kimberlite Storage Containment Facility • Constructed wetland and/or water treatment facilities • Water Management pond and or water and wastewater storage and treatment facilities
5	2) Project Components	De Beers	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>De Beers requests that the following bullet is added to Section 2) Project Components: Components under Construction, use, and decommissioning of additional site infrastructure: an Airstrip, quarries/burrow pits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airship landing pad • Interconnected road network • Pipelines and power lines and transfer stations • Support facilities including warehouses, maintenance buildings,

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
						<p>power plant, and other auxiliary infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazardous and Non-Hazardous waste storage and handling areas • Support infrastructure and services based in Iqaluit
6	2) Project Components	De Beers	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>De Beers requests that the following bullet is added to Section 2) Project Components: Components, Waste Disposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste water from domestic use and industrial processing
7	2) Project Components	De Beers	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>De Beers requests that the “Storage and use of Ammonium Nitrate for blasting” bullet is adjusted to “Storage and use of ammonium nitrate and other explosive materials for blasting”</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

Table 2.0 Additional comments, recommendations, and rationale regarding the Revised Draft Impact Guidelines (July 28,2023).

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
1	1.3 – Precautionary Principle; also Section 10.0	QIA 2023 Chidliak ISG #5	The QIA recommends that NIRB add the following text to the end of Section 10.0. “For instances where there are variations in knowledge between IQ and western scientific conclusions, the Proponent must consider its obligation to apply the precautionary principle (as described further in Section 1.3) when reconciling discrepancies. Specifically, in situations where there is a high degree of uncertainty, the Proponent shall defer to the more conservative source of knowledge. A detailed record of decision-making rationale and efforts to collaboratively reconcile different findings between western science and IQ should be outlined by the Proponent.”	Edit made	Edits made where appropriate and as required.	<p>De Beers requests that the first two sentences of the text added in Section 10.0 are removed (i.e. 'For instances.....reconciling discrepancies. and 'Specifically, in situations where there is a high...of knowledge).</p> <p>The language used is overly prescriptive and inconsistent with the weigh-of-evidence approach to decision making. Developing an impact assessment is not a matter of simply adopting one knowledge source or another, but rather analysing, interpreting, and incorporating all available sources of knowledge to develop an integrated, weight of evidence-based approach to assessing and predicting potential impacts. The language recommended by QIA, and adopted by NIRB does not allow for that integrated approach, but rather stipulates that one set of knowledge is deferred to if it is more conservative. This is not appropriate and if taken literally, would <i>not</i> result in a robust and well-founded impact predictions that considers all available knowledge sources.</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
						Furthermore, the Precautionary Principle is a principles for making better decisions in the face of uncertainty, not a prescriptive rule for how to use differing knowledge sources. It suggests use of caution in decision making, but popular understandings include no reference to how certain sources of knowledge should be prioritized over others.
2	7.4.6 Significance Determination	QIA 2023 Chidliak ISG #41	The QIA requests that the NIRB update the wording within section 7.4.6 (k) to add the following bullet point: “ Have a measurable/observable negative effect on Inuit use of a culturally significant area or value. ”	Edits made	Edits were made where appropriate to improve readability	De Beers requests to remove the added text : ' Have a measurable/observable negative effect on Inuit use of a culturally significant area or value '. While we agree that measurable/observable negative effects on Inuit use of culturally significant areas should be minimized through design and mitigation, we do not agree that all negative effects on this value should be considered significant. Such an approach is not consistent with standard impact assessment methodology or past NIRB practice. For instance, there could be a short-term negative effect on the use of a culturally significant area, but the effect may be small in magnitude, limited in geographic extent, fully reversable, and short in duration. These aspects of a given

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
						effect must be considered when determining significance.
3	7.4.6 Significance Determination	QIA 2023 Chidliak ISG #42	QIA recommends that NIRB identify that bullet "k" includes some characteristics that may suggest significance, but not this is neither a comprehensive nor mandatory list, and that the Proponent must establish a defensible set of significance criteria for consideration by the parties, and strongly suggest they include Inuit in both the criteria setting process and the conduct of significance determination for valued components where IQ is a critical input.	Edits made	Edits were made where appropriate to improve readability	<p>De Beers agrees with the QIA that the bullets in Section 7.4.6, item k should not be considered a mandatory list and that it is up to the Proponent to develop a defensible set of significance criteria.</p> <p>De Beers recommends to NIRB to change the preamble to the bulleted list in item k.) to "The following aspects should be considered when developing the framework for significance determination."</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
4	Section 7.4.6 Significance Determination	De Beers	<p>The NIRB has indicated which attributes should be taken into consideration by the NIRB in determining significance of each impact. These are provided in items a through k.</p> <p>k.) Item k is not like the items listed in item a through j. Item k. provides a bulleted list of effects that will be considered significant, without any consideration of the other aspects of those effects. For example, Item k indicates that the NIRB will consider impacts to be significant if they are likely to be adverse (first bullet). Does this mean that all adverse impacts will be considered significant or only that adversity is essential for a determination of significance? What happens if the effect is adverse, but none of the other factors in the bulleted list are met? There will be adverse impacts associated with development projects that</p>	No Edit Made	<p>As the NIRB has made edits to this section based on others comments, the proponent is encouraged to review the edits and ask questions at the IS Guidelines Workshop before finalization of these Guidelines.</p>	<p>De Beers requests that the preamble to the bulleted list in item k.) is changed from "Impacts are to be considered significant if they are likely to/likely to be" to "The following aspects should be considered when developing the framework for significance determination."</p> <p>The list from a) to i) are all reasonable items to consider in determining significance. Item k) however is unlike all other items in the list, and in fact has it's own premise ie. "Impacts are to be considered significant if they are likely to/likely to be:". Item k) is therefore currently not a list of things to be considered by NIRB, but rather it is a highly prescriptive list of factors that NIRB will consider to be significant.</p> <p>The list of bullets in item k) does not reflect the body of work around significance determination in other impact assessments. It indicates all impacts will be considered significant if they are likely to be adverse for example. How can this be? There will be many adverse impacts which are not significantly adverse. It should</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
			<p>are not great enough in magnitude, large enough extent, long enough in duration etc. to be significant. The factors in the bulleted list should be considered in relation to each other. It should be up to the Proponent to propose a framework for consideration of significance as it relates to these and other factors.</p> <p>The preamble to the bulleted list in item k. should be adjusted to indicate that these are factors which the Proponent should consider when proposing a framework for significance determination.</p>			<p>be up to the Proponent to propose a framework for consideration of significance as it relates to these and other factors and for NIRB to then evaluate that information and make their decisions.</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Organization	Comment (July 14, 2022)	Action by NIRB	Justification by NIRB (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Response (August 22, 2023)
5	11.3.3 Socio-Economic Environmental Plans	QIA 2023 Chidliak ISG #54	QIA requests that the section add a requirement for the Proponent's plans, policies, and programs to discuss how it will mitigate against this issue of preconstruction preparation.	Edits made		<p>De Beers requests to change text to: "These plans should be developed prior to construction to reflect the complete...".</p> <p>Construction of the mine will only begin once the NIRB has approved the project and additional regulatory approvals are obtained granting permission for construction. The phrase 'prior to preconstruction' is redundant and potentially confusing, while the adjusted text will still capture the intent of describing activities before construction.</p>
6	Chidliak NIRB Screening - QIA Comments	QIA 2023 Chidliak ISG #56	Due to the lack of information surrounding employment and the remote workforce, the Impact Statement should include this information as a specific bullet in section 6.5. The proponent shall consider the implications and applicability of using remote SmartMine technology in the Qikiqtani Region and discuss its training initiatives to ensure Inuit are employable with this technology.	Edits made		<p>Section 6.5 incorrectly refers to FutureSmart Mining as 'SmartMine' technology. The term FutureSmart Mining should be used instead or if NIRB wishes to use more generic language, the phrase 'remote technology' could be used in this case.</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

Table 3.0 Comments, recommendations, and rationale regarding the new sections added to the Draft Impact Guidelines by NIRB (July 28, 2028).

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
1	6.2.1 Alternatives	For this validation, the Proponent must include reasons for selection of the project and/or its components or its permutations as the preferred alternative 11, and the reasons for rejecting other alternatives. Where different routes are being considered for components such as roads and transmission line corridors, the Proponent must demonstrate strong consideration of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and avoidance of impacts on Inuit values. The preferred alternative means should be based on the consideration of biological, ecological, physical, health, social, economic, well-being, and cultural impacts, the technical feasibility, and economic viability, and the best available technology, and application of the precautionary principle. If the preferred alternative changes throughout the course of its assessment, the Proponent shall consult with the NIRB to determine whether this proposed change would result in a change to the scope of the proposed project under Review.	<p>De Beers requests that the following edits are made to the adjusted text in Section 6.2.1:</p> <p>"For this validation, the Proponent must include reasons for selection of the project and/or its components or its permutations as the preferred alternative, and the reasons for rejecting other alternatives. Where different routes are being considered for components such as roads and transmission line corridors, the Proponent must demonstrate strong consideration of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and avoidance of impacts on Inuit values. The preferred alternative means should be based on the consideration of biological, ecological, physical, health, social, economic, well-being, and cultural impacts, the technical feasibility, and economic viability, and the best available technology, and application of the precautionary principle. If the preferred alternative changes throughout the course of its assessment, the Proponent shall consult with the NIRB to determine whether this proposed change would result in a change to the scope of the proposed project under Review."</p> <p>Explanation of requested changes:</p> <p>*Remove 'and/or its' because 'the Project' refers to the entire proposed Chidliak Diamond Mine. The assessment of alternatives is not whether to build a</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
			<p>diamond mine or a gold mine or a platinum mine, but rather to assess the alternative components involved in the design of the diamond mine.</p> <p>*Remove 'or its permutations' because it adds bulk and redundancy to the sentence without improving clarity.</p> <p>*Remove 'application of the' because the earlier 'consideration of' clause applies to all of the subsequent terms in the sentence, including the precautionary principle.</p>
2	7.2.2.1 Spatial Boundaries	The Impact Statement shall define the spatial boundaries of the maximum area potentially affected by the proposed project and the alternative means to undertake the project, based on the boundaries for each individual type of impact.	<p>De Beers requests that NIRB replace the text with “The Impact Statement shall define the spatial boundaries of the maximum area potentially affected by the proposed project based on the boundaries for each individual type of impact.”</p> <p>De Beers disagrees that spatial boundaries should be based on all alternatives that were considered for the Project, including those that were determined to not be preferred or viable. Spatial boundaries should be developed to assess the effects of the Project as proposed, not on alternatives that were rejected and are no longer included in the Project. Alternatives that remain continued options for the Project at the time of submission would be included as appropriate.</p>
3	7.4.3 Cumulative Effects Assessment	The Proponent shall also describe and demonstrate how Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit was used to inform, interpret, or guide the cumulative effects assessment. Also, the proponent shall discuss how Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit was able to offer new or	De Beers requests that NIRB remove: " Also, the proponent shall discuss how Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit was able to offer new or additional insights. Where results may not align in full, and where scientific and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit findings differ, the Proponent will identify efforts it has made and

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
		<p>additional insights. Where results may not align in full, and where scientific and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit findings differ, the Proponent will identify efforts it has made and mitigation, monitoring and accommodation measures it has adopted to reconcile these differences.</p>	<p>mitigation, monitoring and accommodation measures it has adopted to reconcile these differences." and "Where results may not align in full, and where scientific and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit findings differ, the Proponent will identify efforts it has made and mitigation, monitoring and accommodation measures it has adopted to reconcile these differences"</p> <p>Rationale: The sentence prior, i.e. "The proponent shall also describe and demonstrate how Inuit Quajumajatuqangit was used to inform, interpret, or guide the cumulative effects assessment", is already a clear requirement instructing the Proponent to incorporate IQ into the cumulative effects assessment. The subsequent sentence, i.e. "Also, the proponent shall discuss ..." is redundant, and also assumes that the IQ did offer new or additional insights. Perhaps it did, perhaps it didn't, however either way it would be addressed already by the earlier requirement for description and demonstration of how IQ was used.</p> <p>There is already a requirement described in Section 2.1 The Study Strategy and Methodology which states that "Where the conclusions drawn from scientific, engineering, and technical knowledge are inconsistent with the conclusions drawn from Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, the Impact Statement shall contain a balanced presentation of the issues and a statement of the Proponent's conclusions and rational as well as plans to address the differences or concerns identified." This sentence is clear, comprehensive, and applies to all aspects of the Impact Statement. It is not necessary to then</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
			generate new clauses with additional, similar requirements related to this concept within some, but not all, of the subsequent sections. Doing so creates some confusion as to where and how IQ should be applied.
4	8.1.1 Air Quality	<p>i. Background ambient air quality data collected in the LSA and RSA including airborne dust (TSP, PM10 and PM2.5);</p> <p>ii. Current sources of criteria air contaminants [TSP, PM10, PM2.5, NOx, SO2, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), Ozone (O3) etc.] and GHG emissions; and</p> <p>iii. Seasonal variations or climatic conditions associated with variations on air quality.</p>	<p>De Beers requests that NIRB change item i) to “Background ambient air quality shall be modelled using the most relevant data sources available for the region” and change item ii) to “Parameters to be considered in ambient air quality modelling may include TSP, PM10, PM2.5, NOx, SO2, VOC, O3 and GHG emissions.”</p> <p>TSP, PM10 and PM2.5 are measured through continuous monitoring. These parameters require stable line-power and cannot be reliably collected using battery or solar sources without installing significant additional power generation infrastructure.</p> <p>De Beers will not have such infrastructure in place until the mine is approved and is operating.</p> <p>De Beers intends to model air quality parameters for which there is no baseline data, at zero or background, so the comparison with projected values would certainly capture the full potential impact.</p>
5	8.1.7.2 Groundwater and Surface Water Quality	<p>v. A solute transport model based on numerical groundwater flow modelling should be used for ground water quality predictions</p>	<p>De Beers request that NIRB remove the text “A solute transport model based on numerical groundwater flow modelling should be used for ground water quality predictions”</p> <p>This type of modelling is very complex and may not be warranted given the type of mining proposed,</p>

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
			limited effluent discharge, and site hydrogeological characteristics. It should not be required as a matter of course, but rather should be one of the potential analytical options considered to characterize impacts on groundwater, if warranted.
6	8.1.8.1 Baseline Information (Sediment Quality)	iii. For the sedimentation deposition rates, flow models and sediment dispersion models should be provided which outline the rate and location of sediment deposition where relevant.	<p>De Beers requests that NIRB change this to “Sediment modelling should be considered based on the baseline studies and results of the water quality models”</p> <p>Sediment modelling should not be required as a matter of course. It is a substantial exercise and is not warranted in all cases. Completion of sediment modelling should be dependent on the results and predictions of the water quality modelling and baseline studies. Water or effluent deposition is the primary mechanism by which sediments may be affected. If the water quality results do not indicate a real potential for sediment chemistry issues, then modelling may not be justified.</p>
7	Section 8.1.11.1	<p>iv. Description of the population health of identified VECs, with a discussion of contaminant loadings in representative species important to Inuit as a food source, such as caribou;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>ix. Discussion of the relative health of VEC populations, including contaminant loading in representative wildlife VEC species (i.e., caribou);</p>	De Beers seeks to understand what baseline information is expected in relation to contaminant loadings. De Beers does not have permission to harvest species, nor do we have access to tissue samples from harvested species, and therefore we will likely have to rely on the existing body of scientific literature on this subject. Please confirm if NIRB is requiring De Beers to harvest, or cause the harvest of animals for the purpose of documenting contaminant loadings or if reliance on the existing body of scientific knowledge is adequate for

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
			description of contaminant loadings in fish and wildlife.
8	8.2.2.1	Provide sector specific breakdown of employment within the NSA and as such may also pertain to Yellowknife, NT;	De Beers requests that NIRB remove ' and as such may also pertain to Yellowknife, NT ' Yellowknife is not expected to be pertinent to this Project.
9	8.2.6	For the purpose of the current Guidelines, traditional activity and traditional knowledge shall consider land use, food security, language, cultural activities and commercial harvesting.	De Beers requests that NIRB remove ' and commercial harvesting ' Commercial harvesting is better addressed in the 'non-traditional land and resource use' section.
10	8.2.6.2	Potential effects on sustainable resource use, such as country food availability and accessibility of carving stone deposits, taking into account the CEA throughout the entire lifespan of the Project;	De Beers requests that NIRB remove ' CEA ' (assumed to be the Cumulative Effects Assessment) as it does not make sense to include it here whereas it is not included in all other clauses in this section, and it is thoroughly addressed in Section 7.4.3.
11	8.2.7.1	Description of current and traditional land use areas and the importance of those areas to Inuit culture and social well-being;	De Beers requests that NIRB remove text." Description of current and traditional land use areas and the importance of those areas to Inuit culture and social well-being" This section pertains to <u>non</u> -traditional and resource use.
12	8.2.10.1	Description of community & regional waste management systems Description of current conditions of local supply and demand of housing, including private, public and rental housing and their costs, other infrastructure, and related capacity within the RSA;	De Beers requests that NIRB split this into two bullets. The existing bullet contains two discrete topics.

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
13	8.2.10.3	Assessment of public health and environmental health needs and implications to the Proponent's community initiatives; and	De Beers requests that NIRB rephrase or remove. It is not clear what is meant by this statement as currently written.
14	8.2.11.2	Potential impacts of workplace discipline and cultural conflicts among Nunavummiut, Northwest Territories, and Southern workers, including those issues which may be related to or exacerbated by language barriers between employees.	De Beers requests that NIRB remove ' Northwest Territories '. Northwest Territories is not pertinent to this Project.
15	8.3	The Proponent shall consider the following when determining the need for and level of detail of a Human Health and Environmental Risk Assessment for a proposed project <i>review Health Canada's Guidance Documents for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessment about the following topics:</i>	De Beers requests that NIRB replaces this text (' review Health Canada.... following topics: ') with the lead-in sentence from Health Canada's 2019 guidance: " <i>Consideration should be given to the following when determining the need for and level of detail of an HHRA for a proposed project.</i> ". It is not clear what the current text is stating. The Health Canada guideline's wording is clear that a number of factors should be considered when determining the need for and level of detail of an HHRA.
16	8.3	The Human Health Risk Assessment is to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Predicted sources, quantities, and points of release from the proposed project emissions and effluents containing hazardous substances; ▪ Selection process for hazardous substance constituents of potential concern; 	De Beers requests that NIRB replace the text with: "The need for a human health risk assessment should be evaluated in accordance with Health Canada's 2019: "Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessments". The current text assumes that a Human Health Risk Assessment is required for the Project, but this has not yet been demonstrated. Health Canada's guidance provides the roadmap for assessing the need for such an assessment, and the process for

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of pathways to human receptors; ▪ Identification and characterization of human receptors (workers and the public), including maps to delineate their locations and the distances of communities, residences, temporary/seasonal residences, etc. to project sites and related infrastructure; ▪ Method used to convert hazardous substance exposure and intake by the various human receptors from the various pathways into an exposure or dose (e.g., conversion factors); and ▪ Criteria used to determine significance of impact (e.g., exposure relative to lifetime cancer risk limit). 	conducting such an assessment if warranted. If the Proponent is required to follow the Guidance document, then NIRB should not need to include the specific bulleted list of aspects to be included in the <i>Impact Statement Guidelines</i> .
17	10	The Proponent shall explain how it treated and used incorporated Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, used to address gaps in currently available scientific data, noting how variations in knowledge were considered and how discrepancies between two <i>views</i> was reconciled.	De Beers requests that NIRB replace the term, “ views ” to “ knowledge systems ” or “ sources of knowledge ” to better reflect IQ and science.
18	11.3.1 Follow-up and Adaptive Management Plans	Plans to involve Inuit and local communities will be involved in adaptive management planning and implementation, including through the development of management objectives, indicators, thresholds (or triggers) and responses in monitoring;	De Beers requests that NIRB replace text with: “ How Inuit and local communities will be involved in adaptive management planning and implementation, including in the future development of management objectives, indicators, thresholds (or triggers) and responses in monitoring; ”

DE BEERS GROUP

#	Section	Revised Draft Guidelines Text (July 28, 2023)	De Beers Recommendation (August 22, 2023)
			This is to correct grammatical error in previous sentence.
19	11.3.1 Follow-up and Adaptive Management Plans	If applicable, identifications of tiers of triggers or thresholds that would result in increasing or varied adaptive management strategies, including the need for operational reductions or shutdowns during sensitive timing windows.	<p>De Beers requests that NIRB replace the text with: “If applicable, identifications of tiers of triggers or thresholds that would result in increasing or varied adaptive management strategies, including the potential for operational reductions or shutdowns during sensitive timing windows.”</p> <p>Change "need" to "potential" because these reductions or shutdowns may not be needed.</p>
20	11.3.3 Socio-Economic Environmental Plans	These plans should be developed prior to preconstruction to reflect the complete life span of the proposed project and contain appropriate monitoring and evaluation techniques (e.g., indicators or thresholds) that will allow regulators to intervene in a timely and constructive manner.	<p>De Beers requests that “preconstruction” is replaced with: “These plans should be developed prior to construction to reflect”</p> <p>Preconstruction is not a defined project phase, so we wouldn't be able to know how to meet this.</p>
21	Table of Conformance	Absent	We understand that NIRB will be checking the Draft Impact Statement, once it is submitted, against the guidelines to confirm conformance. De Beers requests that a conformance table is developed and provided to De Beers as part of the Final Guidelines issuance, so that NIRB, the intervening parties, and De Beers can all clearly read what is required to meet that conformance check.