



AGNICO EAGLE

August 9, 2024

Dionne Filiatrault, Executive Director
Nunavut Impact Review Board
PO Box 1360, 29 Mitik St.
Cambridge Bay, NU
X0B 0C0

Re: Agnico Eagle's Comments on the 2024 Draft Nunavut Impact Review Board's 2024 Revised Draft Standard Impact Statement Guidelines

Dear Ms. Filiatrault,

Agnico Eagle thanks the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) for the opportunity to comment on the 2024 *Revised Draft* Standard Impact Statement Guidelines released in April 2024 (2024 Draft Guidelines).

Agnico Eagle has reviewed the 2024 Draft Guidelines with a focus on the sections as outlined in the NIRBs April 3, 2024 correspondence and provided in the attached. Agnico Eagle appreciates the care and attention that NIRB staff have applied in the development of the IS Guidelines.

What follows is a summary of our highest priority comments:

- In 2023, Agnico Eagle provided a detailed policy paper on phased development for NIRB's consideration which we believe should be the subject of detailed and separate guidance from NIRB.
- Specific consideration should be given to comments that are relevant to significant modifications, amendments and phased development, as these are the items that have represented most major applications considered by NIRB in recent years. For clarity, the IS Guidelines should not impact the existing Hope Bay, Meliadine, and Meadowbank Projects.
- The IS Guidelines should avoid including guidance in the IS Guidelines that is included in other NIRB policies that are under active development but have not yet been subject to public review and comment.
- As a general comment, general reference to policy guidance from third parties should be avoided: if there are key aspects applicable to NIRB, these should be explicitly included in the NIRB IS Guidelines.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. It would be helpful if the NIRB could clarify the next steps and provide a response with rationale to any recommendations that are not included in the next version of the Draft IS Guidelines. Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Regards,



Jamie Quesnel
jamie.quesnel@agnicoeagle.com
Director, Permitting & Regulatory Affairs

Definitions and Terms

Comment Number:	1
Subject:	Definition of Amendment
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	The definition provided for “Amendment” appears to better fit the term “Significant Modification”. Some significant modifications trigger amendments to regulatory approvals, some may not. The use of the word “Amendment” may result in confusion.

Comment Number:	2
Subject:	Definition of Authorizing Agencies
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	The definition provided for “Authorizing Agencies” includes DIOs, but the definition of “Agency” in NuPPAA refers to only federal or territorial authorities. Referring to DIOs as “agencies” in the Guidelines may result in confusion. Authorizing Agencies and DIOs should be listed separately, as they are on page 28 of the Guidelines and elsewhere in the document.

Comment Number:	3
Subject:	Definition of Baseline and Historical Baseline
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>The definition for Baseline provided is “Pre-project biological, physical, or human conditions that can be used to measure both positive and negative changes from the project”</p> <p>The definition for Historical Baseline provided is “Biophysical, physical or human conditions that existed prior to industrial development”.</p> <p>It is recommended that the term “Baseline” and the provided definition should be used.</p> <p>The Draft Guidelines also refer to “historical background.” It is recommended that the term baseline be used.</p>

Comment Number:	4
Subject:	Definition of Impact
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Under "Impact", "<i>Cumulative Impact</i>" defined as refer to the accumulation of impacts caused by past, existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable projects, including activities associated with the proposed project."</p> <p>Part 3, s. 80 (1) of NUPPA refers to "...cumulative ecosystemic and socio-economic 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 inside the designated area, or wholly or partly outside the designated area...".</p> <p>Suggest the following definition for better accuracy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Result from the impacts of the proposed project combined with the impacts of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities."

Comment Number:	5
Subject:	Definition of Phased Development
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Currently defined as "In phased development, a Project Proponent periodically seeks adjustments to project activities and timelines at various stages or "phases" over the course of the project lifecycle.</p> <p>Phased development is a way of developing industrial projects (such as mines) in a flexible manner by putting in several check in points (or phases) where the Project Proponent revisits whether these adjustments can be developed in a sustainable and cost-effective manner."</p> <p>Suggest the following definition for better accuracy:</p> <p>"In phased development, a Project Proponent of a previously approved Project may seek Modifications or Significant Modifications (as those phrases are used in the NIRB process) which enable the Project to extend and/or expand operations. Potential phases may be known at the time of the initial impact assessment or may be identified after approval, due to related activities such as exploration."</p> <p>Note the use of the term "modification" in the Water Licence context is different from the NIRB context.</p> <p>Note: In 2023, Agnico Eagle provided a detailed policy paper on phased development for NIRB's consideration which we believe should be the subject of detailed and separate guidance from NIRB.</p>

Comment Number:	6
Subject:	Definition of Reasonably foreseeable future development
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Currently defined as "Projects or activities that are currently under regulatory review or that will be submitted for regulatory review in the near future, as determined by the existence of a proposed project description, letter of intent, or any regulatory application filed with an authorizing agency (NIRB, 2007)."</p> <p>Our concern is with the phrase "will be submitted". If a proposed project description, letter of intent, or other regulatory application is not available for review on a public registry, how would a proponent be able to identify such projects?</p> <p>Consider removal of the phrase "will be submitted".</p>

Comment Number:	7
Subject:	Definition of Significance
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Currently defined as "Whether a proposed project could have a notable effect on one or more aspects of the environment. Factors to consider defined in s. 90 of the <i>NUPPA</i>."</p> <p>A significant effect should be an effect on one or more aspects of the environment that is more than just notable. There is established literature on characterizing the extent of significance that is applied by impact assessment practitioners. In addition to the s. 90 factors, the outcome of the impact assessment, benchmarks (e.g., standards, guidelines, objectives) and other considerations such as IQ /TK, western science and public input inform the extent to which effects alter valued ecosystemic and socio-economic components. These considerations are too numerous to be captured by one or two sentences.</p> <p>It is recommended this definition simply reference s. 90 factors.</p>

Comment Number:	8
Subject:	Definition of Well-being
Reference:	Definitions and Terms
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Currently defined as "Specific indicators of well-being for a particular impact assessment must be identified by the potentially impacted communities, in collaboration with the Regional Inuit Association. Factors to be assessed at the individual and community levels typically include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit principles and values; • Cultural continuity and language; • Social, physical and mental health; • Connection to the land (including Inuit food harvesting and Inuit food security/food sovereignty); and • Access to training, education and employment opportunities." <p>As currently written, the definition of "Impact Statement" requires proponents to evaluate potential impacts to "well being" (see also 1.3 Overview of an Impact Statement). The phrase "well being" is also considered in section 2.4, Sustainability and Sustainable Development in relation to the Standard Impact Statement Guidelines.</p> <p>Under the Nunavut Agreement and <i>NuPPAA</i>, NIRB is tasked with determining what documentation is required to carry out an environmental assessment. Specific indicators of well being for NIRB Guidelines should be identified clearly by NIRB, taking into account feedback acquired through the Guideline development process from participants such as RIAs and potentially impacted communities.</p> <p>Delegating the determination of Project-specific well being indicators to the community and/or RIO (as the definition suggests) could make it challenging for a Proponent to complete their Impact Statement assessing that topic.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Guidelines include a clear list of the indicators of well-being that are required to be included in an IS.</p>

Part 1: Introduction

Comment Number:	9
Subject:	Overview of an Impact Statement
Reference:	1.3
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Additions to sentence provided below (bold and underline).
Recommendation to Address Issues	"The NIRB relies on the Proponent's Impact Statement <u>and supplemental information (such as in response to Information Requests, Technical Comments, and Final Written Submissions) provided by the Proponent during the NIRB assessment,</u> and information provided by Intervenor and potentially impacted communities, the public, and interested individuals."

Comment Number:	10
Subject:	Overview of an Impact Statement
Reference:	1.3
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>With respect to the statement, "It is the Proponent's responsibility to provide sufficient data and analysis on potential impacts to the ecosystemic and socio-economic environment resulting from the proposed project."</p> <p>Respectfully, it raises fairness concerns if Proponents are expected to use data that is not published or publicly accessible. If data are not made publicly available or shared with the Proponent, this is not necessarily a deficiency on the part of the Proponent.</p> <p>The NIRB should include reference to the fact that it is also the legal obligation and responsibility of Authorizing Agencies to share up to date government data and analysis (whether in final or in draft) that is relevant to the Project Proposal, with the Proponent, for the purposes of enabling the Proponent to prepare its Impact Statement, Addendum, or supplemental submissions as part of the NIRB assessment of the Project Proposal. This is important to support environmental assessments being based on the best available data.</p> <p>Similarly if RIAs or DIOs have access to IQ or other knowledge that they believe should be considered by a Proponent as part of an Impact Assessment, the Guidelines should encourage the sharing of such IQ or other knowledge upon request.</p> <p>The recommendation is that the IS Guideline develop additional language to address this comment.</p>

Comment Number:	11
Subject:	Overview of an Impact Statement
Reference:	1.3
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below (bold and underline).
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>With respect to the statement, "Proponents are required to engage potentially impacted communities about projects and activities in a way that informs them, consults with them, and enables them to participate to some degree in the development of the project."</p> <p>While this is a concept that Agnico Eagle supports, note participation of Inuit in projects are governed by the negotiation of IIBAs with RIOs (per Article 26 of the Nunavut Agreement and NuPPAA).</p> <p>Consider also changing the word "consults" to "engage".</p>

Comment Number:	12
Subject:	Draft Impact Statement Submitted During Review (Standard Approach)
Reference:	1.4.1
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>With respect to the statement,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"Following receipt of the Final Impact Statement submission, the NIRB conducts an internal check of the material to determine whether it complies with the Guidelines, the direction provided by the Board in its Pre-Hearing Conference decision, and is consistent with the list of commitments. A technical review of the Final Impact Statement is then conducted, with written feedback accepted through final written submissions as the Board schedules and holds a Final Hearing. Following the close of the Hearing record, the Board then issues a Final Report and recommendations to the Minister with a determination of whether the project should or should not be allowed to proceed to development."</p> <p>NIRB process participants may identify information that they consider "missing" or "insufficient" during the process. NIRB staff should make determinations on these statements during the IR and TC process, and if they agree more information should be provided to meet sufficiency, they should make a clear request to the Proponent so there is an opportunity to provide it. It is not clear enough to simply forward intervenor requests without NIRB consideration and direction. As process steps proceed (i.e., the IR process step is completed) any necessary information required by the NIRB would be requested and if not requested by NIRB the IR process would be considered complete. This would be relevant to the TC phase, etc.</p> <p>Prior to the close of the Hearing record, the Board and its staff could carry out a final internal evaluation and determination of the completeness of the information provided by the Proponent. Should the Board identify that there is missing information that it considers necessary to make its recommendation, the NIRB should clearly describe and request this information and give the Proponent the opportunity to provide such information to the Board prior to the issuance of the Final Report and recommendations.</p> <p>If the Proponent is not made aware by the Board that the Board considers the Proponent's supporting information incomplete, incomplete information should not be stated as a rationale for a negative recommendation by NIRB to the Minister.</p> <p>The recommendation is that the IS Guideline develop additional language to address this comment.</p>

Comment Number:	13
Subject:	Amendments to Impact Statements for Previously Approved Major Projects
Reference:	1.5
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>For accuracy the word “Amendments” in the title of this section should be replaced with “Addenda”.</p> <p>Typically where there are Significant Modifications that trigger the need for Project Certificate amendments, Impact Statements are supplemented by later Addenda (associated with Phased Development), not amended. Or, this section could be titled “Reconsiderations of Previously Approved Projects”</p> <p>Per the above, modifications (even Significant Modifications) do not necessarily trigger amendments to Project Certificate Terms and Conditions, so calling these “amendments” may create confusion about that point.</p> <p>The following statement should be removed: “While not all sections may be applicable, the Standard Impact Statement Guidelines should be followed for Impact Statement addenda.”</p> <p>Addenda should build from the Guidelines that formed the basis for the original Impact Statement associated with the Project.</p> <p>For clarity, the IS Guidelines should not impact the existing Hope Bay, Meliadine, and Meadowbank Projects.</p>

Part 2 – Guiding Principles

Comment Number:	14
Subject:	Part 2 Guiding Principles
Reference:	2
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Suggested edits provided below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In section 2.1 (IQ), there is significant content overlap with the pending [IQ Guidelines], which has not yet been subject to public review and comment. In order to ensure these concepts are not incorporated in IS Guidelines without a proper opportunity for review, suggest the detailed wording in this section be removed until the IQ Guidelines are finalized. In our view a focused review of this topic would be beneficial to all participants in order to ensure consistency of definitions, clarity of expectations, consistency across regions, and practical advice to Proponents about incorporating IQ (for example, what the specific recommended steps are to seek IQ and complete validation), clear guidance on what specific protocols apply to the development of an IS, etc. • Agnico Eagle employs full time IQ holders who are directly involved in analysis, implementation, assessment and reporting. We are grateful for their generous sharing of Knowledge. In our view the opinion of these IQ holders should be held in the highest regard, respected and accepted by NIRB. • Section 2.3 “Precautionary Principle” discussion reflects little to no consideration of the “cost effective measures” aspect of the definition. “Cost effective measures” are an important aspect of the definition that must be given due consideration in NIRB’s application of the Precautionary Principle, along with the other aspects highlighted. • Section 2.3 also says that the International Union for Conservation of Nature’s (IUCN, 2007) sets out guidelines in the application of the precautionary principle to the conservation of biodiversity and natural resource management that should be considered by the Proponent in the development of the Impact Statement and the proposed project. Rather than referring generally to this lengthy document, much of which appears to overlap with items already fully addressed in the IS Guidelines, if components of the IUCN guidance is being recommended by NIRB, Agnico Eagle suggests it would be more efficient to incorporate the desired components of the IUCN guidelines directly in the IS Guidelines. As written, the NIRB’s recommendation in relation to the IUCN guidelines is unclear. • Under Section 2.4, “The Impact Statement must further characterize the proposed project’s contribution to sustainability, including that as defined by potentially impacted communities, the public, and interested parties and must describe how sustainability principles have been applied to the potential impacts of the proposed project.” It is not clear how a Proponent could identify and apply the various definitions of “sustainability” that might be defined by the different listed parties. Again, NIRB has a responsibility to clearly define its own process requirements (per the Nunavut Agreement) and such important items as definitions should not change from Project to Project, depending on location and preferences of third parties. Such input into definitions should be provided as part of the Guideline development process, not delegated to participants in the process on a case by case basis. NIRB should define “Sustainability” for Project Proponents to apply in the context of preparing an Impact Statement or Addendum, and remove the reference to “sustainability as defined by potentially impacted communities, the public and interested parties...”.

Part 3 – Preparation of the Impact Statement

Comment Number:	15
Subject:	Preparation of the Impact Statement
Reference:	3.1.1.2
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Further to the above, as this reference overlaps with the IQ Guidelines, these sections of the IS Guidelines should be removed and cross referenced, as the IQ Guidelines have not been subject to public review and comment.</p> <p>As examples of issues for further discussion within the general context of the IQ Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 3.1.1.2 states the Proponent shall show evidence that, “appropriate protocols were followed for collection, protection and use of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, Indigenous Knowledge, and Community Knowledge” <p>The Guideline should reference what specific protocols are deemed “appropriate” by NIRB. Other aspects of this section (including evidence of verification how knowledge presented and permission to use knowledge) would presumably be addressed by following such protocols.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 3.1.3 states “Further, the Proponent shall ensure that Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, Indigenous Knowledge, and Community Knowledge used from databases receives input from the applicable Regional Inuit Association(s) and/or Knowledge holders on applicability.” <p>How would a proponent proceed if the named parties did not wish to share advice on applicability with the proponent?</p>

Part 4 – The Impact Statement

Comment Number:	16
Subject:	Project Development Phases
Reference:	Section 4.2.3.2, page 10
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Section 4.2.3.2 identifies the following project development phases: “[site preparation, construction, operation (including reduced operation), maintenance, any potential modifications, temporary closure (care and maintenance), final closure (decommission and reclamation and post-closure)]”.</p> <p>Phases typically defined in impact assessments include: mobilization/construction, operations, reclamation and closure and post-closure.</p> <p>“Maintenance” is an activity and not a phase in an environmental assessment. “Potential modifications” are considered under future development (section 4.3.3). “Temporary closure (care and maintenance)” is described in a standalone section (section 4.6.4.1). Note “final closure” is referred to as “closure”.</p> <p>The following edits are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove “maintenance”, “potential modifications”, and “temporary closure (care and maintenance)” where these phases are referenced in the Guidelines. • Change “final closure” to “closure.”

Comment Number:	17
Subject:	Part 4 The Impact Statement
Reference:	4.3.2.1 Alternatives, “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.”
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	If an alternative identified in the IS becomes the preferred alternative over the course of the assessment, this should not be a potential change in scope, as the alternative is already included in the scope of assessment.
Recommendation to Address Issues	Remove sentence identified above.

Comment Number:	18
Subject:	Requirements for Meaningful Public Engagement
Reference:	Section 4.4.1, Table 5, page 19
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Conformity requirement
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Table 5 states “The Proponent has meaningfully engaged the public and potentially impacted communities throughout the development of the impact statement”</p> <p>Is conformity with this requirement met if the questions in Appendix D (Checklist to Demonstrate Meaningful Engagement) are met?</p> <p>If so, suggest cross referencing Appendix D.</p> <p>Reference to need for external confirmation that “requirements” are met should be avoided.</p>

Comment Number:	19
Subject:	Public engagement plan
Reference:	Section 4.4.1, Table 5, page 19
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Conformity requirement
Recommendation to Address Issues	Table 5 states "Public engagement plan submitted". What must be included in a public engagement plan? This guidance is incomplete.

Comment Number:	20
Subject:	Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit Plan
Reference:	Section 4.4.2, Table 6, page 23
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	Conformity requirement
Recommendation to Address Issues	Table 6 states "Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit Plan submitted". What must be included in an Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit Plan? This guidance is incomplete.

Comment Number:	21
Subject:	Free Prior and Informed Consent
Reference:	Section 4.4.2, Table 6, page 23
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	Conformity requirement
Recommendation to Address Issues	Table 6 states "Free, Prior and Informed consent of Knowledge holders involved in Project Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit studies granted to gather and apply the knowledge shared for the development of the Impact Statement". It may be difficult to meet this requirement as some Knowledge holders do not wish to sign consent forms but wish to participate in the impact assessment process. The Guidelines should include a form that can be used as a precedent to help this standard to be met for IQ that is included in the Impact Statement.

Comment Number:	22
Subject:	Impact analysis on systems
Reference:	Section 4.4.5, pg. 36
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	Agnico Eagle understands this analysis assesses the multiple impacts of a single project, which may not be individually significant but may be collectively significant, particularly when considered as interrelated parts of a system. These impacts are referred to as collective impacts. This impact analysis is not a standard approach to impact assessment. It is recommended this analysis and references to "systems" be removed from the Guidelines.

Comment Number:	23
Subject:	Part 4 The Impact Statement
Reference:	Section 4.4.5.7 Significance Determination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following are descriptors which may be applicable for specifying significance of identified potential impacts: ... “ Associated with variables of societal importance and public concern and likely to exceed desired levels of change”
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	This is an aspect already considered in VEC selection. Further “desired levels of change” is unclear.
Recommendation to Address Issues	Consider removal

SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT (SECTION 4.5.2)

Comment Number:	24
Subject:	Definitions and Terminology
Reference:	Section 4.5.2.2, page 57
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	The first sentence in this section refers to “functioning and stability” of the socio-economic environment and is undefined or described.
Recommendation to Address Issues	Provide a definition to “functioning and stability”. Or remove.

Comment Number:	25
Subject:	Gender Based Analysis Plus (GBA+) and Culturally Relevant GBA+
Reference:	Section 4.5.2.4, page 58
Priority:	Low
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	GBA+ is discussed in the NIRB Draft Socio-economic Toolkit. The IS Guideline needs to be consistent with details included in the Toolkit. For example, this section of the IS Guideline contains statements that do not inform standard GBA+ or culturally relevant GBS+ (e.g., references to “challenging systems” and organizations and groups working together). Suggest these statements be removed.

BASELINE DEVELOPMENT (SECTION 4.4.4)

Comment Number:	26
Subject:	Describing baseline conditions
Reference:	Section 4.4.4.1, page 33
Priority:	Low
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Baseline conditions also describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data sources and data collection methods, including sampling, survey and research protocols; modelling methods, sources of uncertainty, error estimates and any assumptions or biases; describe modelling methods and include assumptions, calculations of margins of error, and other relevant statistical information. • how models have been validated using field data from the appropriate local and regional study areas. • any ongoing or completed regional assessment in the proposed project area or any relevant strategic assessments considered in determining baseline conditions. <p>Suggest the three bullets above be added to this section.</p>

IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF INDIVIDUAL VALUED COMPONENTS (SECTION 4.4.5)

Comment Number:	27
Subject:	Matrix table
Reference:	Section 4.4.5, page 35
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Agnico Eagle agrees that a matrix is a useful tool for demonstrating potential interactions and key potential interactions. The description of the matrix table would be improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> replacing the text in the first paragraph of this section with “To support the identification of potential effects on valued components that may result from the construction, operation, closure and/or post-closure activities of the Project, it is useful to begin by identifying the potential interactions between the various project components and activities with the selected valued components”; and replacing the wording in the text box with: “A matrix table or a comparative tool should be used to determine potential project interactions with valued components”.

Comment Number:	28
Subject:	Residual impacts
Reference:	Section 4.4.5.1, page 37
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	See below.
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Residual impacts are referenced in this section but not described. Suggest incorporating the following paragraph into the section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Following the impact analysis, a summary of residual effects (i.e., impacts after mitigation) is provided for each valued component. Results from the impact analysis are used to describe the direction, magnitude, duration and geographic extent of the residual changes to valued components. These are in turn used in the determination of significance, with cumulative and transboundary effects included, where appropriate”.

IMPACTS OF THE ENVIRONMENT ON THE PROJECT (SECTION 4.4.5.2)

Comment Number:	29
Subject:	Potential Impacts of the Environment on the Project and Climate Resilience
Reference:	Section 4.4.5.2 Table 11, pg. 38
Priority:	
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>The section states</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “While predictions of impacts of the environment on the Project can build off the assessment of predicted impacts from the Project on valued components (Sections 4.5), this assessment should include a discussion of the combined or collective impacts of environmental factors on the Project and recognition of changes in likelihood and severity of factors due to climate change”. <p>Suggest for better clarity and completeness this section be replaced with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The assessment should describe how ecosystemic environmental conditions, including natural hazards such as severe and/or extreme weather conditions and external events, could adversely affect the project and how this in turn could result in effects to the environment, health, social and economic conditions.” <p>Suggest this section also identify the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide details of planning, design and construction strategies intended to minimize the potential adverse effects of the ecosystemic environment on the project; describe possible mitigation measures to address adverse environmental, health, social and economic effects resulting from effects of the environment on the project; describe measures to enhance positive environmental, health, social and economic effects resulting from effects of the environment on the project.

CLIMATE CHANGE (SECTION 4.4.5.3)

Comment Number:	30
Subject:	Identifying GHG emissions and Project Impacts to Climate Change Commitments
Reference:	Section 4.4.5.3, Table 12, pg. 39
Priority:	High
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>Table 12 identifies the following requirement to identify the project's GHG emissions and potential GHG impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the Project's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions against relevant emissions reduction efforts, targets, or climate change legislation, regulation, or policies. • Impact on carbon sinks, both positive and negative. • When required, an upstream GHG assessment. • When required, a net-zero plan. • Proposed mitigation measures, including an evaluation of best available technologies; and • environmental practices as well as offsetting. <p>Suggested this section be replaced with the following requirements for better clarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe the Project's main source(s) of GHG emissions and their estimated annual GHG emissions by GHG type by project phase • describe measures to mitigate GHG emissions, including best available technologies and project design <p>The information requirements and effects assessment of GHG emissions must be scaled to each project based on estimated GHG emissions. Depending on the scale of the Project, additional information may be required in project-specific guidelines such as an upstream GHG assessment, description of GHG intensity and emission offsetting options.</p>

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS (SECTIONS 4.4.5.4)

Comment Number:	31
Subject:	Conformity Requirement
Reference:	Section 4.4.5.4, Table 13, page 43/44
Priority:	Medium
Background/Rationale	See below
Recommendation to Address Issues	<p>It is recommended the requirement in the second row of the table be clarified by replacing the sentence in the second row in Table 13 as follows: "Identify and predict the likelihood and significance of cumulative effects, including direct, indirect and residual impacts (i.e., effects after mitigation)".</p>