



SCREENING DECISION REPORT NIRB FILE No.: 26YN044

NPC File No.: 151230

Date: August 19, 2026.

Following the Nunavut Impact Review Board's (NIRB or Board) assessment of all materials provided, the NIRB is recommending that a review of Defence Research and Development Canada's (DRDC) "ICENAV" project proposal is not required pursuant to Article 12, Section 12.4.4(a) of the Agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada (Nunavut Agreement) and s. 92(1)(a) of the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act, S.C. 2013, c. 14, s. 2 (NuPPAA).

Subject to the Proponent's compliance with the terms and conditions as set out below, issued in accordance with s. 92(2)(a) of *NuPPAA*, the NIRB is of the view that the project proposal is not likely to cause significant public concerns, and it is unlikely to result in significant adverse environmental and social impacts. The NIRB therefore recommends that the responsible Minister accept this Screening Decision Report.

OUTLINE OF SCREENING DECISION REPORT

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	1
PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS	2
ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF NUPPAA	4
VIEWS OF THE BOARD	6
RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS	9
OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12
CONCLUSION	13

TABLES

TABLE 1: NIRB'S ASSESSMENT PROCESS	2
TABLE 2: COMMENTS RECEIVED	4
TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF THE BOARD'S ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS S. 90 <i>NuPPAA</i>	5

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The primary objectives of the NIRB are set out in Article 12, Section 12.2.5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and are confirmed by s. 23 of the *NuPPAA*. The purpose of screening is provided for under Article 12, Section 12.4.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 88 of the *NuPPAA*.

As set out under Article 12, Section 12.4.4 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and s. 92(1) of the *NuPPAA*, upon conclusion of the screening process, the Board must provide its written report to the Minister indicating one of three options:

- (a) a review of the project is not required;
- (b) a review of the project is required; or
- (c) the project should be modified or abandoned.

PROJECT OVERVIEW & THE NIRB ASSESSMENT PROCESS

On June 11, 2026, the Nunavut Planning Commission (Commission) issued and forwarded its conformity determination for Defence Research and Development Canada’s (DRDC) “ICENAV” project proposal (NIRB File No. 26YN044; NPC File No. 151230). The Commission determined that the proposal conforms to the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan and requires screening by the NIRB. The application also identifies activities in the Kitikmeot Region, where no approved land use plan was identified.

- Project Name: ICENAV
- NIRB File No.: 26YN044
- NIRB Application No.: 126478

Table 1: NIRB’s Assessment Process

Date	Stage
June 11, 2026	Receipt of project proposal
July 21, 2026	Pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i> the NIRB requested the Proponent complete an online application to address information required for Screening
July 28, 2026	Receipt of online application from Proponent
July 20, 23, and 27, 2026	Request(s) to Proponent for additional information in order to carry out screening pursuant to s. 144(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
August 4, 2026	Proponent responded to information request(s) and provided additional information
August 4, 2026	Scoping pursuant to s. 86(1) of the <i>NuPPAA</i>
August 5, 2026	Public engagement and comment request
August 14, 2026	Receipt of public comments
August 19, 2026	Issuance of Screening Decision Report

1. Project Scope

Location	Kitikmeot and Qikiqtani (North Baffin) regions; marine waters of the Northwest Passage, including Lancaster Sound, Parry Channel, Barrow Strait, Austin Channel, Peel Sound, Prince Regent Inlet, M’Clintock Channel and Viscount Melville Sound, along routes beginning at Resolute Bay and extending toward Cambridge Bay. The nearest affected communities include Resolute Bay and Cambridge Bay.
Objective	To improve the efficiency and safety of maritime navigation in ice-covered waters and reduce reliance on manned helicopter ice-reconnaissance flights by testing and validating ship-, air-, satellite- and underwater-based systems that detect, track and characterize sea and glacial ice.
Timeline	August 20 to August 30 within the 2026-2028 operating period (seasonal, multi-year; approximately 10 days of field operations per campaign).

As required under s. 86(1) of the NuPPAA, the Board accepted the scope of the project as set out by DRDC in the proposal. The scope of the project proposal includes the following undertakings, works, or activities:

- Conduct a 10-day ship-based research program from the **CCGS (Canadian Coast Guard Ship) Henry Larsen** along northern and southern Northwest Passage routes, adjusted for weather and sea-ice conditions, with up to 13 scientific personnel and no land-based camp. Use vessels, helicopter, Rigid-Hulled Inflatable Boats (RHIBs)/zodiacs, drones/ Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS), satellites, ship-mounted sensors, and underwater vehicles to map and measure sea and glacial ice.
- Collect ice cores and samples from stable floes or from the vessel/RHIB; conduct mechanical, temperature, salinity, thickness, acoustic, and under-ice morphology measurements; and validate sensor data.
- Deploy acoustic instruments, drifting devices, and track Radio Frequency (RF) / Automatic Identification System (AIS) tags and conduct visible and infrared drone surveys for ice-detection, tracking, and navigation research.
- Use approximately 220 m³ of diesel, 1,200 L of aviation fuel, up to 4 L of mixed fuel, and lithium-ion batteries. No freshwater would be withdrawn, and all waste would be managed under Canadian Coast Guard procedures.
- Apply mitigation measures, including low-power acoustic sources, suitable-weather drone operations, trackable drifters, and keeping a RHIB available for equipment recovery.

2. Inclusion or Exclusion to Scoping List

The NIRB has identified:

- no additional work or activities in relation to the project proposal. As a result, the NIRB will proceed with screening the project based on the scope described above.

3. Public Comments and Concerns

As outlined in Table 1 above, notices regarding the NIRB's screening of this project proposal were distributed to community organizations as well as to relevant federal and territorial government agencies, Inuit organizations and other parties with a request for interested parties to provide the Board with any comments or concerns regarding:

- Whether the project proposal is likely to arouse significant public concern; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse eco-systemic or socio-economic effects; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is likely to cause significant adverse impacts on wildlife habitat or Inuit harvest activities; and if so, why;
- Whether the project proposal is of a type where the potential adverse effects are highly predictable and mitigable with known technology, (and providing any recommended mitigation measures); and
- Any matter of importance to the Party related to the project proposal.

On or before August 14, 2026, the NIRB received comments from the following interested parties:

Table 2: Comments Received

Commenting Party	NIRB Doc ID No.
Transport Canada (TC)	362682
Government Of Nunavut (GN)	362776
Kitikmeot Inuit Association (KitIA)	362739

a. Summary of Comments and Concerns Received

The following provides a summary of the comments and concerns received by the NIRB in relation to the “ICENAV” project proposal:

TC Comments:

Transport Canada has no concerns or recommendations regarding the project **and** supports the proposal. It determined that the described project activities do not require further comment.

GN Comments:

The GN has reviewed the proposed project and related documents and has no comments or concerns to raise with the Board at this time.

KitIA Comments:

KitIA recommends protecting belugas, narwhals, and other wildlife during sensitive periods because these animals are important to Inuit communities for harvesting and food. KitIA also recommends ensuring proper fuel and waste management, hiring local Inuit Beneficiaries, and maintaining ongoing engagement with local HTOs and communities.

b. Comments and Concerns with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge

No concerns or comments were received with respect to Inuit Qaujimaningit or Indigenous and Community knowledge in relation to the proposed project. However, Inuit Qaujimaningit and Indigenous and community knowledge is incorporated into the terms and conditions recommended below based on information collected from prior and similar projects, data collected and mapped by the Commission, and other available sources.

ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF *NUPPAA*

In determining whether a review of the project is required, the Board considered whether the project proposal had potential to result in significant ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts, as summarized in Table 3. The Board took particular care to consider Inuit Qaujimaningit, Indigenous and Community Knowledge in carrying out its assessment and determination of the significance of impacts.

Table 3: Summary of the Board's Assessment of Factors s. 90 NuPPAA

Factor	Comment
The size of the geographic area, including the size of wildlife habitats, likely to be affected by the impacts.	Although the vessel route covers a broad marine area, the project has no permanent physical footprint. Project-specific work is temporary and mobile, with brief stations and small on-ice teams generally operating within 100 metres of the vessel. No land-based camp or permanent infrastructure is proposed. The proposed Project would take place within marine and sea-ice habitats used by far-ranging wildlife species, including birds and marine wildlife that may occur along the vessel route. Project activities at individual research stations would be temporary and limited in duration.
The ecosystemic sensitivity of that area.	No specific protected area or other ecosystemically sensitive site was identified in the provided project materials. Activities are limited to short-duration research in marine and sea-ice environments and would move with local ice and weather conditions.
The historical, cultural and archaeological significance of that area.	No specific historical, cultural, archaeological or palaeontological sites were identified. The project is marine- and sea-ice-based and proposes no terrestrial ground disturbance or land-based camp.
The size of the human and the animal populations likely to be affected by the impacts.	The field program involves up to 13 scientific personnel for approximately 10 days. Resolute Bay and Cambridge Bay are the nearest communities referenced in the project materials. Wildlife using the marine and sea-ice environment, including birds and marine wildlife encountered along the vessel route, may also be temporarily exposed to Project activities. Given the temporary and mobile nature of the work, effects on people and wildlife populations are expected to be limited and short term.
The nature, magnitude and complexity of the impacts; the probability of the impacts occurring; the frequency and duration of the impacts; and the reversibility or irreversibility of the impacts.	Potential effects are small-scale and temporary and include short-term vessel/helicopter/drone noise, low-power underwater sound, brief ice sampling, equipment loss or a minor spill/waste incident. The Proponent identifies straightforward mitigation, including low-power acoustics, suitable-weather drone flights, trackable drifters, RHIB recovery capability and Canadian Coast Guard fuel/waste procedures. Effects are expected to be localized and reversible.
The cumulative impacts that could result from the impacts of the project combined with those of any other project that has been carried	Based on the information provided, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts is expected to be limited. The proposed activities are short in duration and mobile in nature, and no permanent physical footprint is

Factor	Comment
out, is being carried out or is likely to be carried out.	anticipated. As such, the Project is not expected to substantially contribute to cumulative ecosystemic or socio-economic impacts when considered in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects.
Any other factor that the Board considers relevant to the assessment of the significance of impacts.	No other relevant factors were identified; however, see below for Regulatory Requirements mandating mitigation and/or reporting

Regulatory Requirements

The Proponent is also advised that the following legislation may apply to the Project:

Acts and Regulations

Nunavut Agreement Act, Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, Arctic Shipping Safety and Pollution Prevention Regulations, and Canada Shipping Act, 2001 as relevant to the project.

Nunavut Research Institute authorization is identified as required;

Views of the Board

In considering the above factors, the Board has identified the following and respectfully provides its views regarding whether the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts. The NIRB has also proposed terms and conditions that would mitigate the potential adverse impacts identified.

Ecosystem, wildlife habitat and Inuit harvesting activities:

Valued Component	Migratory birds, marine-associated wildlife and Species at Risk
Potential effects:	Brief noise or visual disturbance may occur from the vessel, helicopter, RHIBs, drones/RPAS and small on-ice teams. The Proponent specifically identifies drone noise on birds and possible equipment loss/crash as risks.
Nature of Impacts:	Impacts are expected to be minor, intermittent and reversible because activities are temporary, mobile and limited to an approximately 10-day field program with no camp or permanent infrastructure.
Mitigating Factors:	Operate drones only in suitable atmospheric conditions and clear visibility; track deployed drifters; keep a RHIB available for equipment recovery; and keep on-ice work close to the vessel.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Wildlife and Migratory Birds – 14 to 16 Aircraft and Helicopter Operations – 17 to 22

Valued Component	Marine mammals, fish and other marine aquatic organisms.
Potential effects:	Temporary vessel presence, low-power scientific acoustic sources, short acoustic arrays, AUV/ROV work and small-boat activity may cause localized disturbance.
Nature of Impacts:	The activities are brief and station-based. The Proponent states that the scientific acoustic source is low power and has a shorter propagation distance than noise from the CCGS Henry Larsen. Effects are expected to be temporary and localized.
Mitigating Factors:	Use the low-power source only for required trials, keep deployments short, recover equipment, and operate under Canadian Coast Guard procedures.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Marine-Based Activities and Marine Wildlife – 23 - 31

Valued Component	Marine water quality, fish and fish habitat.
Potential effects:	Potential effects are limited mainly to an unlikely fuel/waste incident or loss of small scientific equipment. No project freshwater withdrawal is proposed.
Nature of Impacts:	The project is temporary, uses an existing Coast Guard vessel and proposes no seabed disturbance, dredging or disposal at sea. Any project-specific water-quality effect is expected to be small and localized.
Mitigating Factors:	Follow Canadian Coast Guard fuel, waste and wastewater procedures; retain, treat or land waste at approved facilities; track/recover deployed equipment; and keep RHIB recovery capability available.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Water Quality, Waste and Spill Prevention – 6 to 12

Valued Component	Vegetation, land, soils, terrain stability and permafrost.
Potential effects:	Not applicable to the submitted scope. No land-based camp, terrestrial construction or ground disturbance is proposed.
Nature of Impacts:	No direct effects are expected. Temporary sampling occurs on floating sea ice rather than terrestrial land.
Mitigating Factors:	No project-specific land mitigation was identified as necessary beyond keeping activities temporary and recovering equipment.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	General – 1 to 5

Valued Component	Air quality.
Potential effects:	Minor temporary emissions would occur from the vessel, helicopter, small boats and limited fuel-powered research equipment.
Nature of Impacts:	Emissions are expected to be short term and low in project-specific magnitude because the research is approximately 10 days and is conducted from an existing Coast Guard vessel operating in the Arctic.
Mitigating Factors:	Use standard Canadian Coast Guard operating procedures and limit aircraft, boat and RPAS use to required research activities.

Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Air Quality – 13
---------------------------------------	------------------

Valued Component	Public and traditional marine travel and harvesting activities.
Potential effects:	No specific conflict with public or traditional use was identified in the provided project materials. Temporary vessel, drone, helicopter or acoustic activity could cause brief localized disturbance.
Nature of Impacts:	Potential interactions are expected to be minor and temporary because the project is mobile, short-duration and has no permanent facilities.
Mitigating Factors:	Use normal Coast Guard navigation procedures, keep stations temporary, recover equipment and maintain communication with potentially affected communities and organizations as appropriate.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Community Engagement and Inuit Harvesting 34

Socio-economic effects on northerners:

Valued Component	Historical, cultural, archaeological and palaeontological resources.
Potential effects:	No specific sites or concerns were identified. The project is marine- and sea-ice-based and proposes no terrestrial ground disturbance.
Nature of Impacts:	Adverse effects are not expected from the submitted scope
Mitigating Factors:	Avoid unplanned land disturbance and follow the appropriate authority's direction if an unexpected heritage resource is encountered.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Heritage Resources- 32

Valued Component	Employment, contracting and regional participation.
Potential effects:	A small positive regional benefit may result from participation by Qillaq Innovations, an Inuit-owned company based in Cambridge Bay, which is identified as supporting UAV activities. Resolute Bay community involvement is also recorded in the application.
Nature of Impacts:	Benefits are expected to be positive but limited in scale and duration because the field program is approximately 10 days. Specific local hiring or contract values were not provided.
Mitigating Factors:	Use local and Inuit-owned services where feasible and maintain appropriate community engagement.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Community Engagement and Inuit Harvesting – 35

Significant public concern:

Valued Component	Potential for significant public concern.
Potential effects:	No significant public concern was identified during the public comment period
Nature of Impacts:	The submitted activities are small-scale, temporary and research-focused, with no land-based camp or permanent infrastructure. On the

	project materials alone, the potential for significant public concern appears low.
Mitigating Factors:	Provide clear notice of activities, maintain appropriate communication with affected organizations, recover equipment, and apply the Proponent's operational mitigation measures.
Proposed Terms and Conditions:	Heritage Resources– 32 Community Engagement, Inuit Harvesting 33

Technological innovations for which the effects are unknown:

- The project tests navigation and ice-sensing technologies, but the activities themselves are small-scale and temporary. The main project-specific risks identified are equipment loss, drone disturbance/crash and low-power underwater sound, all of which have straightforward operational mitigation. No specific issue suggesting significant or unmanageable effects from the technological innovations was identified in the provided project materials.

Administrative Conditions:

To encourage compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and assist the Board and responsible authorities with compliance and effects monitoring for project activities, the following project-specific terms and conditions have been recommended: 1-5.

In considering the above factors and subject to the Proponent's compliance with regulatory requirements and the terms and conditions necessary to mitigate against the potential adverse environmental and social effects, the Board is of the view that the proposed project is unlikely to cause significant public concern and its adverse ecosystemic and socioeconomic impacts are unlikely to be significant, or are highly predictable and can be adequately mitigated by known technologies.

RECOMMENDED PROJECT-SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The Board is recommending the following specific terms and conditions to apply in respect of the project:

General

1. Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) (the Proponent) shall maintain a copy of the Project Terms and Conditions at the site of operation at all times and make it accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
2. The Proponent shall operate in accordance with all commitments stated in correspondence provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC File No.: 151230), to the NIRB (Online Application Form, August 4, 2026). This information should be accessible to enforcement officers upon request.
3. The Proponent shall operate the site in accordance with all applicable Acts, Regulations and Guidelines.
4. The Proponent shall ensure that it meets the standards and/or limits as set out in the authorizing agencies' permits or licences as required for this project.

5. The Proponent shall ensure that all personnel, staff and contractors are adequately trained prior to commencement of all project activities and are made aware of all operational plans, management plans, guidelines and Proponent commitments relating to the project.

Water Quality, Waste and Spill Prevention

6. The Proponent shall not deposit, nor permit the deposit of any fuel, chemicals, wastes (including wastewater) or sediment into any water body. The Proponent should have in place an Emergency Spill Response Plan that is approved by the appropriate authorizing agency(ies).
7. The Proponent shall manage all hazardous and non-hazardous waste including food, domestic wastes, debris and petroleum-based chemicals (e.g., greases, gasoline, glycol-based antifreeze) in such a manner to avoid release into the environment and access to wildlife at all times until disposed of appropriately or at an approved facility.
8. The Proponent shall have a Spill Contingency Plan in place at all fuel storage or transfer locations and shall ensure that appropriate spill response equipment and clean-up materials (e.g., shovels, pumps, barrels, drip pans, and absorbents) are readily available.
9. The Proponent shall follow the authorizing agencies' direction for management and removal of hazardous materials and wastes (e.g., contaminated soils, sediment and waste oil).
10. The Proponent shall ensure that wildlife deterrent systems are utilized at the time of a spill incident in order to prevent wildlife (terrestrial or marine) and migratory birds from being contaminated.
11. The Proponent shall ensure that all spills of fuel or other deleterious materials of 100 litres or more are reported immediately to the 24-hour Spill Line at (867) 920-8130.
12. The Proponent shall remove all garbage, fuel and equipment at the end of each field season and/or upon completion of work and/or upon abandonment.

Air Quality

13. The Proponent shall eliminate unnecessary idling to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as much as possible.

Wildlife and Migratory Birds

14. The Proponent shall not substantially alter or damage or destroy any wildlife habitat in conducting this operation unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate authorizing agencies.
15. The Proponent shall not chase, weary, harass or molest wildlife. This includes persistently circling, chasing, hovering over, pursuing or otherwise harassing wildlife, or disturbing large groups of animals.
16. The Proponent shall carry out all phases of the project in a manner that protects migratory birds and avoids harming, killing or disturbing migratory birds or destroying, disturbing or taking their nests or eggs. In this regard, the Proponent shall take into account Environment and Climate Change Canada's Avoidance Guidelines. The Proponent's actions in applying the Avoidance Guidelines shall be in compliance with the Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994 and with the Species at Risk Act.

Aircraft and Helicopter Operations

17. The Proponent shall not alter flight paths to approach wildlife and avoid flying directly over animals.
18. The Proponent shall plan flight paths that minimize flights over known habitat likely to have birds or concentrations of wildlife. Aircraft should avoid critical and sensitive wildlife areas at all times by choosing alternate flight corridors.
19. The Proponent shall restrict aircraft/helicopter activity related to the project to a minimum flight altitude of 610 metres (2,001 ft) above ground level except during landing, take-off or if there is a specific requirement for low-level flying, which does not disturb wildlife or migratory birds.
20. The Proponent shall avoid known concentrations of birds (e.g., bird colonies, moulting areas) by a lateral distance of 1.5 kilometres. If avoidance is not possible maintain a minimum flight altitude of 1,100 metres (3,500 feet) over these areas.
21. The Proponent shall ensure that aircraft/helicopters do not touch down in areas where wildlife are present, except in an emergency.
22. The Proponent shall advise all pilots of relevant flight restrictions and enforce their application over the project area, including flight paths to/from the project area.

Marine-Based Activities and Marine Wildlife

23. The Proponent shall, where practicable, coordinate with other vessels to minimize simultaneous vessel traffic in critical wildlife habitat areas allowing the wildlife to continue to use the habitat undisturbed (e.g. Navy Board Inlet, Lancaster Sound, Milne Inlet, Bellot Strait).
24. The Proponent shall ensure that noise be kept to a minimum and shall refrain from making sharp or loud noises, blowing horns or whistles and shall maintain constant engine noise levels.
25. The Proponent shall not attempt to intersect or interfere with the movements of marine mammals. This includes ensuring that there are no wake zones within 250 metres and a minimum of 100 metre no go zone around marine mammals. Strategic positioning of vessels ahead of the path being traveled by mobile mammals and waiting for the mammals to pass is also prohibited.
26. When marine mammals appear to be trapped or disturbed by vessel movements, the Proponent shall implement appropriate measures to mitigate disturbance, including stoppage of movement until wildlife have moved away from the immediate area.
27. The Proponent shall maintain a distance of 100 metres if a Polar Bear is encountered on land or ice while conducting activities from a zodiac or other small craft; all interaction with Polar Bears should be avoided if possible.
28. The Proponent shall maintain a distance of 500 metres from a walrus haul-out while conducting activities from a zodiac or other small craft.
29. The Proponent shall suspend all project activities should any dead fish or wildlife (both marine and terrestrial), or any injured wildlife be observed during any works or activities in

and around the marine waters. Activities may only be resumed on the recommendation of the authorizing agencies.

30. The Proponent shall report all incidents, injuries or sightings of marine mammals to the appropriate authorizing agencies.
31. The Proponent shall implement measures designed to minimize disturbance to seabed sediments and benthic communities and marine wildlife when carrying out project activities within the marine environment.

Heritage Resources

32. The Proponent shall ensure that archaeological and paleontological sites are not purposely or inadvertently disturbed by clients or staff as a result of project activities.

Community Engagement, Inuit Harvesting

33. The Proponent should consult with local residents regarding their activities in the area and solicit available Inuit Qaujimaningit and information that can inform project activities.
34. The Proponent shall ensure that project activities do not interfere with Inuit wildlife harvesting or traditional land use activities.
35. The Proponent should, to the extent possible, hire local people and access local services.

OTHER NIRB CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the project-specific terms and conditions, the Board is recommending the following:

Change in Project Scope

1. Responsible authorities or Proponent shall notify the Nunavut Planning Commission and/or Parks Canada as appropriate, and the NIRB of any changes in operating plans or conditions, including phase advancement, associated with this project prior to any such change.

Copy of licences, etc. to the Board and Commission

2. The NIRB respectfully requests that responsible authorities submit a copy of each licence, permit or other authorization issued for the Project to the NIRB to assist in enabling possible project monitoring that may be required. Please forward a copy of the licences, permits and/or other authorizations to the NIRB directly at info@nirb.ca or upload a copy to the NIRB's online registry at www.nirb.ca.

Use of Inuit Qaujimaningit

3. The Proponent is encouraged to work with local communities and knowledge holders to inform project design, to carry out the project, and to confirm or validate the perspectives represented in publications and reports as part of the project. Care should be taken to ensure that Inuit Qaujimaningit and local knowledge collected for the project is used with permission and is accurately represented.

No additional project-specific NIRB concerns or recommendations were identified in the provided project materials. Any additional requirements would need to be developed through the screening and regulatory review process.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing constitutes the Board's screening decision with respect to Defence Research and Development Canada's "ICENAV" project. Based on the submitted materials, the project is a small-scale, temporary and mobile research program with no permanent footprint or land-based camp. The NIRB remains available for consultation with the Minister regarding this report as necessary.

Dated August 19, 2026 at Iqaluit, NU.



Albert Ehloak, Chairperson