

**NPD Environmental Impact Statement, March 31, 2020**  
**CNSC Staff Completeness Check: May 2020 - FINAL – CNL Responses to NPD EIS Federal and Provincial Review Comments**

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Reference #: 1   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 2   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 227 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 3   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 4   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 5   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 6   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 256 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 257 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 259 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 7   | Complete: No  | Rationale: The response is incomplete or unclear with respect to environmental effects or impacts. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers to a specific section in the revised EIS. However, the text quoted in turn refers the reader to the entire Decommissioning Safety Assessment Report (DSAR) Technical Support Document (TSD) rather than the specific section where this information can be found and verified by the reviewer. Please refer to the specific and relevant section of this document. |
| Reference #: 8   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 260 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 9   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 10  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 261 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 11  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |

| Reference #       | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|-------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Reference #: 262  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 263  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response indicates a new paragraph will be added to the revised EIS. This new text states that additional information is found in (Aikens 2019c). However, this reference is not provided and therefore the reviewer cannot verify this information. CNSC staff's expectation is that all referenced documents that underpin IR responses be provided as part of the complete EIS submission. Please provide the referenced document and update the response to clearly identify where the referenced information may be found.   |
| Reference #: 12   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 13   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 14   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 237  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 15   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 255  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 16   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 17   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 18   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 253A | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 19   | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. For IRs that require a significant amount of technical information, this may mean that the response is summarized in the response table and that additional information is referenced and presented in an addendum document so as not to overwhelm the response table. The response does not contain sufficient technical information to respond to the IR. In particular, the IR requests that the applicability of the chosen analogues be discussed in context with the barrier system details of the proposed NPD Disposal Facility (NPDDF). The information linking the analogues to the barrier at NPDDF is currently very minimal or not included for most analogues. In order to allow for comparison between the analogues and the proposed barriers, this information should draw parallels between the age of the analogues and the barrier performance life for NPD including the environmental conditions of the barrier and those expected for the barriers at NPD in greater detail than is currently provided. Please provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. |
| Reference #: 266  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 252  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 20   | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Reference #: 307 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 21  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The response is incomplete or unclear with respect to environmental effects or impacts. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The response does not completely respond to the question regarding how the Maqarin analogue can be used to provide robustness to the NPDDF safety case. The response presents the observations of cement at the Maqarin site, and where they are, notes in the revised EIS and supporting documentation (although not the alkaline plume modelling report mentioned in the IR). However, the response does not indicate whether or how these observations were taken into account, e.g., any linkage between these observations and the long term behavior of grout at NPD. Please provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. |
| Reference #: 22  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 249 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 228 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 235 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 239 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 23  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 245 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 244 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 24  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 25  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 236 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 26  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 270 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 27  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 28  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 29  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 30  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |

| Reference #       | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|-------------------|---------------|------------|---|
| Reference #: 31   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 238  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 272  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 274  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 273  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 275  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 268  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 282  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 304  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 278  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 32   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 253B | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 269  | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 33   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 34   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 35   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 36   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 37   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 38   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 39   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 40   | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Reference #: 41  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 42  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. For IRs that require a significant amount of technical information, this may mean that the response is summarized in the response table and that additional information is referenced and presented in an addendum document so as not to overwhelm the response table. The response also does not contain sufficient technical information to respond to the IR. The response indicates that sections, 8.10 and 9.10, have been added to the EIS to present information on Indigenous Socio-economic and Health Baseline and Effects, respectively. However, information specific to each Indigenous group is not included in these two sections as related to Socio-Economic and Health Baseline and Effects. Please clarify where this information may be found or justify why it is not presented. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information. |
| Reference #: 283 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 43  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 284 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers to specific sections in two documents. It is unclear if the information in these two documents is intended to be repetitive or complementary. Please provide a fulsome response to the IR, and summarize clearly in the response the relevancy of referencing these two documents in addressing this comment, including how either or both references contain information underpinning the response.  |
| Reference #: 44  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 45  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 289 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 46  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 47  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 48  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 49  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 50  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 51  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 52  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 53  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 54  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements   |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|---|--|
|                  |               | The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. This response refers the reviewer to section 8.2.4.2 of the revised EIS, which includes the information requested in the IR. However, the key elements of how this information addresses the IR is not summarized directly in the response. Please summarize clearly in the response how this referenced information addresses the comment.  |
| Reference #: 55  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 56  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 57  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 58  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 59  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 60  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 61  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 62  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 63  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 64  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 65  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that all responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. The reference in the response (Silken and Wills, 2012), which underpins this response, has not been provided. As such, the reviewer cannot verify this response nor the change to the revised EIS submission. Please include the reference that underpins the response as part of the complete EIS submission. |
| Reference #: 66  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that all responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. The reference in the response (Silken and Wills, 2012), which underpins this response, has not been provided. As such, the reviewer cannot verify this response nor the change to the revised EIS submission. Please include the reference that underpins the response as part of the complete EIS submission. |
| Reference #: 67  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that all responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. The reference in the response (AECOM 2017), which underpins this response, has not been provided. As such, the reviewer cannot verify this response nor the change to the revised EIS submission. Please include the reference that underpins the response as part of the complete EIS submission.             |
| Reference #: 68  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 69  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 70  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 286 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|------------------|---------------|--|---|
| Reference #: 287 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 71  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 72  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. The IR response states, "CNL believes the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) would agree with this interpretation as they asked and secured funding through the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to carry out a Traditional Knowledge and Land Use Study (TKLUS) that is relevant to CNL's activities in the region." Please clarify if the conclusion drawn by CNL in the response was validated with the MNO. If so, please provide details on these discussions. If not, please provide a rationale.<br><br>In addition, sections 4.5.2, 6.1, 7.6, 7.9 and 8.9 of the revised EIS do not include the information specified by CNL in the response. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information. |
| Reference #: 73  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 74  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 75  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 76  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 77  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 78  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. In this response, CNL states that section 8.9 (Indigenous Land and Resource Use) has been added to the revised EIS, which includes the text from the IR response in section 8.9.3.1.2. However, there is no section 8.9.3.1.2. Please clarify where this information may be found in the revised EIS. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information.   |
| Reference #: 79  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 80  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 305 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 81  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 82  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 83  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 84  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers the reviewer to the EIS for information on   |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|--|--|
|                  |               |  | mitigation measures, and to three other documents for information on monitoring programs, without including references to the specific and relevant sections of these documents. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the EIS and referenced documents.   |
| Reference #: 85  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 86  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 87  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 88  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers the reviewer to three documents for information on follow-up monitoring programs, without identifying the relevant sections within these documents. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of these referenced documents.   |
| Reference #: 89  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 295 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 90  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 91  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 92  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.<br><br>The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response should also address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The response refers the reviewer to a reference (Taylor 2020) for additional information which would complement and complete the response. This would include a rationale for site selection and a map thereof. However, as this reference has not been provided, it is unclear if this reference provides the requested information, which would include a detailed map of site structures/areas, and a full methodology for site selection (in addition to the criteria listed in the response itself). Please include the reference that underpins the response as part of the complete EIS submission.<br><br>In addition, the request for a comparison of alternatives is not addressed in the response. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed. |
| Reference #: 93  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 296 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 94  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 292 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 95  | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that all responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. The response indicates that section 6.3.3 contains a short section describing how valued components (VCs) suggested by Indigenous communities have been incorporated into the revised EIS. However, this section does not contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission   |



| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|------------------|---------------|--|---|
|                  |               |  | and/or Indigenous Engagement Report (IER) include detailed information on how engagement with Indigenous groups helped define the selection of VCs for the aquatic environment.<br><br>The response also contains incomplete information regarding engagement discussions and uses assumptions statements. Please clarify what validation and feedback was received from each Indigenous group and how CNL responded or incorporated this into the selection of VCs. This should also include how and where the information provided by MNO through the TKLUS was incorporated into the revised EIS and/or IER for this subject matter.   |
| Reference #: 96  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 97  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 297 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 98  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 298 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 99  | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 100 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 101 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self- contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers the reviewer to two entire sections of the revised EIS as well as three documents for information on trigger levels, without identifying the relevant sections within these sections and documents. In effect, the response does not contain sufficient information for review. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the EIS and referenced documents. |
| Reference #: 102 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 290 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 103 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 104 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 300 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 105 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 291 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 106 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review, on three points:  |

| Reference #      | Complete     | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|--------------|--|--|
|                  |              |  | <p>1- The response does not specifically indicate what “existing information” on traditional use was referenced to validate the indication “that the typical types of traditional activities such as hunting and fishing were being carried out by Indigenous people in the Ottawa Valley.” As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to consider this information. Please provide a list of resources that are being referred to as “existing information” and any documentation that was used to validate the statements made in the IR response. CNSC staff expect all documents/information to be provided as part of the complete EIS submission in order to begin the technical review.</p> <p>2- The response does not contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to include detailed information on how engagement with Indigenous groups helped define the selection of VCs.</p> <p>3- The response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p>  |
| Reference #: 107 | Complete: No | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review, on three points:</p> <p>1- The response does not specifically indicate what traditional knowledge was considered in the development of the assessment boundaries. Please provide a list of resources that were considered as well as any documentation that was used to validate the statements made in the IR response. CNSC staff expect all documents/information to be provided as part of the complete EIS submission in order to begin the technical review.</p> <p>2- The response and indicated sections of the revised EIS and IER do not contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to include detailed information on how engagement was conducted by CNL with Indigenous groups on this topic.</p> <p>3- The response references the MNO TKLUS under the “References” heading however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p>  |
| Reference #: 108 | Complete: No | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review, on two points:</p> <p>1- There is very little detail included on discussions had and feedback received from each Indigenous group identified in table 7.3-1 in the revised EIS and how this feedback was taken into consideration or addressed by CNL in sections 7.6 and 9.9 of the revised EIS and section 4.5 of the IER. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to consider this information. CNL should demonstrate that through its engagement activities it had discussions with all identified First Nation and Métis groups regarding potential impacts to Indigenous and/or treaty rights, as well as potential impacts as per the requirements of the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> (CEAA 2012) and has tracked and addressed any issues/concerns/feedback in the EIS and/or IER. If these discussions did not occur with any group, CNL should provide justification.</p> <p>2- The response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p> |
| Reference #: 109 | Complete: No | Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.            | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response and the referenced section 7.6 of the revised EIS do not specifically indicate whether the “renaturalization process” and its potential benefits to trapping, hunting, and gathering activities have been discussed with Indigenous groups, what feedback was received from each Indigenous group and how this feedback was taken into consideration or addressed by CNL.</p>  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|--|--|
|                  |               |  | <p>The response also indicates that sections 4 and 7 of the IER include an updated description of engagements, discussion and engagement results. However, these sections are broad and therefore these references are unspecific, and do not allow the reviewer to find and validate the referenced information. Please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- where the information specific to engagement on the “renaturalization process” and its potential benefits to trapping, hunting, and gathering activities may be found within section 4 of the IER (or elsewhere in the submission)</li> <li>- where the information specific to engagement on the “renaturalization process” and its potential benefits to trapping, hunting, and gathering activities may be found within section 7 of the IER (or elsewhere in the submission).</li> </ul>  |
| Reference #: 110 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.  | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>                     The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. This response states that section 9.9.3 of the revised EIS includes specific reference to potential effects of First Nation and Métis fishing rights. However, neither the response nor the referenced section 9.9.3 of the revised EIS contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission and/or IER to include detailed information on how CNL conducted engagement with Indigenous groups on this topic.</p>   |
| Reference #: 111 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b></p>  |
| Reference #: 112 | Complete: No  | <p>Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.</p> <p>The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.</p> | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>                     The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. There is very little detail included on discussions had and feedback received from each Indigenous group identified in table 7.3-1 in the revised EIS related to CNL’s conclusion that there will be no residual effects on Aboriginal Land and Resource Use VCs during all phases of the project and how this feedback was taken into consideration or addressed by CNL. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to consider this information. CNL should demonstrate that through their engagement activities it were discussions with all identified First Nation and Métis groups regarding potential impacts to Indigenous and/or treaty rights, as well as potential impacts as per the requirements of CEAA 2012 and has tracked and addressed any issues/concerns/feedback in the revised EIS and/or IER. If these discussions did not occur with any group, CNL should provide justification.</p> <p>In addition, the response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR.</p> <p>Finally, the response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provide in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p> |
| Reference #: 231 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b></p>  |
| Reference #: 293 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b></p>  |
| Reference #: 113 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b></p>  |
| Reference #: 114 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b></p>  |
| Reference #: 115 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>                     The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self- contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. This response refers the reviewer to section 9.6.6 of the DSAR for further information regarding the stack collapse event. However, this information is not summarized in the response so it is unknown if this reference will address the sub-questions in the IR. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been</p>  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|--|--|
|                  |               |  | addressed and clearly summarize in the response the information contained in the DSAR supporting the response and the relevancy of referencing the DSAR in addressing the comment and its sub-questions.   |
| Reference #: 294 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 251 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 116 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 234 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 117 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 118 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self- contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers to the reference (Taylor 2020) for identification of the location of the batch mixing plant. As this information could not be found in the revised EIS, and the reference was not provided, the reviewer cannot confirm and validate this information. Please include the reference that underpins the response as part of the complete EIS submission.  |
| Reference #: 119 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 120 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self- contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers to three draft monitoring plans for information. However, it is unclear if all the information requested is found in either or all of these documents. In addition, CNSC staff's expectation in the comment is that the information requested be included in the EIS. The response only states that a mention has been made in the EIS about the existence of these documents, and that they are being developed in consultation with Indigenous groups and the public, which does not respond adequately to the request to incorporate information into the EIS. Please update the revised EIS accordingly to include the information requested and clearly summarize in the response the supporting information and the relevancy of referencing the three draft monitoring plans in addressing the comment. |
| Reference #: 301 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 230 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 121 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self- contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The reference in the response (Taylor 2019), which underpins this response as a source of supporting information, has not been provided. As such, the reviewer cannot verify this response. Please include the reference that underpins the response as part of the complete EIS submission.   |
| Reference #: 122 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. Please clarify if all Indigenous groups identified in table 7.3-1 of the revised EIS were engaged on the topic and if not please provide a rationale. Please provide details in the revised EIS and/or IER on which Indigenous groups provided feedback through engagement including what issues, concerns, and/or feedback were raised by each Indigenous group, as well as how CNL addressed these.  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|--|--|
|                  |               |  | <p>In addition, the response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR.</p> <p>Finally, the response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provide in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p>   |
| Reference #: 123 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>                     The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. Please clarify if all Indigenous groups identified in table 7.3-1 of the revised EIS were engaged on the topic and if not, please provide a rationale. Please provide details in the revised EIS and/or IER on which Indigenous groups provided feedback through engagement including what issues, concerns, and/or feedback were raised by each Indigenous group, as well as how CNL addressed these.</p> <p>In addition, the response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR.</p> |
| Reference #: 124 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>                     The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. In the response, CNL indicated that the information regarding the Algonquin Anishinabeg Nation Tribal Council (AANTC) was updated in table 7.3-1 of the revised EIS. This information has not been updated in the referenced table, it currently references a comprehensive land claim. Please update table 7.3-1 within the revised EIS with the appropriate information.</p>  |
| Reference #: 125 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b>   |
| Reference #: 126 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b>   |
| Reference #: 127 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>                     The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR.</p> <p>In addition, the response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of the IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information.</p>                                  |
| Reference #: 128 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | <b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b>   |
| Reference #: 129 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.   | <p><b>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:</b><br/>                     The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. Section 7.4 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER provide information on MOUs with two groups, AOO and MNO. However, it is unclear if the requested information on any planned engagement activities (or a rationale if none) with all Indigenous groups identified by CNL in table 7.3-1 in the revised EIS has been provided. Please clarify and provide information on planned engagement activities, if any, with all Indigenous groups identified by CNL in table 7.3-1 in the EIS. If there are no planned activities, please provide a rationale.</p>  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|------------------|---------------|------------|---|
| Reference #: 130 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 131 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 132 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 133 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 134 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 135 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 136 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 137 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 138 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 139 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 140 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 141 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 142 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 143 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 144 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 145 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 146 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 147 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 148 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 149 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 150 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Reference #: 151 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 152 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 153 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 154 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 155 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 156 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 157 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 158 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 159 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 160 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 161 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. This response refers the reviewer to an entire section of the Ecological Risk Assessment (EcoRA) TSD, entitled "Problem Formulation", without identifying the section(s) relevant to addressing the comment. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the EcoRA TSD and summarize clearly in the response the relevancy of referencing this document in addressing the comment. |
| Reference #: 162 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 163 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 164 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 165 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 166 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 167 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 168 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. This response does not address the request to provide additional information on the "discharge to Shore" scenario. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed.  |
| Reference #: 169 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Reference #: 170 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 171 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 172 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 173 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 174 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 175 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 176 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 177 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 178 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 179 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 180 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:<br>This response is sufficient for the purposes of the EA process. This does not exclude the safety case from undergoing a review as part of the licensing process.   |
| Reference #: 181 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 182 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 183 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 184 | Complete: No  | Rationale:<br>The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:<br>The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. The response provides information related to the demonstration of model parameters and the consideration of specific Features, Events and Processes (FEPs) for the various scenarios. However, the response refers the reviewer to combine tables in Appendix D with the entire Appendix E to find this information. This reference is too vague. It is further unclear how each of the sets of information relate to each other (e.g. how the FEPs described in Appendix D relate to or affect the model parameters described in Appendix E).The response further refers the reviewer to the entire section 5 of the Post closure Safety Assessment to find information responding to the sub-questions related to dominant transport pathways and release characteristics. Please summarize clearly in the response how this referenced information addresses the comment. For each sub-question, a summary response should be provided along with targeted reference to specific sections in supporting documentation for additional information. In addition, please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the Postclosure Safety Assessment. |
| Reference #: 185 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:   |
| Reference #: 186 | Complete: No  | Rationale:<br>The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.            | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:<br>The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The information provided in the response, while corollary, does not clearly answer the question asked. The response does not adequately explain the linkage between the start of  |



| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response   |
|------------------|---------------|--|--|
|                  |               |  | the degradation times and the number of flushes. More specifically, the response does not specify the time scale corresponding to each stage (I, II and III), and the hydraulic conductivities at the end of each stage. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed.   |
| Reference #: 187 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 188 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The response does not address the request to clarify how the assumptions for the exposure profiles were made. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed. |
| Reference #: 189 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 190 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 191 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 192 | Complete: No  | Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request. | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that all responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. The reference in the response (Edwards and Adams 2019), which underpins this response, has not been provided. As such, the reviewer cannot verify this response nor the change to the revised EIS submission. Please include the reference that underpins the response as part of the complete EIS submission.                     |
| Reference #: 193 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 194 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 195 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 196 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 197 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 198 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 199 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 200 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 201 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 202 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 203 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |
| Reference #: 204 | Complete: Yes | Rationale:   | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:  |

| Reference #      | Complete      | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|------------------|---------------|------------|---|
| Reference #: 205 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 206 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 207 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 208 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 209 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 210 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 211 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 212 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 213 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 214 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 215 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 216 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 217 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 218 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 219 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 220 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 221 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 222 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 223 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 224 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |
| Reference #: 225 | Complete: Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |

| Reference #         | Complete         | Rationale  | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response  |
|---------------------|------------------|------------|---|
| Reference #:<br>226 | Complete:<br>Yes | Rationale: | Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: |