

Attachment 1: Public Engagement and Information Sessions Information Requirements for the Bay du Nord Development Project				
IR Number	External Review ID	EIS Guideline Reference/ Reference in EIS	Context and Rationale	Specific Question/Information Requirement
IR-1	CEAA-01	EIS: Section 2.6.6	Within the EIS and during discussions in the public virtual information sessions, Equinor Canada has described the tieback threshold distance for future well site development to be 40 kilometres. The Agency confirmed with the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board that 40 kilometres is the technically feasible distance to the production installation. Therefore, the Agency requires information that explains why the spatial boundary for the Future Development Project Area exceeds the 40 kilometre range, in some directions, from the proposed location of the FPSO. The Agency requires this information in order to determine the extent to which the Agency will assess and condition where project activities will take place.	Provide the rationale for the portions of the Project Area boundary that exceeds the 40 kilometre threshold distance from the FPSO located in the Core Development Area.
IR-2	KMKNO-03, 04	EIS Guidelines Part 5: Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised Reference in EIS: Section 3.0 Regulatory, Indigenous, and Stakeholder Engagement; Subsection 3.3.2 Engagement Activities	With respect to engagement activities conducted by the proponent, Section 5 of the EIS guidelines requires that the EIS <i>“document the main issues and comments raised during the engagement activities by each group and the proponent’s responses.” Further, the EIS guidelines requires the proponent to document where and how Indigenous groups perspectives were integrated into and/or contributed to decisions regarding the project, design, construction, operation, decommissioning, maintenance, follow-up and monitoring and associated potential effects (paragraph 5(1)(c)) and the associated mitigation utilized to manage those effects. The effects and mitigation measures should be clearly linked to valued components in the EIS as well as to specific project components or activities.”</i> Section 3.3.2 of the EIS includes “Key Issues” tables (3.3; 3.5; 3.7; 3.9; 3.11; 3.13; 3.15; 3.17; 3.19; 3.21; 3.23; 3.25; 3.27; 3.29; 3.31; and 3.33). Indigenous groups have indicated that the descriptions in the “Key Issues and Questions Raised” columns are too high level and that the response provided does not address the issue. Example: KMKNO indicates it raised concerns related to the cumulative effects of the offshore projects on Aboriginal rights to fish for food, social and ceremonial purposes, Treaty rights including a right to fish for a moderate livelihood, and commercial communal fishing licences; however, the	For each entry in the “Key Issues and Questions Raised” columns in Tables 3.3- 3.33 in Section 3.3.2 of the EIS, provide details on the specific comment, issue or concern raised by the Indigenous group. For each specific comment, issue or concern, provide a description of how it was used in the effects assessment; and, if any potential effects or impacts on Indigenous peoples were predicted (yes or no); if yes, indicate what mitigation measures and follow up and monitoring programs are intended to manage these effects or impacts.

Attachment 1: Public Engagement and Information Sessions Information Requirements for the Bay du Nord Development Project				
IR Number	External Review ID	EIS Guideline Reference/ Reference in EIS	Context and Rationale	Specific Question/Information Requirement
			<p>summary of issues provided only states “Cumulative Effects” (which KMKNO indicates does not respond to the concerns they raised).</p> <p>In order to assess the adequacy of the responses provided and complete the environmental assessment report and consideration of potential conditions, the Agency requires the specific details of all key issues or comments brought forward by Indigenous groups.</p>	
IR-3	WNNB-09; MTI-01; KMKNO-06	Part 4.2.2 (Part 1)- Community Knowledge and Indigenous Knowledge/Section 3.0 Regulatory, Indigenous, and Stakeholder Engagement; Subsection 3.3.2 Engagement Activities	<p>The EIS guidelines require Equinor to explain what Indigenous knowledge was obtained (unless confidential), including how and where this knowledge has been integrated into the EIS.</p> <p>Several Indigenous groups indicated that it is not evident if and where primary sources of Indigenous knowledge were collected and incorporated in the effects analyses.</p> <p>The Agency requires this information to determine whether Indigenous knowledge made available has been considered in the proponent’s effects analyses and to confirm that any predicted effects or impacts to Indigenous peoples have been mitigated to the greatest extent possible.</p>	<p>Describe the primary sources of Indigenous knowledge that were collected during consultation activities.</p> <p>Describe where primary sources of Indigenous knowledge have been incorporated into the EIS.</p>
IR-4	WNNB-25	VC- Marine Fish and Fish Habitat	Appendix O of the EIS only included consideration of offsetting the calculated amount of potential habitat loss from the Project’s subsea infrastructure. It is not clear to WNNB whether Equinor plans to include the potential alterations and loss of seabed habitat from the drill cuttings in the offsetting plan as described in modelling of drill waste fate and effect.	Explain if the potential alteration and loss of benthic habitat and species from drilling waste effects will be included in the offsetting plan or provide a rationale for why these areas are excluded.