

**REGDOC-1.2.1: Comments received in advance of the  
workshop with industry**

**REGDOC-1.2.1: Commentaires reçus en vue de  
l'atelier avec l'industrie**

**Note:** Comments submitted, including names and affiliations are intended to be made public, in the official language in which they are received.

**Remarque :** Les commentaires reçus, y compris les noms et les affiliations, seront rendus publics, dans la langue officielle dans laquelle ils auront été reçus.

	<b>Section</b>	<b>Organization / Organisation</b>	<b>Comment / Commentaire</b>	<b>CNSC Response / Réponse la CCSN</b>
1.	General	Bruce Power, BWXT, Cameco, CNA, CNL, CANDU Owners Group, Hydro-Québec, Kinetrics, NB Power, NWMO, OPG, Orano	<p><b>MAJOR</b> While Industry is grateful for the opportunity to review and provide feedback on draft REGDOCs, it is difficult to establish all of the licensees to which this REGDOC applies and how close this version is to its final form.</p> <p><b>Suggested change:</b> Industry realizes that the CNSC will address editorial and minor items in the final version. However, it is difficult to determine how close this REGDOC is to a final version with items such as an incomplete scope and applicability for some facilities. For example, there is an incomplete listing of legislation provided as background (e.g., Impact Assessment Act and its associated regulations).</p> <p><b>Impact on industry:</b> With incomplete sections, it is difficult to determine its applicability for some facilities and to provide a final review.</p> <p>This REGDOC should highlight the extensive review and public processes that DGR facilities are subject to by way of background.</p>	<p>This comment was made based on an earlier version of the REGDOC that did not incorporate the extensive revisions made following public comments.</p> <p>The current revised document clarifies the applicability of the REGDOC in section 1.2, Scope, and has updated the relevant legislation in section 1.3.</p> <p>A new background section was added in section 2, which highlights the importance of environmental reviews (section 2.1) and of public and indigenous engagement (section 2.2).</p>

	Section	Organization / Organisation	Comment / Commentaire	CNSC Response / Réponse la CCSN
2.	General and applies to various sections	Bruce Power, BWXT, Cameco, CNA, CNL, CANDU Owners Group, Hydro-Québec, Kinetrics, NB Power, NWMO, OPG, Orano	<p><b>MAJOR</b> This REGDOC is titled “Guidance” but it also describes requirements which creates confusion about which aspects are considered guidance. For example, Section 3.1 and Figure 1 cover things like the safety case, EA/IA aspects and licensing. Section 5.1 describes the requirement to have a management system.</p> <p><b>Suggested change:</b> The REGDOC should be clear about the aspects that are considered guidance.</p> <p><b>Impact on industry:</b> The clarity on requirements versus guidance provides the regulatory certainty that is needed for licensing and compliance activities.</p>	<p>There are no requirements in this document, only guidance.</p> <p>The language in the document is consistent with language conventions applied to all CNSC regulatory documents. This is now clearly described in the preface. For example, there are no “shall” statements, commonly used to express requirements, in REGDOC-1.2.1, <i>Guidance on Deep Geological Repository Site Characterization</i>. The revised REGDOC only contains language consistent with expressing guidance.</p>
3.	Section 3.1, Figure 1 and Appendix A, Section 4	Bruce Power, BWXT, Cameco, CNA, CNL, CANDU Owners Group, Hydro-Québec, Kinetrics, NB Power, NWMO, OPG, Orano	<p><b>MAJOR</b> The REGDOC should be clear that the level of detail and information supporting a given licence progressively increases with each licensing phase. It should not suggest that the same requirements apply to different licences. For example, there would be more information/evidence available from site characterization to support a construction licence application than a licence to prepare site application (which could be requested earlier).</p> <p><b>Suggested change:</b> Similar to the Class I regulations, Section 3.1, Figure 1 and Appendix A, Section 4 should be clear that there are different requirements that apply depending on the licence being considered. The initial licence application referred to in the last sentence of Appendix A, Section 4 will be very different if the initial application is for a licence to prepare site as opposed</p>	<p>There are no requirements in this document. The revised document was carefully evaluated for consistency with the NSCA and associated Class I regulations.</p> <p>Revisions to the document were undertaken to provide clarity. This was done by addressing and incorporating comments from industry, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders. The revision and drafting of Section 3, 3.1 and Figure 1 in REGDOC-1.2.1, <i>Guidance on Deep Geological Repository Site Characterization</i> addressed many of those comments.</p> <p>Requirements for a post-closure safety case (including safety assessment) are not addressed or defined in this document (section 1.2, bullet 5). Similarly, safety analysis is not referenced in this document, except to say that it is not within the scope of the document (section 1.2 bullet 4). Section 1.2 (scope) in the revised REGDOC indicates that these topics are addressed in REGDOC-2.11.1, <i>Waste Management, Volume III: Safety Case for Disposal of Radioactive Waste, Version 2</i>.</p>

	Section	Organization / Organisation	Comment / Commentaire	CNSC Response / Réponse la CCSN
			<p>to a combined licence for site preparation and construction.</p> <p>Appendix A should also be clear that Section 4 activities occur under a licence given that it makes reference to sinking the shaft. This point is also at odds with the one above.</p> <p><b>Impact on industry:</b> This REGDOC needs to remain consistent with the NSCA and its associated regulations as well as standard definitions. This comment also applies to the reference to draft REGDOC-2.11.1 Vol III used in this REGDOC and that is being revised at the same time. Reference is made to “safety assessment”, “safety analysis” and “safety case” with specific licensing phases in this REGDOC and in the 2.11.1 Series. These terms are used in regulations and are defined in REGDOC-3.6 but they appear to be used differently (and sometimes interchangeably) in the waste REGDOCs.</p>	<p>Reference to the initial licence application (whether for site preparation or construction or both) have been removed from the Appendix, section A.4.</p>
4.	3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, all of 3.3 and 4.0	Bruce Power, BWXT, Cameco, CNA, CNL, CANDU Owners Group, Hydro-Québec, Kinetrics, NB Power, NWMO, OPG, Orano	<p>This REGDOC appears to duplicate other legislation and guidance.</p> <p><b>Suggested change:</b> This REGDOC appears to duplicate other legislation and guidance.</p>	<p>This document does not duplicate other guidance documents, or other pieces of legislation. Links to the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> are provided in the relevant legislation section (section 1.3) in the revised REGDOC.</p> <p>The REGDOC was edited to remove redundancies.</p> <p>Figure 1 was developed to provide clarity on CNSC’s role in the site characterization of DGR facilities, and therefore address numerous comments from industry, civil society, and other stakeholders.</p>