



UNPROTECTED/NON PROTÉGÉ

SUPPLEMENTAL/SUPPLÉMENTAIRE

CMD: 22-H7.B

Date signed/Signé le : 20 MAY/MAI 2022

Reference CMD(s)/CMD de référence : 22-H7

A Licence Amendment

Modification d'un permis

Required Approvals for

Approbations requises pour

Construction of the Near Surface
Disposal Facility (NSDF) at the Chalk
River Laboratories (CRL) site

La construction de l'installation de gestion
des déchets près de la surface (IGDPS)
aux Laboratoires de Chalk River (LCR)

**Canadian Nuclear
Laboratories
Chalk River Laboratories**

**Laboratoires Nucléaires
Canadiens
Laboratoires de Chalk River**

Commission Public Hearing

Audience publique de la Commission

Commission Public Hearing – Part 2

Audience publique de la Commission –
Partie 2

Scheduled for:

Prévue pour :

May 30, 2022

Le 30 mai 2022

Submitted by:

Soumis par :

CNSC Staff

Le personnel de la CCSN

Summary

The purpose of this supplemental Commission member document (CMD) is to provide additional information to what is presented in [CMD 22-H7](#), including:

- CNSC staff's responses to key themes of comments received from public interventions
- Information [requested](#) by the Commission during Part 1 of the hearing
- A mapping of public and Indigenous concerns in relation to international standards
- Additional information addressing concerns around the adequacy of consultation with Indigenous Nations and communities

No actions are required of the Commission. This CMD is for information only.

Résumé

Le présent document à l'intention des commissaires (CMD) supplémentaire fournit d'autres renseignements pour étayer le [CMD 22-H7](#), notamment ce qui suit :

- Les réponses du personnel de la CCSN aux thèmes clés des commentaires reçus lors des interventions publiques
- Les renseignements [demandés](#) par la Commission durant la Partie 1 de l'audience
- Une mise en correspondance des préoccupations du public et des Autochtones par rapport aux normes internationales
- Des renseignements supplémentaires pour donner suite aux préoccupations sur la nature adéquate des consultations auprès des Nations et communautés autochtones

Aucune mesure n'est requise de la Commission. Ce CMD est fourni à titre d'information seulement.

Signed/Signé le

20 May/Mai 2022

Kavita Murthy

Director General

Directorate of Nuclear Cycle and Facilities Regulation

Directrice générale

Direction de la réglementation du cycle et des installations nucléaires

Signed/Signé le

20 May/Mai 2022

Haidy Tadros

Director General

Directorate of Environmental and Radiation Protection and Assessment

Directrice générale

Direction de l'évaluation et de la protection environnementales et radiologiques

This page was intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1 INTRODUCTION.....	2
2 INFORMATION REQUEST FROM PART 1 HEARING	2
3 KEY TOPICS IDENTIFIED IN PUBLIC INTERVENTIONS.....	2
3.1 Environmental Assessment and Environmental Protection	3
3.1.1 Consideration of Alternatives	3
3.1.2 Potential Impacts on Perch Lake.....	4
3.1.3 Potential Impacts on the Ottawa River	5
3.1.4 Conclusion	5
3.2 Indigenous Consultation and Engagement.....	6
3.2.1 Consultation and Engagement with Kebaowek First Nation.....	7
3.2.2 Consultation and Engagement with Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg	9
3.2.3 Consultation and Engagement with the Mitchikanibikok Inik (Algonquins of Barriere Lake) 10	10
3.2.4 Consultation and Engagement with Wolf Lake First Nation.....	11
3.2.5 Conclusion	12
3.3 Long-Term Safety.....	12
3.3.1 NSDF Design	13
3.3.2 Waste Characterization and Acceptance Criteria	14
3.3.3 Potential Long-Term Impacts	15
3.3.4 Conclusion	16
3.4 The Requested Licence Amendment	16
3.4.1 Conclusion	17
4 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS.....	17
5 ERRATA	18
REFERENCES	19
ADDENDUM A. MAPPING OF PUBLIC AND INDIGENOUS CONCERNS AND ALIGNMENT OF NSDF PROJECT PROPOSAL WITH INTERNATIONAL GUIDANCE.....	20
ADDENDUM B. RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH SELECTED FIRST NATIONS	24

This page was intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Commission member document, CMD 22-H7.B, is supplemental to [CMD 22-H7](#), the submission from Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) staff regarding the application from Canadian Nuclear Laboratories to amend its Chalk River Laboratories site licence to authorize the construction of a near surface disposal facility (NSDF).

CNSC staff acknowledge that some intervenors have outstanding concerns or views that diverge from staff's technical assessments. This CMD provides CNSC staff's responses to key themes of comments received from public interventions. Common themes include concerns about the proximity of the proposed NSDF to the Ottawa River and protection of the river, the inventory and types of wastes proposed for emplacement, the consideration and adequacy of the NSDF design, long-term safety, and the CNSC's duty to consult.

The CNSC's regulatory review process is designed to consider and assess all the key themes of concern raised by intervenors. The topics raised by the interventions are not new to CNSC staff and were considered during the regulatory review process. To help address the concerns raised in the interventions, CNSC staff used new and different public engagement tools to explain and transparently provide information on the regulatory review process and staff's technical assessments of the NSDF proposal specific to these topics, as well as to answer questions raised during engagement activities and through email inquiries.

Furthermore, as requested by the Commission during Part 1 of the public Commission hearing, this CMD provides additional information on how the CNSC's assessment aligns with international standards in order to address concerns raised by members of the public and Indigenous Nations and communities (addendum A of this CMD).

The information provided in this CMD does not alter CNSC staff's findings, conclusions or recommendations to the Commission as presented in [CMD 22-H7](#).

1 INTRODUCTION

As stated in CNSC staff's [Part 1 CMD](#), the proposed Near Surface Disposal Facility (NSDF) project is a facility designed for the safe and permanent disposal, with no intention of retrieval, of low-level radioactive waste. The majority of waste proposed for disposal in the NSDF is either currently in safe storage at the Chalk River Laboratories (CRL) site or would be generated from future operational, decommissioning and environmental remediation activities mainly at the CRL site.

The Part 1 hearing was held on February 22, 2022, where the Commission [heard](#) an overview of the project, and CNSC staff's overall conclusions and recommendations ([CMD 22-H7 Part 1](#)). During the hearing discussions pertaining to the evaluations of site suitability, design adequacy and construction activities were held.

The Part 2 hearing will be held starting on May 30, 2022, where the Commission will hear from the public and Indigenous Nations and communities with regards to their concerns regarding the project.

CNSC staff have reviewed all the interventions received and have provided further information in this CMD for the Commission to consider with respect to the key themes raised. The themes have been aligned with the agenda for the hearing as set by the CNSC Registrar in the [revised Notice of Hearing](#) [1].

2 INFORMATION REQUEST FROM PART 1 HEARING

During Part 1 of the public hearing on February 22, 2022, the Commission requested that CNSC staff provide a mapping of the concerns raised by members of the public and Indigenous Nations and Communities regarding alleged inconsistency between the assessment criteria used by CNSC staff for its review of CNL's application and international (IAEA) standards. This mapping is provided in Addendum A to this CMD and provides evidence to demonstrate that the proposed NSDF project meets the guidance in applicable international standards.

Additionally, Commission members highlighted that there was a request to adjourn Part 1 of the hearing due to concerns regarding adequacy of consultation and indicated that Part 2 of the hearing will focus on this issue. In response, CNSC staff have provided additional information regarding adequacy of consultation with those Indigenous Nations and communities that have raised concerns.

3 KEY TOPICS IDENTIFIED IN PUBLIC INTERVENTIONS

There were 165 interventions submitted to the CNSC for Part 2 of the Commission hearing regarding the licence amendment for the construction of the NSDF at the CRL site. Interventions were received from Indigenous Nations and communities, civil society organizations, the public and the nuclear industry.

CNSC staff carefully considered each intervention and identified key topics from the interventions and within the scope of this licensing request for construction of the NSDF. CNSC staff have addressed the key topics in this supplemental CMD. The topics are organized under the following themes, as provided by the CNSC Registrar in the revised notice of hearing:

- environmental assessment and environmental protection
- Indigenous consultation and engagement
- long-term safety case
- the requested licence amendment

3.1 Environmental Assessment and Environmental Protection

An environmental assessment (EA) was conducted for the proposed NSDF project, in accordance with the [Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012](#) (CEAA 2012). Based on the regulatory review and technical assessments of CNL's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and supporting documentation, CNSC staff found that the proposed NSDF project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, taking into account the implementation of all identified EA regulatory commitments and follow up program measures, and recommends that the Commission conclude the same.

From reviewing the interventions, the following 3 key topics were identified related to the Environmental Assessment and Environmental Protection Safety and Control Area. CNSC staff have provided information for the Commission's consideration.

3.1.1 Consideration of Alternatives

Several interventions provided comments on the proposed location of the NSDF on the Chalk River Laboratories Site. As Canada's nuclear regulator, the CNSC does not dictate the locations of nuclear projects or suggest alternative locations. CNSC evaluates projects as proposed to ensure they do not pose a risk to people and the environment.

However, with respect to site suitability, as outlined in Section 3.1 of CNSC staff's Part 1 CMD, [CMD 22-H7](#), CNSC staff assessed the proposed site and location of the NSDF against applicable standards, specifically Appendix I of the [IAEA Safety Standard SSG-29, Near Surface Disposal Facilities for Radioactive Waste](#). CNSC staff found that CNL adopted a reasonable evaluation of several sites based on mandatory criteria, exclusion criteria, judgements about the ability to meet all safety requirements, and about the acceptability for construction of the disposal facility. CNL retained two suitable sites and selected the proposed NSDF site. CNSC staff assessed the characteristics of the selected site and the evidence provided to show the site is suitable and will protect the Ottawa River. The characteristics of the site were shown to be favourable with the NSDF as follows:

1. The NSDF site is located well above the maximum calculated Ottawa River flood levels. Therefore, flooding would not affect the integrity of the NSDF. Flooding assessments performed by CNL show the base of the engineered containment mound is 41 metres higher than the predicted maximum flood level created if dams upstream were to fail.
2. The engineered containment mound that contains the waste is located on a ridge that slopes in the opposite direction to the Ottawa River. CNL's safety assessment shows that contaminated seepage (if any) that originates from the engineered containment mound would move in the opposite direction to the Ottawa River, to Perch Swamp, and would take 7 to 10 years to reach Perch Creek. Along that seepage path to Perch Creek, contaminants would be attenuated by sorption, diffusion and dispersion. Therefore, the overburden and near-surface bedrock would act as an additional barrier to contaminant transport to complement the engineered barriers.
3. The NSDF site is in a moderate seismic zone known as the West Quebec Seismic Zone. Seismic analysis provided by CNL, and assessed by CNSC staff, shows that the isolation and containment of the waste would not be compromised by an earthquake with a 10,000 year return period.

CNSC staff also assessed CNL's alternative means assessment against the [Canadian Environmental Assessment Act \(CEAA 2012\)](#) requirements, as documented in Section 4.2 of the [Environmental Assessment \(EA\) Report](#). CNL's alternative means assessment considered the different technical and economical ways to carry out the designated project, including an evaluation of the different potential sites for the NSDF. CNSC staff evaluated the NSDF project description, and the proposed location as submitted based on its merits. CNSC staff have found that CNL's alternative means assessment met the requirements and guidance of [Generic Guidelines for the Preparation of and Environmental Impact Statement – Pursuant to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012](#) and [REGDOC-2.9.1 Environmental Protection: Environmental Principles, Assessment and Protection Measures](#).

CNSC staff evaluated the project as presented in CNL's submissions and are satisfied that the NSDF site selection process used structured criteria and methodology and is in alignment with the applicable standards for the purposes of assessing the environmental effects of the proposed project under CEAA 2012.

3.1.2 Potential Impacts on Perch Lake

Potential impacts to Perch Lake from the NSDF is a key topic that has been raised in several interventions.

As summarized in Sections 6.2.2 and 7.1.1 of the NSDF [EA Report](#), CNSC staff reviewed CNL's assessment of potential changes to surface water discharge and fish habitat from installation of a pipeline in Perch Lake and confirmed that CNL conducted a comprehensive analysis of these effects. CNSC staff also reviewed CNL's identified mitigation measures to reduce impacts to Perch Lake during the construction of the pipeline, which includes turbidity curtains to limit extent of any suspended sediments, avoidance of sensitive periods for fish species (e.g.,

spawning, egg/larval development), and surface water monitoring, and have found that they are adequate.

Should construction of the NSDF be approved by the Commission, CNL will be required to include additional surface water and suspended particulate contaminant monitoring for Perch Lake as part of the Environmental Assessment Follow Up Monitoring Program (EAFMP), to evaluate potential impacts during and following installation of the Perch Lake diffuser pipeline. CNSC staff will also conduct regular oversight of CNL's follow-up monitoring program.

CNL conducted a geotechnical investigation of Perch Lake for the effluent discharge pipeline to support the NSDF project. CNSC staff will assess the results of this investigation upon its submission. In addition, should construction of the NSDF be approved by the Commission, CNL will be requested through a Licensing Regulatory Action to provide the detailed design of the in-water pipe and diffuser for CNSC staff assessment.

3.1.3 Potential Impacts on the Ottawa River

A prominent topic in the interventions was NSDF's proximity to the Ottawa River and the potential for contaminating this source of drinking water for many residents downstream.

Perch Creek drains Perch Lake into the Ottawa River. As such, the endpoint receiving environment for discharge from the NSDF is the Ottawa River. As discussed in Section 6.2 of the NSDF [EA Report](#), any incremental change in concentration to Perch Creek and the Perch Lake watershed from NSDF operations are not expected to be measurable beyond existing baseline conditions in the Ottawa River and the downstream environment. As outlined in Section 6.2 of the NSDF EA Report, mitigation measures and environmental design features would mitigate effects on the aquatic environment. CNL has proposed an EAFMP for the NSDF Project that covers monitoring for the construction, operation, and closure phases of the NSDF Project. The EAFMP consists of an environmental monitoring plan, groundwater and effluent monitoring, including the aquatic environment, which will be integrated in the CRL site's existing environmental protection program. CNSC staff have evaluated CNL's environmental protection program and conclude that it meets regulatory requirements.

Residual effects from the NSDF project on aquatic biodiversity are not predicted to be significant. Additionally, drinking water sources are not likely to be affected by treated effluent from the NSDF wastewater treatment plant. Further information on CNSC staff's assessment demonstrating safety of the Ottawa River is provided in Section 3.3 Long-term Safety of this CMD.

3.1.4 Conclusion

The NSDF project has been assessed in accordance with the [CNSC's Generic Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement – Pursuant to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012, REGDOC-2.9.1 Environmental Protection: Environmental Principles, Assessment and Protection Measures, REGDOC-3.2.1, Public Information and Disclosure and REGDOC-3.2.2, Indigenous Engagement and Consultation](#).

CNSC staff confirm that their conclusions remain as stated in CMD 22-H7, that the proposed NSDF project is protective of people and the environment and that the NSDF project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, taking into account the implementation of proposed mitigation and follow-up monitoring program measures.

3.2 Indigenous Consultation and Engagement

The CNSC is committed to meaningful engagement and consultation with Indigenous Nations and communities that have an interest in CNSC regulated facilities and activities. The CNSC ensures that its licensing decisions under the [NSCA](#) and EA decisions under the [CEAA 2012](#) uphold the Honour of the Crown and consider Indigenous peoples' potential or established Indigenous and/or treaty rights pursuant to section 35 of the [Constitution Act, 1982](#).

As described in CNSC staff's [CMD 22-H7](#), section 5.2. and in the appended [EA Report](#), CNSC staff conducted thorough consultation including corresponding and meeting with all identified and interested Indigenous Nations and communities to discuss the regulatory review process, seek comments and feedback and respond to any concerns raised with respect to the NSDF project's potential impacts on their Indigenous and/or treaty rights. Despite CNSC staff's best efforts to engage and conduct meaningful consultation in good faith, some Indigenous Nations and communities did not actively participate and engage with the CNSC throughout the regulatory process. For these Nations and communities, CNSC staff continued to ensure that information regarding the NSDF Project's EA and licensing process was made available and continued to offer to consult, in alignment with the Honor of the Crown. For the many Indigenous Nations and communities that did participate in CNSC staff's consultation activities, CNSC staff were able to develop meaningful processes and relationships.

In addition, CNSC staff ensured that CNL's engagement activities with identified and interested Indigenous Nations and communities met the requirements of [REGDOC-3.2.2, Indigenous Engagement](#). This included the Nations and communities that did not respond to CNSC staff's consultation efforts.

Interventions were received from the following Indigenous Nations and Communities:

- Algonquins of Ontario (AOO)
- Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation (AOPFN)
- Curve Lake First Nation (CLFN)
- Kebaowek First Nation (KFN)
- Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg (KZA)
- Metis Nation of Ontario (MNO)
- Wolf Lake First Nation (WLFN)
- Mitchikanibikok Inik, (Algonquins of Barriere Lake) (MI)

CNSC staff reviewed the interventions and note that those submitted by the Algonquins of Ontario, Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation, Curve Lake First Nation and Métis Nation of Ontario raise concerns that were discussed, responded to, and addressed by CNSC staff throughout the EA and licensing process as documented in CNSC's staff's [CMD 22-H7](#).

During Part 1 of the NSDF Commission hearing, the Commission indicated that Part 2 of the Commission hearing would further discuss CNSC staff's consultation efforts with Indigenous Nations and communities, particularly in relation to Kebaowek First Nation (KFN), who raised concerns in a [letter](#) to the Commission Registry with regards to the consultation process in relation to the NSDF project.

Further, the Commission Registry also received interventions from Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg (KZA) and Wolf Lake First Nation (WLFN). Ultimately, KZA indicated concern that they were not consulted on the NSDF Project and raised some concerns with respect to environmental effects which are covered in CNSC staff's [CMD 22-H7](#) submitted for NSDF Part-1 Commission hearing. WLFN's intervention stated that they were also not consulted on the NSDF Project. The following subsections of this supplemental CMD provide additional details on CNSC staff's engagement and consultation process with KFN, KZA, MI and WLFN.

3.2.1 Consultation and Engagement with Kebaowek First Nation

On April 11, 2022, Kebaowek First Nation (KFN) submitted a [letter](#) to the Commission Registry requesting to intervene in the NSDF Part-2 Commission hearing, indicating that they were not consulted for the NSDF Project and that they required an extension for their intervention. An extension was granted and on April 28, 2022, KFN submitted a written intervention.

Since 2016, CNSC staff have regularly reached out to provide information, understand concerns and develop a consultation and/or engagement process with Kebaowek First Nation (KFN) for the NSDF Project in over 60 recorded instances. This occurred through different forms of communication: email, phone calls and in person meetings.

CNSC staff offered KFN all of the same opportunities for consultation and engagement as other potentially interested and identified Indigenous Nations and communities, including the opportunity to develop a mutually agreeable consultation framework, the completion of a collaborative Rights Impact Assessment, collaborative drafting of sections of the CNSC staff's EA Report, gathering and consideration of Indigenous Knowledge, funding support through the CNSC's Participant Funding Program (PFP), opportunities to review KFN specific issues and concerns tables, community workshops and meetings.

As stated in [CMD 22-H7](#), the Algonquin Anishinabeg Nation Tribal Council (AANTC) is a tribal council that can coordinate and represent the rights of Algonquin communities including KFN and Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg. In 2017, CNSC staff had a number of meetings and communications with KFN and the AANTC where KFN leadership indicated that they did not have any specific concerns regarding the NSDF Project at the time but would appreciate updates

from the CNSC and to work with AANTC as part of its role in coordinating consultation and engagement with the Algonquin communities they represent. Although AANTC often took the lead in communicating and engaging with the CNSC with regards to the NSDF Project, since 2016, CNSC staff have always ensured that KFN leadership was sent all correspondence and followed up with directly, including specific in-person meetings, phone conversations, virtual meetings and emails with leadership and representatives of KFN.

With respect to participant funding support, AANTC was originally awarded funding in 2017 and 2019 through the CNSC's Participant Funding Program (PFP). As indicated in their PFP application, these funds would support the coordination of engagement and consultation with its member First Nations, including KFN, in the regulatory process for the NSDF Project. In August 2017, AANTC did provide comments to the CNSC on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. In the Fall of 2021, KFN indicated to CNSC staff that they would prefer to be consulted and engaged directly by CNSC staff as opposed to in collaboration and coordination with AANTC, and that they would prefer receiving the provision of funding support. CNSC staff immediately responded to this request and worked with KFN to offer and award up to \$30,000 through the PFP to support KFN's participation in the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process including reviewing the CMDs and CNSC staff's [EA Report](#).

Since early 2020, CNSC staff have been offering to develop a consultation agreement with KFN for the NSDF, however, for close to two years KFN indicated to CNSC staff that they preferred to work directly with the Minister of Natural Resources of Canada to develop a consultation protocol for nuclear projects in their traditional territory. The Minister of Natural Resources responded in a [letter](#) on July 16, 2020 and other occasions to KFN to clarify that KFN needed to work directly with the CNSC on the development of a mutually agreeable consultation process for its regulatory processes. Since late 2021, KFN has commenced meeting regularly with CNSC staff to work together on the development of an Arrangement for Long-term Engagement and Consultation with the CNSC to ensure active engagement with the CNSC as part of its regulatory and consultation processes for projects of interest or concern and participation in Commission proceedings.

A summary table of CNSC staff's consultation and engagement activities with KFN related to the NSDF Project is attached (Table 1/ Addendum B of this CMD). It contains further details regarding engagement efforts leading up to the 2022 Commission hearings for the environmental assessment and licence amendment applications and processes.

CNSC staff have made considerable efforts over the entire EA and regulatory review process for the NSDF Project to engage and consult with KFN. CNSC staff also met regularly over the years with CNL staff and management to ensure that they were also striving to engage with KFN. CNSC staff feel they have been fair and flexible with its approach to working with KFN and have provided many opportunities for KFN to be engaged in the regulatory and consultation process for the NSDF Project and have their concerns considered and addressed. To date CNSC staff have not been made aware of any specific concerns with regards to

how the proposed NSDF Project could cause new adverse impacts on the exercise of KFN's rights and interests. CNSC is very much committed to a collaborative working relationship with KFN and is committed to working with the KFN in continuing our work together in drafting an Arrangement for Long-term Engagement and Consultation.

3.2.2 Consultation and Engagement with Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg

In their intervention to the Commission, Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg (KZA) raised concerns that they were not adequately consulted on the NSDF Project and raised concerns with respect to potential environmental effects which are discussed and addressed in detail in CNSC staff's [CMD 22-H7](#) submitted for NSDF Part-1 Commission hearing. Since 2016, until present CNSC staff have reached out to provide information, understand concerns and develop a consultation and/or engagement process with KZA for the NSDF Project. This occurred through different forms of communication, email, phone calls and in person meetings. CNSC staff and KZA corresponded and met frequently between 2016 to 2019 and in 2021 commenced meeting regularly (on a monthly basis) with CNSC staff to discuss CNSC licensing and EA activities. CNSC staff has offered KZA all of the same opportunities for consultation and engagement as other potentially interested and identified Indigenous Nations and communities including the opportunity to develop a mutually agreeable consultation framework, the completion of a collaborative Rights Impact Assessment, collaborative drafting of sections of the CNSC staff's [EA Report](#), gathering and consideration of Indigenous Knowledge, funding support through the CNSC's PFP, opportunities to review KZA specific issues and concerns tables, community workshops and meetings.

In 2017, similar to KFN, CNSC staff had a number of meetings and communications with KZA and AANTC where it was indicated to CNSC staff that AANTC would lead the coordination of engagement and consultation on behalf of its member First Nations, including KZA as part of the EA and licensing activities for the NSDF Project. Although AANTC often took the lead in communicating and engaging with the CNSC with regards to the NSDF Project, since 2016, CNSC staff have always ensured that KZA was sent all correspondence and followed up with directly, including specific in-person meetings in 2016, 2017 and 2019, phone conversations, multiple virtual meetings and emails with leadership and representatives of KZA.

As mentioned above in the section specific to KFN, AANTC was originally awarded funding in 2017 and 2019 through the CNSC's PFP to support the coordination of engagement with its member First Nations, including KZA, in the regulatory process for the NSDF Project. However, in the Fall of 2021, KZA indicated to CNSC staff that they would prefer to be consulted and engaged directly by CNSC staff as opposed to in collaboration and in coordination with AANTC, including the provision of funding support. In January 2022, KZA indicated that they wanted to participate in the NSDF Hearing process and CNSC staff immediately responded to this request and worked with KZA to offer and award up to \$30,000 through the PFP to support KZA's participation the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process including reviewing the CMDs and CNSC staff's [EA Report](#) and participation in the Commission hearing.

Since 2020, CNSC staff have been offering to develop a consultation agreement with KZA for the NSDF and other CNSC regulated projects in KZA's traditional territory, however, CNSC staff did not receive a response or an expression of interest from KZA until late in 2021 to develop such an agreement. CNSC have offered to work with KZA to develop a mutually agreeable consultation approach for the other ongoing projects and activities in their traditional territory and have also set up monthly meetings with KZA to ensure ongoing dialogue, collaboration and relationship building. In addition, CNSC staff have offered to negotiate a long-term relationship term of reference to help create efficiencies and support KZA's participation in CNSC licensing and EA activities. A summary table of CNSC staff's consultation and engagement activities with KFN related to the NSDF Project is attached (Table 2/ Addendum B of this CMD). It contains further details regarding engagement efforts leading up to the 2022 Commission hearings for the environmental assessment and licence amendment applications and processes.

CNSC staff have made considerable efforts over the entire EA and regulatory review process for the NSDF Project to engage and consult with KZA. CNSC staff have been fair and flexible with its approach to working with KZA and have provided many opportunities for KZA to be engaged in the regulatory and consultation process for the NSDF Project and have their concerns considered and addressed. However, only recently was CNSC staff made aware of KZA's concerns related to the Project. CNSC staff have discussed these concerns with KZA and offered to continue this dialogue as the concerns raised to date have already been addressed through mitigation measures as identified in CNL's EIS and CNSC staff's [EA Report](#). CNSC staff are very much committed to a collaborative working relationship with KZA moving forward.

3.2.3 Consultation and Engagement with the Mitchikanibikok Inik (Algonquins of Barriere Lake)

In March 2022, CNSC staff received a request from Mitchikanibikok Inik (MI), also known as the Algonquins of Barriere Lake, for funding to support their participation in the Commission proceedings for the NSDF Project. Up until March 2022, CNSC staff had not heard directly from MI regarding the NSDF Project, and the March 2022 communication was the first instance of a direct expression of interest in the NSDF Project and regulatory process from MI. On April 11, 2022, MI submitted a letter to the Commission Registry to intervene in the NSDF Part-2 Commission hearing, indicating that they were not adequately consulted for the NSDF Project and that they would provide a written intervention at the proceedings. An extension of May 4, 2022 was provided to MI for the submission of their written intervention.

Mitchikanibikok Inik (MI), also known as Algonquins of Barriere Lake, is an Algonquin community with its reserve located approximately 250 km upstream from the NSDF Project and whose asserted traditional territory overlaps with the CRL site. Since 2016 until present CNSC staff have reached out to provide information, understand concerns and develop a consultation and/or engagement processes with the Algonquin Nation Secretariat (ANS). CNSC staff had been informed that ANS represents the Indigenous rights and interests of the MI, and

coordinates consultation and engagement for the NSDF Project. These activities occurred through different forms of communication, letters, emails, and phone calls. CNSC staff offered multiple opportunities and options for ANS and the communities they represent, including MI, to be engaged in the consultation and regulatory process for the NSDF Project. In addition, CNSC staff also offered multiple opportunities to apply for participant funding to the ANS throughout the process to support their participation. However, to date ANS and MI have not raised any specific concerns with regards to the NSDF Project and did not communicate a specific interest in getting involved in the CNSC's regulatory or consultation process until the communication that CNSC staff received in March 2022 from the MI requesting funding support to participate in the Part-2 Commission hearing for the NSDF Project.

Upon receipt of the funding request from MI, CNSC staff demonstrated flexibility and worked with MI to offer and award the funding request for \$30,000 through the CNSC's PFP to support their participation in the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process including reviewing the CMDs and EA Report and participation in the Commission proceeding. CNSC staff also offered to meet with the community to discuss any questions or concerns they may have, however, to date MI have not expressed an interest in meeting with CNSC staff directly. A summary table of CNSC staff's engagement activities with ANS and MI related to the NSDF Project is attached (Table 3/Addendum B).

To date CNSC staff have not been made aware of any specific concerns with regards to how the proposed NSDF Project could cause new adverse impacts on the exercise of MI rights and interests and are committed to working with and engaging the MI directly moving forward, should they express an interest.

3.2.4 Consultation and Engagement with Wolf Lake First Nation

In a letter submitted to the Commission on April 11, 2022, Wolf Lake First Nation (WLFN) indicated that they were not adequately consulted on the NSDF Project and requested an extension for submission of a written intervention. An extension was granted for May 4, 2022. WLFN is an Algonquin community whose majority of members are located approximately 200 km northwest of the CRL site.

Since 2016 until present CNSC staff have reached out to provide information, understand concerns and develop a consultation and/or engagement processes with the ANS who also represents Wolf Lake First Nation (WLFN) for the NSDF Project. These activities occurred through different forms of communication, letters, emails, and phone calls. CNSC staff offered multiple opportunities and options for ANS and the communities they represent, including MI, to be engaged in the consultation and regulatory process for the NSDF Project. In addition, CNSC staff also offered multiple opportunities to apply for participant funding to the ANS throughout the process to support their participation. However, to date ANS and WLFN have not raised any specific concerns with regards to the NSDF Project and did not communicate a specific interest in getting involved in the CNSC's regulatory or consultation process until WLFN submitted an intervention to the Commission indicating that they had not been consulted on the project.

CNSC staff continue to engage and consult with WLFN to understand their concerns related to CNSC-led activities such as EAs and licensing. A summary table of CNSC staff's engagement activities with ANS and WLFN related to the NSDF Project is attached (Table 4/Addendum B).

To date CNSC staff have not been made aware of any specific concerns with regards to how the proposed NSDF Project could cause new adverse impacts on the exercise of WLFN rights and interests and are committed to working with and engaging the WLFN directly moving forward, should they express an interest.

3.2.5 Conclusion

CNSC staff are confident that the consultation process that was offered to KFN, KZA, MI, WLFN and all identified and interested Indigenous Nations and communities was reasonable, fair, transparent and in line with best practices across the Government of Canada and demonstrates that CNSC staff consulted in good faith to ensure that the Honour of the Crown was upheld and the requirements pertaining to the Duty to Consult and Accommodate were met.

CNSC staff offered multiple opportunities to engage throughout the regulatory process including the possibility of applying for funding through the CNSC's PFP. Consultation requires both parties to actively engage in good faith efforts to understand and address potential concerns with regards to the Project and process. However, should an Indigenous Nation or community not actively engage in the CNSC's regulatory and consultation processes, the Commission hearing process is also an important aspect of the consultation process. For all Indigenous Nations and communities, including the ones who did not to engage with CNSC staff in the period leading up to the Commission proceedings, the public hearing process provides another meaningful opportunity for their concerns to be heard and addressed by the Commission.

Taking into consideration the consultation activities conducted to date, the low likelihood of new adverse impacts to Indigenous and/or treaty rights, the proposed mitigation, follow-up program measures and commitments by CNL, AECL and CNSC staff, CNSC staff conclude that the potential impacts to Indigenous and/or treaty rights have been adequately identified, assessed, and mitigated in relation to the NSDF Project.

CNSC staff's consultation and engagement is an ongoing commitment which will continue throughout the lifecycle of the project, should it be approved by the Commission, including the commitment to continue to be available to engage with KFN, KZA, MI and WLFN to build long-term relationships and collaborate to address any ongoing concerns or topics of interest should there be an interest and a commitment to work together moving forward.

3.3 Long-Term Safety

The fundamental objective of a radioactive waste disposal facility is to provide safety with a minimal degree of human intervention for long periods of time which can range from a few hundred years (near surface disposal facility) to millions of years (deep geological repository). While the scope of the current

licensing application is limited to construction of the NSDF, CNSC staff assessed the operational and long-term (post-closure) safety of the NSDF in accordance with international guidance and practices, to provide the basis to proceed with construction.

From reviewing the interventions, 3 key topics were identified related to Long-term Safety. CNSC staff have provided further information on the NSDF design, the waste characterization and acceptance criteria, and the potential long-term impacts for the Commission's consideration.

3.3.1 NSDF Design

Key topics raised by intervenors related to the robustness of the engineered containment mound and the design life of the liner system.

The engineered containment mound design has multiple barriers with multiple safety functions to contain and isolate the waste beyond its hazardous life:

1. The cover minimizes water infiltration into the waste and provides shielding to minimize the risk of human, animal, and root intrusion.
2. The base liner has three low-permeability layers to reduce contaminated leakage (if any) to the surrounding groundwater. There is also a leak detection and collection system to intercept contaminated water from the waste and route it to the water treatment plant.
3. The perimeter berm physically contains the waste and minimizes contaminated seepage.
4. A construction quality assurance program would ensure the engineered containment mound is built as designed. A monitoring and surveillance program developed in accordance with the [IAEA Safety Standard SSG-31, *Monitoring and Surveillance of Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities*](#), would verify that the NSDF is operated and performs as expected in the safety case.
5. Research contracted by CNL to a third party shows that the service life of the engineered containment mound would extend beyond 550 years which is longer than the planned 300 years institutional control period, ensuring waste containment and isolation. Seismic analyses performed by CNL, and independently verified by CNSC staff, show that the engineered containment mound will retain its structural integrity if a strong seismic event, with a 10,000 year return period, occurs.

The engineered containment mound encapsulates the waste and meets CNSC's requirements and international standards for a radioactive waste disposal facility (REGDOC-2.11.1 Vol. [I](#) and [III](#), [IAEA SSR-5](#), [SSG-29](#)).

The design of the NSDF encompasses the period of the maximum hazard of the waste. The post closure period is planned to begin in ~2100 which is followed by the 300 year institutional control period. The 550 year design life of the liner and cover system encompasses this time allowing the waste to decay to near background levels before the liner has degraded.

Additionally, CNL provided evidence to support the design life of the liner and cover, which would be constructed of a combination of engineered and natural materials. CNSC staff assessed the information and concluded that the liner and cover systems are robust. The key points in support of the liner and cover system performance are summarized as follows:

1. Accelerated ageing tests contracted by CNL have shown that the liners' service life would likely exceed its design life of 550 years.
2. In the pre-closure period, leak detection and leak collection systems will intercept contaminated water leaking through the liners (if any) and route it to the waste water treatment plant.
3. In the post-closure period and within the 550 years design life of the liners, leaks are expected to be minimal due to the robustness of the liner and cover systems.
4. In the post-closure period, beyond the 550 years design life, the liners can degrade resulting in higher leakage rates. However, at that time the radioactivity in the waste would have decayed to approximately 0.02% of the inventory at closure.

CNSC staff's conclusions following the assessment of the licence application are, that, at all times, contaminants in potential leaks through the base liner would be attenuated by sorption, and dispersion along their flow path towards Perch Swamp and Perch Creek before reaching the Ottawa River. As a result, by the time contaminants reach the Ottawa River, their concentrations would be very low. Modelling performed by CNL and reviewed by CNSC staff, and independent modelling by CNSC staff confirm that the impact on the Ottawa River from potential leaks would be negligible at all times.

3.3.2 Waste Characterization and Acceptance Criteria

Waste characterization and the waste acceptance criteria was identified by multiple intervenors as areas for consideration by the Commission. Intervenors voiced concerns with CNL's ability to characterize the waste prior to emplacement and respect the waste acceptance criteria, to prevent intermediate-level waste, hazardous materials, and long-lived nuclides from being emplaced into the NSDF.

The NSDF waste acceptance criteria (WAC) is the document that controls the waste accepted for disposal in the NSDF. CNL's waste characterization programs are required to comply with CNSC REGDOC 2.11.1 *Waste Management, Volume I: Management of Radioactive Waste* and CSA N292.8 *Characterization of radioactive waste and irradiated fuel*, which set out the requirements for radioactive waste characterization. The WAC is a foundational licensing basis document that has been reviewed extensively and accepted by CNSC staff.

The WAC contains limits on the concentration of radionuclides in waste that could be accepted for emplacement in the NSDF. These concentrations align with Canadian and international definitions for low-level radioactive waste and affirm that near surface disposal is an acceptable solution for this waste.

Long-lived radionuclides identified in the WAC constitute a small proportion of the total radioactive inventory proposed for emplacement in the NSDF (approximately 0.02% of the total radioactive inventory at closure). The characterization of significant radionuclides, which are identified in the WAC and include a number of long-lived radionuclides, is required. The total activity of these radionuclides in the NSDF must be tracked. The WAC contains a limiting total inventory for each radionuclide in the waste. The implementation and compliance with the WAC during the operational period ensure that no intermediate level radioactive waste would be emplaced in the NSDF.

The NSDF WAC specifies that hazardous waste shall not be accepted in the NSDF. However, if hazardous materials are present in radiologically contaminated waste, also known as “mixed waste”, they can be accepted into the NSDF only if other waste diversion strategies (decontamination and reuse and/or recycling in the nuclear industry) are unsuccessful. The NSDF WAC stipulates that, to qualify for disposal in the NSDF, any waste containing hazardous materials must meet the land disposal and leachate requirements of the [Ontario Regulation 347, General – Waste Management](#). Therefore, prior to emplacement in the NSDF, CNL would be required to perform analysis, treatment, processing or stabilization of mixed waste and ensure that the treated waste qualifies for disposal in accordance with the Ontario waste management regulations. CNSC staff have determined that the limits and conditions placed on mixed waste acceptance by the WAC are aligned with Canadian requirements.

CNSC staff have assessed the NSDF WAC and post-closure safety assessment (using REGDOC-2.11.1 Vol. [I](#) and [III](#), [IAEA SSR-5](#), [SSG-29](#), [SSG-23](#)), and determined that they are conservative and protective of people and the environment. The WAC complies with all requirements and guidance (Annex A) for the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in a near surface disposal facility and ensures that the waste accepted for disposal in the NSDF is appropriately classified and characterized. In addition, CNSC staff have assessed the NSDF proposed inventory and determined that it is suitable for disposal in a near surface facility through reviews of the safety case and post closure safety assessment.

3.3.3 Potential Long-Term Impacts

CNSC staff reviewed the interventions and determined that disruptive events and their impact to the Ottawa River and human health was a key topic.

As described in CNSC staff’s [CMD 22-H7](#) Section 3.5, CNL’s post closure safety assessment [2] analyzed a wide variety of disruptive events, such as strong earthquakes or erosion due to a probable maximum precipitation, and their impact on the facility during the post closure period. CNSC staff assessed the conceptual models, the assumptions made, the input data and the results to ensure they bound the potential outcomes of both individual and multiple disruptive events. The results show that following such events, all acceptance criteria would be met, ensuring protection of the Ottawa river and all receptors, both human and environmental.

The CNSC's public dose limit of 1 mSv/yr is protective of the public. In their post-closure safety assessment, CNL used a conservative dose constraint of 0.3 mSv/yr for the normal evolution scenario and 1 mSv/yr for disruptive events and human intrusion scenarios. These acceptance criteria align with CNSC regulatory requirements ([REGDOC-2.11.1 Vol. III](#)) and international guidance ([IAEA SSR-5](#)). CNL assessed the impact on the Ottawa River and the environment caused by the degradation of the NSDF and the release of contaminants. This was investigated through both the expected degradation of the barrier system over long periods and the impact of disruptive events. The results of the normal evolution scenario meet the dose constraint of 0.3 mSv/yr and all disruptive event and human intrusion scenarios meet the dose limit of 1 mSv/yr. Long-lived radionuclides constitute a small proportion of the total radioactive inventory proposed for emplacement in the NSDF. At the end of the planned 300 year institutional control period, short-lived radionuclides would have essentially all decayed and the remaining radioactivity would be due to a small fraction of long-lived radionuclides.

Furthermore, CNSC staff reviewed testing and research conducted by CNL which shows that the liners' service life would be much longer than their design life of 550 years. Beyond the design life, the liners might degrade resulting in increased leakage rates. However, at that time, approximately 0.02% of the radioactive inventory at closure would remain.

3.3.4 Conclusion

CNSC staff have determined that the results and conclusions of CNL's post-closure safety assessment are appropriate and acceptable. Long-term safety of the NSDF is assured using both engineered and natural barriers inherent to the design of the facility, the suitability of the site, and the class and characteristics of the wastes qualified for emplacement in the NSDF in compliance with the facility waste acceptance criteria.

CNSC staff reaffirm our conclusions made in CMD 22-H7 that the proposed NSDF provides for long-term safety and meets Canadian and international regulatory requirements and guidance for disposal facilities.

3.4 The Requested Licence Amendment

Intervenors commented on the proposed licence amendment and associated licence conditions handbook to ensure effective regulatory oversight of CNL's activities related to the NSDF.

The NSDF is considered a new Class IB nuclear facility and therefore triggers an amendment of the current CRL site licence. To authorize the construction of the proposed NSDF, in the [NSDF Part 1 Hearing](#), CNSC staff recommended the Commission amend the CRL operating licence and staff would then amend the associated licence conditions handbook (LCH) accordingly to include two new conditions:

Licence Condition G.7: Construction licensing requirements: The licensee shall implement the licensing regulatory actions prescribed by the Commission.

Review and closure of the licensing actions is administered by the Commission or a person authorized by the Commission.

Licence Condition G.8: Environmental assessment commitments: The licensee shall implement the Environmental Assessment (EA) regulatory commitments prescribed by the Commission. Review and closure of the EA regulatory commitments is administered by the Commission or a person authorized by the Commission.

The NSDF Licensing Regulatory Actions [3] and the licensee's [Near Surface Disposal Facility Project Consolidated Commitments Report, 232-513440-REPT-001](#) are set as compliance verification criteria in the CRL LCH. They identify conditions resulting from CNSC staff's licensing regulatory review and technical assessments of CNL's licence application to construct the NSDF, and the EA regulatory commitments, including mitigation measures and follow-up program measures, made by CNL during the EA review process pursuant to the [CEAA 2012](#).

Should the Commission authorize construction of the NSDF, CNL's licence application and supporting documents will become part of the licensing basis and will be added by staff to the LCH. The licensing basis sets the boundary conditions for acceptable performance of the facility and establishes the basis for the CNSC's compliance program. CNSC staff will conduct compliance verification activities to verify that the requirements associated with the CRL operating licence and the associated LCH including the proposed two licence conditions are being met.

Operation of the NSDF is not considered in this amendment. CNL will require a future authorization by the Commission to operate the NSDF. CNSC staff's assessment of that application will include, among other things, a verification that CNL has fulfilled the commitments referenced in this section as well as an assessment of all other compliance activities carried out by CNSC staff.

3.4.1 Conclusion

CNSC staff consider that the draft licence and LCH submitted to the Commission [in Part I of CMD 22-H7](#) remain valid and appropriate for the licensing actions, commitments and regulatory oversight for construction of the NSDF.

4 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The information provided in this CMD does not alter CNSC staff's findings, conclusions or recommendations to the Commission as presented in [CMD 22-H7](#).

CNSC staff have determined that the proposed NSDF project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, taking into account the implementation of all identified EA regulatory commitments. Additionally, CNSC staff have determined that the proposed NSDF project is protective of people and the environment, taking into account the implementation of all identified EA regulatory commitments and licensing regulatory actions. CNSC staff conclude that CNL's licence application to construct the NSDF at the CRL site complies with all applicable regulatory requirements.

With respect to the CNSC's duty to consult obligations, CNSC staff consider that consultation and engagement with identified Indigenous Nations and communities for the NSDF project was meaningful, reasonable, responsive, and followed best practices. Taking into consideration the location of the NSDF site and CNL's identified mitigation measures and follow-up program measures, CNSC staff conclude that potential adverse impacts to asserted or established Indigenous and/or treaty rights as a result of the NSDF project have been assessed, mitigated, addressed and accommodated to the extent possible given the participation of the Indigenous Nations and communities. CNSC staff are committed to continuing to work with identified and interested Indigenous Nations and communities on our long-term relationships and allow opportunities to raise issues and concerns around the future licensing and regulatory practices at the NSDF and CRL site.

5 ERRATA

In Part 1 of the NSDF hearing CNSC staff [stated](#) that Section 3.5, page 32 of the CNSC staff's Part 1 [CMD 22-H.7](#) included an error where it is indicated in the very last line "an earthquake with a 50,000 year return period". The correct text should read "an earthquake with a 10,000 year return period".

REFERENCES

- [1] Revised Notice of Public Hearing with Procedural Guidance – CNL NSDF, February 16, 2022 (e-Doc 6738090)
- [2] CNL document, *Post Closure Safety Assessment 3rd Iteration to the NSDF Project, 232-509240-ASD-004, Revision 2*, December 2020 (e-Doc 6452409).
- [3] *NSDF Licensing Regulatory Actions*. (e-Doc 6617091)

ADDENDUM A. MAPPING OF PUBLIC AND INDIGENOUS CONCERNS AND ALIGNMENT OF NSDF PROJECT PROPOSAL WITH INTERNATIONAL GUIDANCE

Public/Indigenous Concerns	International Standards	Alignment with International Guidance
<p>Emplacing intermediate level waste (ILW) in an above ground mound is contrary to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) standards. Even an NSDF is not recommended for disposal of intermediate-level wastes that can be hazardous for hundreds of thousands of years. Intermediate-level wastes require a stable geological environment.</p> <p>In addition, radioactive exposures to humans as a result of intrusion would exceed currently allowed limits by a large margin.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA SSR-5: Disposal of Radioactive Waste, Section 1.14 • IAEA SSG-29: Near Surface Disposal Facilities for Radioactive Waste, Section 4.7 	<p>As outlined in IAEA SSG-29, an NSDF is a suitable and technically feasible means of disposing of LLW. The proposed NSDF project meets the guidance in IAEA SSR-5 and IAEA SSG-29, both of which state that near surface disposal facilities are appropriate for LLW.</p> <p>With respect to human intrusion, the Post-Closure Safety Assessment analysed human intrusion scenarios for the NSDF and demonstrated that there are no significant radiation dose consequences from any of the scenarios and that the regulatory dose limit for a member of the public of 1 mSv/yr is met.</p>
<p>The engineered containment mound is not suitable for the disposal of LLW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA SSR-5 (2011, p. 4) suggests that VLLW is suitable to dispose of in a landfill, but LLW should be disposed of in engineered trenches or vaults. Why is the NSDF proposed to include LLW that is beyond VLLW, especially as much of the huge volume of waste is legacy waste that is very heterogeneous and not easily characterized? • IAEA GSG-1 discusses that the only wastes suitable for a mound facility for wastes classified as VLLW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA SSR-5: Disposal of Radioactive Waste, Section 1.14 • IAEA GSG-1: Classification of Radioactive Wastes, Section 2.21-2.27 	<p>IAEA SSR-5 stipulates that LLW can go into a near-surface disposal facility with engineered barriers, which the proposed NSDF does have (it is composed of the base liner and cover system). Therefore, LLW may be disposed of in a near-surface disposal facility whether these are trenches, vaults or engineered facilities. IAEA SSR-5 defines near surface disposal as disposal in a facility consisting of engineered trenches or vaults constructed on the ground surface or up to a few tens of metres below ground level. Such a facility may be designated as a disposal facility for LLW.</p> <p>Section 2.2 of IAEA GSG-1 states such waste (LLW) requires robust isolation and containment for periods of up to a few hundred years and is suitable for disposal in engineered near surface facilities.</p>

Public/Indigenous Concerns	International Standards	Alignment with International Guidance
		The NSDF waste inventory and WAC are consistent with this definition of LLW; the safety case and post closure safety assessment, in particular the human intrusion scenarios confirm the waste inventory is appropriate for near surface disposal.
A Geological Waste Management Facility (GWMF) away from the river would be far preferable to the NSDF and would coincide with the IAEA safety standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA SSR-5: Disposal of Radioactive Waste, Section 1.14 • IAEA GSG-1: Classification of Radioactive Wastes, Section 2.2 	Based on IAEA SSR-5 and GSG-1 , robust GWMFs are designed to accommodate high level waste (HLW) and ILW whereas a NSDF is typically appropriate for LLW. Low level waste requires isolation and containment for periods of time up to a few hundred years, which is consistent with the proposed NSDF design and waste acceptance criteria. This has been demonstrated using the post closure safety assessment. This approach is consistent with Canadian requirements and international guidance.
The NSDF waste classification system does not match those of the IAEA waste classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA GSG-1: Classification of Radioactive Wastes, Section 2.2 	<p>CNL operates the CRL site in compliance with the licensing basis of the licence conditions and its associated LCH specifically the regulatory requirements set out in the applicable laws and regulations.</p> <p>All wastes proposed for disposal into the NSDF must comply with the CNSC REGDOC 2.11.1 Vol. I, Management of Radioactive Waste and CSA N292.0-19 General principles for the management of radioactive waste and irradiated fuel, which both contain guidance for the classification of low-level waste and are consistent with IAEA GSG-1 Classification of Radioactive Wastes. The NSDF WAC aligns with Canadian requirements and international guidance for the classification of radioactive waste.</p>

Public/Indigenous Concerns	International Standards	Alignment with International Guidance
<p>The EIS ignores the IAEA Safety Standard for Disposal of Radioactive Waste (SSR-5). This is the preferred means for long-term management of low-level radioactive wastes according to IAEA Safety Standard SSR-5.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA SSR-5: Disposal of Radioactive Waste 	<p>CNL has used IAEA SSR-5 to demonstrate the safety of the NSDF project. Table B-3 of the Safety Case identifies the CNL documents where specific SSR-5 safety requirements are met.</p> <p>CNSC staff’s regulatory review and technical assessments of the proposed NSDF have considered all the applicable IAEA guidance, including SSR-5, SSG-23, SSG-29, SSG-31 and many others.</p> <p>The proposed NSDF is in alignment with the above standards and guidance.</p>
<p>Describing the facility as an NSDF is not consistent with international terminology and guidance that define an NSDF.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA SSG-29: Near Surface Disposal Facilities for Radioactive Waste, Section 1.11 	<p>IAEA SSG-29 describes the term ‘Near Surface Disposal’ as follows:</p> <p><i>The term ‘near surface disposal’ is used in this Safety Guide to refer to a range of disposal methods, including the emplacement of solid radioactive waste in earthen trenches, above ground engineered structures, engineered structures just below the ground surface and rock caverns, silos and tunnels excavated at depths of up to a few tens of metres underground. This Safety Guide provides general guidance for the development, operation and closure of facilities of this type that are suitable for the disposal of VLLW and LLW.</i></p> <p>The use of the term NSDF for this project proposal is consistent with IAEA’s description.</p>
<p>NSDF WAC allows disposal of low-level radioactive waste and intermediate level radioactive waste</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAEA SSR-5: Disposal of Radioactive Waste, Section 5.1-5.3 	<p>The development of the NSDF is in alignment with Requirement 20, waste acceptance in a disposal facility, of the IAEA SSR-5 which states “<i>Waste packages and unpackaged waste accepted for emplacement in a disposal facility shall conform to criteria that are fully consistent with, and are derived</i></p>

Public/Indigenous Concerns	International Standards	Alignment with International Guidance
		<p><i>from, the safety case for the disposal facility in operation and after closure.”</i></p> <p>In alignment with Requirement 20, the waste acceptance criteria (WAC) for the NSDF were developed using the facility specific safety case and safety assessment incorporating both operational and long-term safety. The development of the WAC with regards to long-term safety, supported by the post closure safety assessment, has considered radionuclides and contaminants release during normal evolution and human intrusion scenarios to ensure that the resulting dose meets the dose acceptance criterion of 1mSv/y. The radionuclide activity concentration limits in the WAC were adopted from IAEA GSG-1, CNSC REGDOC 2.11.1 Vol. I, and CSA N292.0:19 and use the lower bound concentrations for LLW.</p> <p>Regarding waste classification, there is no threshold or limit that differentiates LLW from ILW in CNSC or IAEA guidance. Rather, GSG-1 ensures waste is classified from the perspective of both operational and long-term safety using the safety case and supporting safety assessment. In developing the NSDF WAC, CNL used safety assessments (post closure safety assessment) as part of the safety case that demonstrate the safety of the facility in the long-term. As part of operational safety measures and defence in depth, CNL will emplace waste packages with higher activity concentrations at selected locations within the engineered containment mound (e.g., far from the perimeter berm, and deeper within the ECM, etc.).</p>

ADDENDUM B. RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH SELECTED FIRST NATIONS

Table 1: Engagement/Correspondence with Kebaowek First Nation (KFN) and Algonquin Anishinabeg Nation Tribal Council (AANTC) regarding NSDF Project 2016 -2022

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 17, 2016	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC), L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter notifying AANTC and KFN of NSDF & NPD Closure Projects and notification of PFP for these opportunities.
March 31, 2016	Phone call: A. Levine (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow-up phone call on project notification letter and offer of PFP for the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects EAs and licensing processes.
March 31, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: A Levine (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Follow-up phone call on project notification letter and offer of PFP for the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects EAs and licensing processes.
May 25, 2016	Letter, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC), L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter notifying AANTC and KFN of the comment period for the Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD Closure Projects.
June 17, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff noted that the voicemail-box of N. Odjick was full.
June 17, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	N. Frigault, left message with Chief L. Haymond following-up on the Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD Closure Projects and inquiring if KFN intends to submit comments.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
July 5, 2016	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow-up phone call to May 25 th Notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff re-sent the Letter and Project Description upon request.
July 5, 2016	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Follow-up phone-call to May 25 th Notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD Closure Projects. CNSC staff spoke to Chief L. Haymond who indicated that they had to engage additional resources to review these project descriptions and they are currently under review. He also mentioned that they probably will not be raising any concerns with the projects and also appreciate the fact that we are consulting with them on these projects.
October 24, 2016	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC), L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter notifying AANTC and KFN of comment period on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project.
November 9, 2016	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow up phone-call on notification of comment period on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project and a reminder about PFP availability. CNSC Staff spoke to N. Odjick, who requested that we re-send the information via email.
November 9, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Follow up phone-call on Notice to comment on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project and a reminder about PFP availability.
January 1, 2017	Participant Funding Notification (A. Levine (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC))	CNSC awarded up to \$20,000 through its Participant Funding Program to AANTC to support their participation in the EA process for the NSDF project, including for the coordination of communication and engagement with its member communities including Kebaowek First Nation.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 15, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Letter notifying AANTC and KFN of the draft EIS and of the public comment period from March 17-May 17, 2017.
March 27, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email following up March 15, 2017 notice of the draft EIS and public comment period for the NSDF Project.
April 12, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email with public Notices for two upcoming CNSC open house sessions taking place on April 26, 2017 in Deep River, ON, and on April 27, 2017 in Sheenboro, QC.
April 13, 2017	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow up phone call to March 15 th letter Notification of the draft EIS and public comment period, as well as Public Notices for two upcoming CNSC public open house sessions for NSDF Project. CNSC staff left a detailed message with AANTC staff who will pass the message on to N. Odjick.
April 13, 2017	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Follow up phone call to March 15 th letter Notification of the draft EIS and public comment period, as well as Public Notices for two upcoming CNSC public open house sessions for NSDF Project. CNSC staff left a detailed message for Chief L. Haymond.
April 26, 2017	Meeting: A. Levine, N. Frigault, C. Ducros, L. Ethier, D. Wylie (CNSC), KFN, AANTC, Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg, Lac Simon First Nation,	CNSC staff and CNL provided separate presentations regarding the NSDF and NPD projects. The meeting was held in person at the AANTC offices in Maniwaki, QC and was supported through funding from the CNSC's PFP. Simultaneous translation was provided in English and French. Some of the participants in the meeting raised concerns regarding the amount of capacity available for review of the technical documentation and EIS. The length of the comment period for the EIS. Potential impacts on the Ottawa River. Legacy

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
	Abitibiwinni First Nation, Kitcisakik First Nation	of radioactive waste and contamination at the Chalk River site. The desire for Algonquin First Nations to provide consent for anything that happens on their lands, including at Chalk River. The need for CNSC staff to spend time with each of their communities to explain more about our regulatory oversight role and the project review process. CNSC staff committed to working with AANTC and each First Nation to develop an approach to consultation with regards to the NPD and NSDF Projects. CNSC staff discussed options for engagement and information sharing with the leadership and community members for each community and working together to address the concerns raised collaboratively throughout the regulatory review process. Chief L. Haymond (KFN) expressed an interest in meeting with CNSC staff more regularly and developing a relationship.
May 19, 2017	Email, outgoing:	Email with update on Public Comment Period on Canadian Nuclear Laboratories' (CNL) Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
May 24, 2017	Letter, incoming: V. Polson (AANTC) to CNSC	Letter from AANTC indicating that they are opposed to the NSDF project and that the consultation process with them and their communities regarding the NSDF Project has not been adequate to date due to the minimal amount of funding awarded to them through the CNSC's PFP. They have requested for the CNSC to remedy the situation.
June 7, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to V. Polson (AANTC)	Letter responding to AANTC letter received on May 24, 2017, offering to coordinate future meetings and provide funding to cover meeting related costs.
June 19, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KFN	Notice of the CNSC relaunching the public comment period for 60 days for the Draft EIS of the NSDF project.
August 14, 2017	Email, incoming: N. Odjick (AANTC) to N. Frigault (CNSC)	Email providing AANTC's comments to CNSC staff on CNL's Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which as per the contribution agreement could include feedback from AANTC's representative communities.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
September 15, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KFN	English and French copies of Advertisements for upcoming Open House Sessions in Sheenboro (Oct 2), Pembroke (Oct 3) and Deep River (Oct 4)
September 27, 2017	Phone call and email: A. Levine (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Phone and email with CNSC staff providing updates to N. Odjick (AANTC) on the timelines for the NSDF Project EA, including: Public comment period deadline for Draft EIS document; CNSC Open House Sessions for NSDF Project (EA focus) in Sheenboro, QC, Pembroke, ON and Deep River, ON; 30-day public comment period (written interventions) on the EA Report and the EA and licensing Commission Member Documents
October 18, 2017	Email, outgoing: A. Levine (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email from CNSC staff requesting to organize a discussion on Next Steps for engagement on the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects, including additional capacity for AANTC. CNSC staff also offered to discuss potential funding to cover costs related to the meetings and for AANTC to hire a consultant.
December 6, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to V. Polson, N. Odjick (AANTC), and L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter with an update on the status of the NSDF Project's Environmental Impact Statement and pending revised timelines.
September 27, 2018	Letter, outgoing: C. Cianci (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC), L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter with an update on NSDF and NPD Closure Projects including schematic of process showing upcoming consultation opportunities. CNSC staff offered to arrange a meeting to discuss CNL and CNSC responses to comments on the draft EIS.
October 16, 2018	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow up phone call to letter sent Sept 27, 2018. CNSC staff spoke to N. Odjick, who indicated that AANTC do not currently have the resources to meet about these projects or to review any additional information. CNSC staff reiterated the availability of PFP to support such activities.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
October 16, 2018	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Follow up phone call to correspondence sent Sept 27, 2018. CNSC staff spoke to Chief L. Haymond's staff, who confirmed their receipt of the September 27 correspondence. CNSC staff also offered to arrange a meeting at this time.
January 10, 2019	Phone call: A. Zenobi (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Phone call to offer to set up a meeting between AANTC and CNSC in April 2019 and to offer PFP funding to support.
January 11, 2019	Email, outgoing: A. Zenobi (CSNC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email with a Participant Funding Program application form for a meeting with CNSC staff in April 2019. The meeting was to provide updates on the NSDF project and discuss CNSC's responses to AANTC's comments on CNL's draft EIS, as well as to discuss a path forward for consultation and engagement. The CNSC proposed inviting KZA, KFN, and CNL to this meeting. This meeting never occurred.
January 29, 2019	Email, incoming: N. Odjick (AANTC) to A. Zenobi (CNSC)	N. Odjick reached out with questions on CNSC & CNL's comments for the draft EIS for NPD & NSDF. CNSC responded with a timeline and details for their comments.
March 20, 2019	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KFN	CNSC staff sent out a notice on the re-opening of PFP and a project status update for NSDF with CNL website Links.
October 24, 2019	Phone call: A. Levine (CNSC) to S. Green, R. Van Schie (KFN)	Phone call to KFN where CNSC staff obtained 2 new contacts for KFN. CNSC staff learned that R. Van Schie and Chief L. Haymond were planning to come in person to the CNL ROR Commission meeting on Nov. 7 to give an oral intervention. KFN voiced interest in meeting with CNSC staff after the Commission meeting ends to start talking about the three EAs and enhancing our consultation process. KFN also requested new copies of the PD, EIS guidelines, and related comments.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
October 31, 2019	Email, outgoing: L. Abellan (CNSC) to S. Green, R. Van Schie (KFN)	CNSC staff followed-up to their October 24 th phone call to KFN with the requested materials and offered to discuss any EA-related questions or information requests.
November 7, 2019	Meeting: A. Levine, S. Leclair (CNSC) with R. Van Schie (KFN)	Prior to the CNL ROR, CNSC staff met with KFN (R. Van Schie) to provide an overview of the CNSC as well as project updates including NSDF, NPD and MMR.
February 6, 2020	Participant Funding Notification (A. Levine (CNSC) to N. Odjick)	CNSC awarded up to \$33,500 through its Participant Funding Program to AANTC to support their participation in the remaining steps of the EA, licensing and regulatory process for the NSDF project including participation in the Commission hearings, and for the ongoing coordination of communication and engagement with its member communities including Kebaowek First Nation.
February 14, 2020	Meeting: N. Frigault, S. Leclair, A. Rupert (CNSC)and R. Van Schie (AANTC)	CNSC staff reiterated its interest in developing a consultation protocol and asked KFN to confirm if KFN would like to develop a bi-lateral agreement between CNSC and KFN, or if the agreement should also include AANTC. KFN indicated that they would speak to AANTC about the preferred approach and would follow-up with CNSC to confirm and discuss next steps.
June 2, 2020	Email, outgoing	Follow-up email to Feb 14, 2020 meeting. CNSC staff inquired about the status of KFN's internal discussions on consultation protocol about a bi-lateral agreement or a tri-lateral agreement with AANTC.
June 26, 2020	Letter, outgoing: C. Cianci (CNSC) to V. Polson (AANTC)	Letter including a Proposed Consultation Approach with AANTC for the remaining steps of the regulatory review process for the NSDF Project.
June 26, 2020	Letter, outgoing: C. Cianci (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter including a Proposed Consultation Approach with KFN for the remaining steps of the regulatory review process for the NSDF Project.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
June 29, 2020	Email, outgoing: A. Levine (CNSC) to R. Van Schie, L. Haymond (KFN), V. Polson and N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email correspondence between KFN and CNSC staff regarding setting up a virtual meeting to discuss the development of a consultation framework for the NSDF Project and other CNSC-led projects of interest including NPD and MMR. KFN indicated that they were awaiting on direction from AANTC leadership before agreeing to a meeting.
August 6, 2020	Email, outgoing: A. Levine (CNSC) to R. Van Schie, L. Haymond (KFN), V. Polson and N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email correspondence from CNSC staff regarding following up on the possibility of setting up a virtual meeting to discuss the development of a consultation framework for the NSDF Project and other CNSC-led projects of interest including NPD and MMR. KFN indicated that they were still awaiting on direction from AANTC leadership before agreeing to a meeting.
August 24, 2020	Email, outgoing: A. Levine (CNSC) to R. Van Schie, L. Haymond (KFN), V. Polson and N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email correspondence from CNSC staff regarding following up on the possibility of setting up a virtual meeting to discuss the development of a consultation framework for the NSDF Project and other CNSC-led projects of interest including NPD and MMR. KFN indicated that they were still awaiting on direction from AANTC leadership before agreeing to a meeting.
August 26, 2020	Letter from KFN & AANTC: To Minister of Natural Resources (CC) CNSC	Letter indicating that KFN and AANTC are of the view that the CNSC has not met its Duty to Consult obligations with regards to the MMR project as well as the other major nuclear projects in their traditional territory (NSDF and NPD Closure Projects). In the letter, AANTC and KFN request that the regulatory review processes for all three of these Projects be put on pause until their concerns are addressed and asked the Minister to intervene.
November 25, 2020	Letter, outgoing: KFN & AANTC	CNSC response to August 26, 2020 letter from KFN and AANTC which included an offer to consult on the NSDF Project as per earlier attempts.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
November 13, 2020	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to R. Van Schie, N. Odjick; (CC) L. Haymond	Email to KFN and AANTC with table summarizing the concerns and issues they have raised regarding the NSDF project, seeking their review and feedback. In addition, CNSC staff offered to meet to discuss the concerns that AANTC and KFN have raised with regards to each project and to collaboratively work on a mutually agreeable consultation process.
January 2021	Letter, outgoing: R. Jammal (CNSC) to KFN & AANTC	Letter sent to KFN and AANTC in response to their letter to the Minister of Natural Resources on August 26, 2020, regarding three environmental assessment (EA) processes occurring in and around the Chalk River site, for which the CNSC is the Responsible Authority, including the NSDF project. CNSC staff reiterated its commitment to developing a mutually agreeable consultation framework together and working collaboratively together to address the concerns they have raised.
January 5, 2021	Email, outgoing: B. Carter (CNSC) to R. Van Schie (KFN)	Email following up on KFN & AANTC's review of the Issues Tracking Table for NSDF. CNSC staff offered to meet to answer any questions related to the draft table and to provide an update with the latest information on process timelines and next steps for the NSDF, NPD and MMR projects.
January 22, 2021	Email, incoming: R. Van Schie (KFN) to B. Carter (CNSC)	Email from KFN indicating that they will reach out to CNSC to discuss a formal consultation approach for the NSDF, NPD, MMR projects after they meet with Minister O'Regan in February. CNSC staff responded by email to KFN acknowledging their note about meeting with Minister O'Regan on their consultation concerns for NSDF, NPD, & MMR. CNSC staff indicated that we remain open to discussing their concerns and discussing a path forward for consultation.
March 3, 2021	Email, incoming:	Email from KFN and AANTC indicating that they will share the results of ongoing meetings and discussions with the Minister and his Office regarding a consultation framework and process in relation to nuclear projects in their territory.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
April 1, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Blair (CNSC) to R. Van Schie (KFN); (CC) J. Duhaime	Email offering to meet with KFN at their earliest convenience to provide an update on the latest information and process timelines for the NSDF, NPD Closure and MMR projects, and discuss KFN's concerns for consultation and engagement for these projects.
May 26, 2021	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to C. Leigh (AANTC)	Phone call offering to meet with AANTC and member communities to provide updates on the proposed NSDF and NPD EA processes, including current status and next steps for each project.
June 1, 2021	Letter, incoming: L. Haymond (KFN) to Minister of Natural Resources; (CC) CNSC	Dated May 31, 2021. Letter from KFN to Minister Seamus O'Regan as a follow up to February 8, 2021 Chalk River Nuclear Meeting and Honour of the Crown. NSDF, NPD, GFP, and Advanced nuclear materials research centre projects and failure to consult, accommodate and build positive relationships.
June 8, 2021	Letter, outgoing: R. Velshi (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter from President Velshi responding on behalf of the CNSC to the May 21 st letter from KFN to Minister Seamus O'Regan. President Velshi reiterated the CNSC's commitment to meeting with KFN at a working level and offered to meet with KFN leadership on the matter.
June 30, 2021	Email, incoming: R. Van Schie (KFN) to B. Carter (CNSC)	Email from KFN requesting updates on the NPD EIS & NSDF EIS ahead of a meeting with President Velshi. CNSC staff responded on June 30 th to inform KFN that CNL submitted a revised EIS for the NSDF Project to CNSC staff on May 28 th , which was undergoing a completeness check. The revised EIS for the NPD Closure Project was not submitted in April 2021 and is now expected in August 2021. CNSC staff also offered to arrange a working-level meeting to discuss a consultation approach for the remainder of the EA process.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
June 30, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN); (CC) S. Green, K. Young, J. Roy, M. Jawbone (KFN)	Email proposing to organize a meeting between KFN and President Velshi to discuss relationship- and trust-building, as well as a path forward on consultation as per the CNSC's June 8, 2021 letter.
July 15, 2021	Meeting: R. Velshi, C. Cattrysse, (CNSC), L. Haymond (KFN), J. Boudrias (AANTC)	KFN, AANTC and CNSC staff agreed to develop an action plan for a path forward on the major projects on the CRL site which would include ongoing collaboration on nuclear matters, that will articulate key steps, timelines and roles and responsibilities. As part of the action plan development, parties will discuss and strive to find resource funding options and/or solutions related to the activities articulated in the plan. AANTC agreed to brief the other Algonquin communities in August 2021 and provide clarity on whether AANTC is continuing to represent them for the major projects going forward. Following this meeting, AANTC will provide direction to CNSC on who they are representing for consultation and on which projects.
Between 15 & 22 July	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to M. Jawbone (KFN)	Email following up to July 15, 2021 meeting between leadership of KFN, AANTC, & CNSC. CNSC staff offered to meet the following week at a working-level with KFN and AANTC to discuss concerns about MMR, NPD, and NSDF. CNSC staff proposed then having a follow-up meeting to address an Action Plan and Terms of Reference. CNSC staff followed-up on July 28, 2021 and July 30, 2021 via email.
August 12, 2021	Letter, incoming: L. Haymond. (KFN) to M. Leblanc (CNSC)	Letter reiterating KFN's desire to establish an overarching consultation agreement jointly with the CNSC and Natural Resources Canada (NRCan). KFN also called on the CNSC to suspend decision-making on the MMR project until such an agreement is in place.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
Sept 8, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to M. Jawbone (KFN)	Follow-up to July 15 th meeting between leadership of KFN, AANTC, & CNSC. CNSC staff requested to meet with KFN to discuss next steps for consultation on the NPD and NSDF projects.
September 08, 2021	Letter, outgoing: M. Leblanc (CNSC) to L. Haymond (KFN)	Letter responding to KFN's letter from August 12, 2021.
October 6, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to M. Jawbone (KFN)	Email following up to Sept 08, 2021 Secretariat response to August 12, 2021 letter from KFN. CNSC staff requested to meet with KFN in the coming weeks to discuss next steps for consultation on the NPD and NSDF projects.
October 19, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to M. Jawbone (KFN)	Email requesting to meet with KFN at their earliest convenience to discuss next steps for consultation on the NPD and NSDF projects. KFN and CNSC set Nov 05 th to meet.
November 5, 2021	Meeting: R. Van Schie, R. Pelletier, K. Blaise (KFN); C. Cianci, C. Cattrysse, N. Kwamena, D. Saumure, A. Levine, J. Wray (CNSC)	Meeting between CNSC staff and KFN to discuss a consultation agreement, the Federal Lands processes, and concerns about ongoing Environmental Assessments under CEAA 2012 . CNSC staff confirmed that PFP funding had originally been awarded to AANTC, who was intended to coordinate and engage with KFN as part of the NSDF and NPD processes. KFN clarified that for the purposes of consultation on CNSC regulatory processes the duty to consult authority rests with KFN. KFN committed to discussing internally and with AANTC to determine the approach for accessing the remaining funds to support KFN's participation and engagement in the remaining phases of the NSDF and NPD projects. CNSC staff also committed to providing further information regarding the funding that has been previously awarded to AANTC.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
November 9, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to R. Van Schie, J. Roy, L. Haymond, M. Jawbone, C. Leigh (KFN)	Email following up to Nov 5 th meeting with KFN. CNSC staff included information on AANTC's awarded funding to date, as well as a link to the CNSC Indigenous Policy Framework, and a draft project agreement for KFN and CNSC on the MMR, NSDF, and NPD Projects. CNSC staff proposed to meet again in December to continue discussion.
November 19, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to R. Van Schie (KFN)	Email offering to meet with KFN to continue discussing PFP for the ongoing NPD, NSDF projects.
December 3, 2021	Email, outgoing: C. Cattrysse (CNSC) to R. Van Schie (KFN)	Email offering to meet with KFN to continue discussing PFP for the ongoing NPD, NSDF projects. CNSC staff also expressed that they expect the Environmental Impact Statement for the NPD project later in December 2021. CNSC also requested comments on the draft Terms of Reference for KFN and CNSC on the MMR, NSDF, and NPD Projects shared on Nov 9 th .
December 6, 2021	Email, incoming: R. Van Schie (KFN) to C. Cattrysse (CNSC)	Email from KFN requesting \$30,000.00 in PFP to develop an action plan and consultation agreement. CNSC clarified that they had already made over \$83,000 available to KFN through AANTC (for both the NSDF and NPD Projects), who specifically said they were using the funds to consult on behalf of the rights holders including KFN and Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg. CNSC staff asked if KFN to clarify if they are working or not with AANTC in this capacity using the existing funding that had been awarded, or if KFN would be engaging directly with the CNSC on the NSDF and other projects.
December 7, 2021	Email, incoming: N. Odjick (AANTC) to C. Cattrysse (CNSC)	Email from AANTC clarifying that they are canceling their funding agreements with the CNSC, and support KFN's approach to consulting with CNSC directly.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
December 9, 2021	Email, outgoing: A. Zenobi (CNSC) to S. Green, R. Van Schie (KFN)	Email with a PFP application form for funding to assist KFN in co-developing a Terms of Reference for consultation and a Rights Impact Assessment process for the NPD Closure Project and the MMR Project. The CNSC also presented the option of working with KFN on a separate application for funding, beyond the funding previously awarded to AANTC, to assist with participating in the remaining process steps for CNL's Near Surface Disposal Facility and NPD Closure project, including consultation and engagement with CNSC staff, review of CNSC staff's environmental assessment (EA) report/commission member documents, and intervening in the Commission hearing process.
January 14, 2022	Email, outgoing: B. Carter (CNSC) to R. Van Schie (KFN)	Email providing advance notice of the NSDF public maildrop scheduled for the week of January 24, 2022.
January 18, 2022	Email, incoming: R. Van Schie (KFN) to B. Carter (CNSC)	Email from KFN requesting to cancel the NSDF public maildrop in KFN community. CNSC staff responded to say that the request was made but was too late to stop the mail drop.
February, 2022 to ongoing	Meetings: C. Cattrysse, A. Levine, K. Campbell, N. Kwamena Owusa, K. Magill (CNSC), R. Van Schie (KFN), R. Pelletier (KFN), K. Blaise (KFN)	Bi-weekly meetings to discuss a consultation approach and agreement. NSDF consultation process was also discussed, and concerns were raised by KFN.
March 17, 2022	Email, outgoing: A. Zenobi (CNSC), to R. Van Schie (KFN)	Confirmation of CNSC awarding up to \$30,000 to support KFN's participation in the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process including reviewing the EA Report, CMDs, community feedback/engagement and participating in the Commission hearing.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March to April, 2022	Emails: R. Van Schie (KFN) to C. Cattrysse (CNSC)	A dozen emails back and forth between KFN and CNSC regarding the funding request and coordination of a contribution agreement for the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process, and the request for postponement of the NSDF Commission proceedings.
April 22, 2022	Email, incoming: R. Van Schie (KFN) to C. Cattrysse (CNSC)	Signed contribution agreement sent from KFN to CNSC staff which included proposed KFN-led community consultations on the proposed NSDF project should KFN want to use the allocated funds to do this. CNSC staff agreed to this proposal.

Table 2: Engagement/Correspondence with Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg (KZA) and Algonquin Anishinabeg Nation Tribal Council (AANTC) regarding NSDF Project 2016 -2022

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 17, 2016	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to Chief J.G. Whiteduck (KZA) and N. Odjick (AANTC): Project Notification	Letter notifying the AANTC and KZA, of the NSDF Project and notification of PFP opportunities. AANTC confirmed that they provide updates on information shared with them on CNSC projects to KZA.
March 31, 2016	Phone Call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC): Follow-up on letter of project notification	Phone call following up on project notification letter and offer of PFP for the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects EAs and licensing processes.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 31, 2016	Phone Call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to Chief J.G. Whiteduck (KZA): Follow-up on letter of project notification	Phone call following up on project notification letter and offer of PFP for the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects EAs and licensing processes. CNSC staff spoke with S. Commanda-Riel and confirmed letter was received by Chief J.G. Whiteduck.
May 25, 2016	Letter, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KZA	Letter with notifying KZA of the comment period for the Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD Closure Projects.
June 17, 2016	Phone Call, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC): Follow-up on letter of project description notification	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff left voicemail.
June 17, 2016	Phone Call, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to S. Commanda-Riel (KZA): Follow-up on letter of project description notification	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff left voicemail.
July 05, 2016	Phone Call, outgoing N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC): Follow-up on letter of project description notification	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff re-sent the Letter and Project Description upon request.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
July 05, 2016	Phone Call, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to S. Commanda-Riel (KZA): Follow-up on letter of project description notification	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff left voicemail.
July 12, 2016	Letter, incoming: Chief J.G. Whiteduck (KZA) to C. Ducros (CNSC)	Letter responding to requests for comments on NSDF Project description. CNSC staff responded.
August 25, 2016	Email, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to Chief J.G. Whiteduck (KZA)	Email offering to discuss NSDF Project description comments and NSDF and NPD Closure Projects. Was resent on September 09, 2016 to correct email address.
October 24, 2016	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg (KZA) and Algonquin Nation Tribal Council (AANTC): Comment period on Revised NSDF Project Description.	Letter notifying AANTC and KZA of comment period on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project.
November 3 & 9, 2016	Phone call, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC) and S. Commanda-Riel (KZA): Follow-up on letter of project description notification	Follow up phone-calls on Notice to comment on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project and a reminder about PFP availability.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
November 16, 2016	Email, incoming: Chief J.G. Whiteduck and S. Commanda-Riel (KZA) to N. Frigault (CNSC)	Email regarding organization of meetings with CNL staff.
December 20, 2016	Meeting: N. Frigault, L. Ethier, H. Mulye, L. Abellan, A. Levine (CNSC) and AANTC and KZA	Meeting to introduce the CNSC, environmental assessment processes and the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects at the AANTC offices in Maniwaki, Quebec.
March 15, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Cianci (CNSC) to AANTC and KZA	Letter notifying AANTC regarding the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and public comment period from March 17-May 17, 2017.
March 27, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC	Email following up March 15, 2017 notice of the draft EIS and public comment period for the NSDF Project.
April 12, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email with public Notices for two upcoming CNSC open house sessions taking place on April 26, 2017 in Deep River, ON, and on April 27, 2017 in Sheenboro, QC.
April 13, 2017	Phone call, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to M. Olmstead (KZA)	Follow up phone-call on March 15, 2017 Notice to comment on draft EIS for NSDF Project. CNSC staff spoke to KZA who indicated that they planned to submit comments on the draft EIS.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
April 13, 2017	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow up phone call to March 15 th letter Notification of the draft EIS and public comment period, as well as Public Notices for two upcoming CNSC public open house sessions for NSDF Project. CNSC staff left a detailed message with AANTC staff who will pass the message on to N. Odjick.
April 26, 2017	Meeting: A. Levine, N. Frigault, C. Ducros, L. Ethier, D. Wylie (CNSC), KFN, AANTC, Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg, Lac Simon First Nation, Abitibiwinni First Nation, Kitcisakik First Nation	CNSC staff and CNL provided separate presentations regarding the NSDF and NPD projects. The Nations raised concerns regarding the amount of capacity available for review of the technical documentation and EIS. The length of the comment period for the EIS. Potential impacts on the Ottawa River. Legacy of radioactive waste and contamination at the Chalk River site. The need for Algonquin First Nations to provide consent for anything that happens on their lands, including at Chalk River. The need for CNSC staff to spend time with each of their communities to explain more about our regulatory oversight role and the project review process. CNSC staff committed to working with AANTC and each First Nation, including KZA, to develop an approach to consultation with regards to the NPD and NSDF Projects. CNSC staff discussed options for engagement and information sharing with the leadership and community members for each community and working together to address the concerns raised collaboratively throughout the regulatory review process.
May 11, 2017	Letter, incoming: KZA to N. Frigault (CNSC)	Response to CNSC letter on draft EIS and comment period. Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg FN outlined their concerns regarding the project.
May 19, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KZA	Email update on the public comment period on the draft EIS for the NSDF Project.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
May 24, 2017	Letter, incoming: V. Polson (AANTC) to CNSC	Letter from AANTC indicating that they are opposed to the NSDF project and that the consultation process with them and their communities regarding the NSDF Project has not been adequate to date due to the minimal amount of funding awarded to them through the CNSC's PFP. They have requested for the CNSC to remedy the situation.
June 7, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to V. Polson (AANTC)	Letter responding to AANTC letter received on May 24, 2017, offering to coordinate future meetings and provide funding to cover meeting related costs.
June 19, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KZA	Notice of the CNSC relaunching the public comment period for 60 days for the Draft EIS of the NSDF project.
August 14, 2017	Email, incoming: N. Odjick (AANTC) to N. Frigault (CNSC)	Email providing AANTC's comments to CNSC staff on CNL's Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which as per the contribution agreement could include feedback from AANTC's representative communities.
September 15, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KZA	English and French copies of Advertisements for upcoming Open House Sessions in Sheenboro (Oct 2), Pembroke (Oct 3) and Deep River (Oct 4)
September 27, 2017	Phone call and email: A. Levine (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Phone and email with CNSC staff providing updates to N. Odjick (AANTC) on the timelines for the NSDF Project EA, including: Public comment period deadline for Draft EIS document; CNSC Open House Sessions for NSDF Project (EA focus) in Sheenboro, QC, Pembroke, ON and Deep River, ON; 30-day public comment period (written interventions) on the EA Report and the EA and licensing Commission Member Documents

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
October 18, 2017	Email, outgoing: A. Levine (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email from CNSC staff requesting to organize a discussion on Next Steps for engagement on the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects, including additional capacity for AANTC. CNSC staff also offered to discuss potential funding to cover costs related to the meetings and for AANTC to hire a consultant.
December 6, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros to V. Polson, N. Odjick (AANTC), and J. G. Whiteduck (KZA)	Letter with an update on the status of the NSDF Project's Environmental Impact Statement and pending revised timelines.
June 21, 2018	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to Chief. J.G. Whiteduck (KZA)	CNSC staff spoke with Chief J.G. Whiteduck about key contacts. He clarified that KZA would like to continue to be contacted separately for all communication.
August 02, 2018	Email, outgoing: L. Brunarski (CNSC) to Chief J.G. Whiteduck (KZA)	Email offering CNSC PFP for Indigenous Knowledge Studies related to the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects.
August 28, 2018	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to Chief. J.G. Whiteduck (KZA)	Follow-up phone call regarding the email offering CNSC PFP for Indigenous Knowledge Studies related to the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects. KZA indicated that they would get in contact with CNSC if they are interested, however KZA indicated that such a study was not necessary at this time.
September 27, 2018	Letter, outgoing: C. Cianci to N. Odjick (AANTC), Chief. J.G. Whiteduck (KZA)	Letter with an update on NSDF and NPD Closure Projects including schematic of process showing upcoming consultation opportunities. CNSC staff offered to arrange a meeting to discuss CNL and CNSC responses to comments on the draft EIS.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
October 16, 2018	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Follow up phone call to letter sent Sept 27, 2018. CNSC staff spoke to N. Odjick, who indicated that AANTC do not currently have the resources to meet about these projects or to review any additional information. CNSC staff reiterated the availability of PFP to support such activities.
October 16, 2018	Phone call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to Chief J.G. Whiteduck (KZA)	Follow up phone call to correspondence sent Sept 27, 2018. CNSC staff left voicemail.
January 10, 2019	Phone call: A. Zenobi (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Phone call to offer to set up a meeting between AANTC and CNSC in April 2019 and to offer PFP funding to support.
January 11, 2019	Email, outgoing: A. Zenobi (CNSC) to N. Odjick (AANTC)	Email with a Participant Funding Program application form for a meeting with CNSC staff in April 2019. The meeting was to provide updates on the NSDF project and discuss CNSC's responses to AANTC's comments on CNL's draft EIS, as well as to discuss a path forward for consultation and engagement. The CNSC proposed inviting KZA, KFN, and CNL to this meeting. This meeting never occurred as the communities did not express a direct interest in working with CNSC staff to organize the meeting.
January 29, 2019 & February 07, 2019	Emails: A. Zenobi (CNSC) to AANTC	Email exchange between CNSC staff and AANTC regarding AANTC questions on CNSC and CNL's responses to AANTC's comments on the draft EIS.
March 20, 2019	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to AANTC and KZA	CNSC staff sent out a notice on the re-opening of PFP and a project status update for NSDF with CNL website Links.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
July 12, 2019	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to KZA, Kitcisakik First Nation, Lac Simon First Nation, Abitibiwinni First Nation, Timiskaming First Nation, Kebaowek First Nation, Long Point First Nation	Email providing general updates and CNSC staff request a meeting with KZA and other Algonquin communities on the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects. KZA responded indicating ability to meet but no large group meeting occurred as proposed due to a lack of interest and response from the communities.
November 21, 2019	Meeting: CNSC staff and KZA	Meeting in person to discuss the NSDF, NPD Closure and MMR Projects.
June 29, 2020	Letter, outgoing: C. Cianci (CNSC) to V. Polson (AANTC)	Letter including a Proposed Consultation Approach with AANTC for the remaining steps of the regulatory review process for the NSDF Project.
June 29, 2020	Letter, outgoing: C. Cianci (CNSC) to KZA	Letter including a Proposed Consultation Approach with KZA for the remaining steps of the regulatory review process for the NSDF Project.
November 13, 2020	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to Chief J.G. Whiteduck and L. Dwyer (CNSC)	Update on the EA process for NSDF and NPD and attached copy of Issues Tracking Table for NSDF
September 22, 2021	Meeting (virtual): CNSC and KZA	Meeting with Kitigan Zibi Anishinbeg to provide overview on all CNSC projects (EA and Licensing), PFP and discuss a path forward. New contacts were provided.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
January 14, 2022	Email, outgoing: B. Carter (CNSC) to P.L. Bastien and E. Higgins (KZA)	Email providing advance notice of the NSDF public maildrop scheduled for the week of January 24, 2022.
January 20, 2022	Email, incoming: E. Higgins (KZA) to B. Carter (CNSC)	Email from KZA concerns regarding NSDF maildrop being delivered without KZA approval & CNSC response and proposal to meet to discuss NSDF and possible Terms of Reference for Long-Term Engagement.
February 03, 2022	Email: A. Zenobi (CNSC) to E. Higgins and P.L. Bastien (KZA)	Confirmation of CNSC awarding up to \$30,000 to support KZA's participation in the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process including reviewing the EA Report, CMDs, community feedback/engagement and participating in the Commission hearing.
January – current	Meetings: CNSC and KZA	CNSC staff are meeting regularly to discuss NSDF (hearing preparation), NPD Closure and MMR Projects as well as a potential long-term relationship terms of reference.

Table 3: Engagement/Correspondence with Mitchikanibikok Inik (MI) also known as Algonquins of Barriere Lake through Algonquin Nation Secretariat (ANS) regarding NSDF Project 2016 -2022

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 17, 2016	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to Algonquin Nation Secretariat (ANS): Project Notification	Letter notifying the ANS who represents the MI also known as Algonquins of Barriere Lake, of the NSDF Project and notification of PFP opportunities. ANS confirmed that they provide updates on information shared with them on CNSC projects to MI.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
April 07, 2016	Phone Call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to ANS: Follow-up on letter of project notification	Phone call following up on project notification letter and offer of PFP for the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects EAs and licensing processes.
May 25, 2016	Letter, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter with notifying ANS of the comment period for the Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD Closure Projects.
June 17, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff left voicemail.
July 05, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff left voicemail.
October 24, 2016	Letter, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter notifying ANS of comment period on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project.
November 9, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow up phone-call on Notice to comment on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project and a reminder about PFP availability. CNSC staff left voicemail.
November 17, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow up phone-call on Notice to comment on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project and a reminder about PFP availability. CNSC staff left voicemail.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 15, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter notifying AND regarding the draft EIS and public comment period from March 17-May 17, 2017.
March 27, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Email following up March 15, 2017 notice of the draft EIS and public comment period for the NSDF Project.
April 13, 2017	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow up phone-call on March 15, 2017 Notice to comment on draft EIS for NSDF Project. CNSC staff left voicemail.
May 19, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Email update on the public comment period on the draft EIS for the NSDF Project.
December 6, 2017	Letter, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter providing an update on the status of the EIS and pending revised timelines for the NSDF Project.
March 20, 2019	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Email update on re-opening of PFP and NSDF Project status.
June 25, 2020	E-mail, outgoing N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS) and cc to MI, Wolf Lake First Nation and Timiskaming First Nation;	An update to the Algonquin Nation Secretariat and the communities they represent and coordinate, on the regulatory review process, including the environmental assessment, for the proposed Near Surface Disposal Facility Project.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 4, 2022	Email, incoming: R. Van Schie (MI) to C. Cattrysse (CNSC)	Email indicating that on behalf of ABL that R. Van Schie would like to submit a funding application for up to \$30,000 to support ABL's participation in the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process.
March 18, 2022	Email, outgoing: A. Zenobi (CNSC) to R. Van Schie (MI)	Email confirming that the CNSC has awarded up to \$30,000 to support ABL's participation in the remaining steps of the NSDF regulatory process, including opportunity to use allocated funds for community engagement if MI choose to, through the PFP.

Table 4: Engagement/Correspondence with Wolf Lake First Nation (WLFN) through Algonquin Nation Secretariat (ANS) regarding NSDF Project 2016 -2022

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
March 17, 2016	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to Algonquin Nation Secretariat (ANS): Project Notification	Letter notifying ANS, who represents WLFN, of the NSDF Project and notification of PFP opportunities. ANS confirmed that they provide updates on information shared with them on CNSC projects to WLFN.
April 07, 2016	Phone Call: N. Frigault (CNSC) to ANS: Follow-up on letter of project notification	Phone call following up on project notification letter and offer of PFP for the NSDF and NPD Closure Projects EAs and licensing processes.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
May 25, 2016	Letter, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter notifying ANS of the comment period for the Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD Closure Projects.
June 17, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff left voicemail.
July 05, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow-up phone-call to May 25, 2016, letter with notice to comment on Project Descriptions for both NSDF and NPD. CNSC staff left voicemail.
October 24, 2016	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter notifying ANS of comment period on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project.
November 9, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow up phone-call on Notice to comment on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project and a reminder about PFP availability. CNSC staff left voicemail.
November 17, 2016	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow up phone-call on Notice to comment on Revised Project Description for NSDF Project and a reminder about PFP availability. CNSC staff left voicemail.
March 15, 2017	Letter, outgoing: C. Ducros to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter notifying AND regarding the draft EIS and public comment period from March 17-May 17, 2017.
March 27, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Email following up March 15, 2017 notice of the draft EIS and public comment period for the NSDF Project.

Date	Outreach/ Engagement/ Correspondence	Content
April 13, 2017	Voicemail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Follow up phone-call on March 15, 2017 Notice to comment on draft EIS for NSDF Project. CNSC staff left voicemail.
May 19, 2017	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Email update on the public comment period on the draft EIS for the NSDF Project.
December 6, 2017	Letter, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Letter providing an update on the status of the EIS and pending revised timelines for the NSDF Project.
March 20, 2019	Email, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS)	Email update on re-opening of PFP and NSDF Project status.
June 25, 2020	E-mail, outgoing: N. Frigault (CNSC) to P. Digangi (ANS) and cc to Algonquins of Barriere Lake, Wolf Lake First Nation and Timiskaming First Nation	An update to the ANS and the communities it represents and coordinates, on the regulatory review process, including the environmental assessment, for the proposed Near Surface Disposal Facility Project.