ANNEX 1: Advice to the Agency

Table 1: Please use the table below to provide advice for the Agency's consideration in its recommendation to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and preparation of draft conditions

Questions	Responses/Comments
• Has the proponent described all project components and activities in sufficient detail to understand all relevant project-environment interactions? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	
• Were the study areas sufficient to predict potential effects from all relevant project-environment interactions, and to consider the effects within a local and regional context? • Is the baseline information sufficient to characterize the existing environment, predict potential effects and obtain monitoring objectives? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	
Alternatives Assessment	
• Has the proponent adequately described the criteria it used to determine the technically and economically feasible alternative means? • Has the proponent listed the potential effects to valued components (VCs) within your mandate that could be affected by the technically and economically feasible alternative means? • Has the proponent adequately described why it chose each preferred alternative means? • Are there other alternative means that could have been presented? If so, please describe.	
Environmental Effects Assessment	
• Has the proponent clearly described all relevant pathways of effects to be taken into account under section 5 of CEAA 2012? • Has the proponent identified all potential effects to VCs, including species at risk, within your mandate? • Were all potential receptors considered?	
• Were the methodologies used by the proponent appropriate to collect baseline data and predict effects, why or why not? • Has the proponent explicitly addressed the degree of scientific uncertainty related to the data and methods used within the assessment? If there are unaccounted for scientific uncertainties, describe them and indicate the options for increasing certainty in the predictions?	

Questions	Responses/Comments
• Are the predicted effects described in objective and reasonable terms (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible)?	
• Has the proponent adequately assessed the potential cumulative environmental effects, including using appropriate temporal and spatial boundaries , examining physical activities that have been and will be carried out, and proposing mitigation and follow-up program requirements? Provide rationale.	
• Has the proponent adequately described the potential for environmental effects caused by accidents and malfunctions, including the types of accidents and malfunctions, their likelihood and severity and the associated potential environmental effects? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	
• Are you satisfied with the proponent's assessment of effects of the environment on the Project? • Has the proponent characterized the likelihood and severity appropriately? Provide rationale.	
• Has the proponent sufficiently described and characterized the project activities and components as they relate to federal decisions within your mandate? If not, identify what additional information is needed. • Are changes to the environment, as they relate to federal decisions within your mandate, sufficiently described? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	
Mitigation	
• Has the degree of uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures been described? If not, identify what information is needed. • Is it clear how each proposed mitigation measure links to each potential pathway of effect?	
• Would you propose different or additional mitigation measures? If so, provide a description of the mitigation measure(s), with rationale.	
• Which of the proposed mitigation measures and/or project design elements do you consider to be necessary to reduce the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects? Provide rationale.	
Residual Adverse Environmental Effects	
• Are the identification and documentation of residual environmental effects described by the proponent adequate? If not, what are the aspects for which there is uncertainty and, where	

Questions	Responses/Comments
possible, indicate how these residual effects can be best described. If there is uncertainty, what are the options for increasing certainty?	
• Did the proponent provide a sufficiently precise, ideally quantitative, description of the residual environmental effects related to your mandate? Identify any areas that are insufficient.	
Determination of Significance	
• Are the conclusions on significance in the EIS supported by the analysis that is provided? • Are the proponent's proposed criteria for assessing significance appropriate? This includes how the criteria were characterized, ranked, and weighted. Provide rationale. Where the proponent has **not** used one of the Agency's recommended key criteria (magnitude, geographic extent, duration, frequency, reversibility, and social/ecological context), has a rationale been provided?	
• Were appropriate methodologies used in developing the conclusions on significance?	
• Do you agree with the proponent's analysis and conclusions on significance? Provide rationale.	
Monitoring and Follow-up	
• Does the proposed monitoring and follow-up program verify the predictions of the environmental assessment as they relate to section 5? Please explain additional monitoring or follow-up needed to address uncertainty in the effects assessment.	
• Does the proposed monitoring and follow-up program verify the effectiveness of proposed mitigations as they relate to section 5? Please explain additional monitoring or follow-up needed to address uncertainty in the proposed mitigation.	
• Is the objective of the follow-up program clear and measurable? • Does the follow-up program include sufficient detail, and technical merit, for the Agency to achieve the stated objective through a condition (e.g. sufficient baseline dataset, monitoring plans, acceptable thresholds of change, contingency procedures)?	
• Are you aware of any federal or provincial authorizations or regulations that will achieve the same follow-up program objective(s)? If so, how do these achieve the objective(s)?	
Additional comments, views, advice	
• Provide any other comments.	

ANNEX 2: Information requirements directed to the proponent

Table 2: Please use the table below to provide your department's comments and suggestions for information that should be required from the proponent to ensure the information in the EIS is scientifically and technically accurate and is sufficient to make a determination of significance on environmental effects.

ID	Project Effects Link to CEAA 2012	Reference to EIS guidelines	Reference to EIS	Context and Rationale	Specific Question/ Request for Information
DFO-01	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.3 Fish and fish habitat	Page 6-3, Section 6.1.3 Key Marine Assemblages (final sentence) Section 6.1.7 Finfish (Demersal and Pelagic Species)	With respect to the identification of key species, the EIS states, "In most cases, such species were determined based on numerical dominance or as a result of their conservation status; however, migration for spawning and seasonality were also considered" (Page 6-3). Based on the last two paragraphs of page 6-26, it appears that abundance data from DFO RV survey data were used to identify key finfish species. Biomass should also be considered when identifying key species.	Where possible, identify key species based on biomass. Update baseline information and effects assessment, as necessary.
DFO-02	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.3 Fish and fish habitat	Section 6.1.6 Benthic Invertebrates	The EIS describes benthic invertebrates within different geographic areas (e.g., Grand Banks Shelf), but does not characterize species in the Orphan Basin.	Update Section 6.1.6 to include a description of benthic invertebrates in the Orphan Basin.
DFO-03	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat	Part 2, Section 7.1.3 Fish and fish habitat	E.g., Pages 6-13 to 6-14, Section 6.1.6 Benthic	Before drilling, the Proponent has committed to "conduct an imagery-based seabed survey at	Provide justification for or revise survey transect length for

			Invertebrates (second last sentence)	the proposed well sites to confirm the presence or absence of any aggregations of habitat-forming corals or sponges within a 500-m radius from each wellsite". It is not clear why 500 m was selected.	seabed investigation surveys. The survey layout for each wellsite should take into account dispersion modelling results. It is recommended that a 1.5 mm threshold be considered in determining the areal extent of surveys. Seabed survey layout should be reviewed by DFO prior to surveys.
DFO-04	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.3 Fish and fish habitat	Pages 6-27 to 6-34, Table 6.5	Although the Longnose Eel is noted as particularly abundant on page 6-26, it is not included in Table 6.5. Table 6.5 provides brief descriptions for key fish species in the RAA based on RV survey sets. For species that are particularly abundant (e.g., Blue Hake, Common Grenadier, Greenland Halibut, Lanternfish), more thorough descriptions should be provided (e.g., key areas and timing, spawning). Reference should be made to Figures 6-9 to 6-16 to describe distribution and abundance.	Provide more detailed descriptions for predominant finfish species in the RAA (including reference to associated Figures), and include Longnose Eel in Table 6.5.
DFO-05	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk	Pages 6-43 to 6-45, Table 6.6 Page 6-46, Section 6.1.8 Species at Risk (paragraph 3,	Tables 6.6 and 8.5 are missing some populations of fish species of conservation interest with the potential to occur in the RAA: • Atlantic Plaice (Maritime population)	Update Tables 6.6 and 8.5 to include missing fish populations, and to correct population names and COSEWIC designation.

			sentence 1; paragraph 4, final sentence) Pages 8-26 to 8-37, Table 8.5	• Atlantic Cod (Laurentian North population) • Smooth Skate (Laurentian-Scotian population) • Atlantic Salmon (Inner Bay of Fundy population) • Deepwater Redfish (Gulf of St. Lawrence-Laurentian Channel population) Tables 6.6 and 8.5 contains errors in population names: • Population name should not be associated with Roundnose Grenadier • For Atlantic Salmon, corrections should be made for Quebec Eastern **North** Shore and Quebec Western **North** Shore) • Population name should not be associated with Lumpfish (and Common can be removed from the name) In Tables 6.6 and 8.5, the Smooth Skate's (Funk Island Deep population) COSEWIC designation should be Endangered. Portions of the EIS are inconsistent with Tables 6.6 and 8.5 regarding the number and species considered to be of conservation interest in the RAA. For example, the final	Update EIS (throughout) to ensure consistency between Tables 6.6 and 8.5 and related text.

				sentence of Section 6.1.8 states "A summary of the habitat, distribution and general life characteristics of the eight species of conservation interest (SAR and SOCC) that may occur in the Project Area is provided in Table 6.5"; however, there are more than eight species of conservation interest in Table 6.6 and they are not all included in Table 6.5.	
DFO-06	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk	Section 6.1.8 Species at Risk Section 8.3.3 Species at Risk: Overview of Potential Effects and Key Mitigation	Although Northern and Spotted Wolffish are noted as potentially occurring in the RAA in Table 6.6, there is no discussion of the proposed critical habitat for these species in Section 6.1.8. Potential impacts to proposed critical habitat should be discussed, especially since threats for wolffish include activities that will/could be associated with this project.	Update 6.1.8 to include proposed critical habitat for Northern and Spotted Wolffish. Update 8.3.3 to describe potential impacts on proposed critical habitat. Update effects assessment, as necessary.
DFO-07	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.3 Fish and fish habitat Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk	Page 6-49, Section 6.1.9.2 Atlantic Salmon (paragraph 1, sentence 3) E.g., Page 6-55, Section 6.1.9.2 Atlantic Salmon (final sentence)	The EIS states "With the exception of the Inner Bay of Fundy population, all of the listed Atlantic salmon populations have the potential to occur in the Project Area". Although it is unlikely that the Inner Bay of Fundy population of Atlantic Salmon would occur in the Project Area, it is possible.	Update text in 6.1.9.2 to accurately reflect uncertainty in the overwintering distributions of the Inner Bay of Fundy population of Atlantic Salmon.

DFO-08	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.3 Fish and fish habitat Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk	Page 6-50, Table 6.7	Some corrections are required for Table 6.7: • The Southwest Newfoundland population is missing • Gaspé-Southern St. Lawrence should be Gaspé-Southern Gulf of St. Lawrence • Southern Uplands should be Nova Scotia Southern Upland	Update Table 6.7 and other portions of the EIS, as required.
DFO-09	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk	Section 6.3.3.1 Humpback Whale Page 6-94, Table 6.14	The EIS states that Humpback whale is listed as Special Concern by SARA. The Western North Atlantic population is not at risk. Ringed Seal COSEWIC designation is incorrect	Ensure all species at risk designations are up to date and accurate. Table 6.14 should be reviewed and designations updated.
DFO-10	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk Part 2, Section 7.1.6 Marine Mammals	Section 6.3.3 Section 6.3.4 Section 6.3.5 Section 6.3.6 Section 6.3.7	The EIS guidelines requires information on marine mammal important areas or critical habitat (for mating, breeding, feeding, nursing, etc.).	There is very little or nothing stated regarding important areas for each of the marine mammals that are potentially found in the Regional Assessment Area. If there are no important areas for marine mammals in the Regional Assessment Area, it should be stated.
DFO-11	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Section 6.4.2 Section 6.4.3 Section 6.4.4 Section 6.4.5	The EIS does not address the following request in the EIS Guidelines:	Describe distances between the edge of the Project Area and special areas.

				The EIS will describe the distances between the edge of the Project Area and special areas.	
DFO-12	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.2 Human Environment	Pages 7-18 to 7-19, Table 7.5	The EIS should include an additional table that reflects total catch (including redacted data). The Rule of 5 will not be jeopardized when the table represents catch/value totals.	Provide catch and value totals.
DFO-13	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.2 Human environment	Pages 7-43 to 7-44, Table 7.15	The list of stocks managed by NAFO is incomplete. It is recommended that the Proponent refer to Annex 1 A of the 2020 NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures. NAFO does not manage skate (or any species) in 3PS. 3M skate is currently unregulated.	Update Table 7.15 to ensure list of stocks is complete and to address information provided on skate.
DFO-14	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.2 Human environment	Page 7-47, Section 7.2.5 Description of Key Fisheries by Species and Potential Commercial Fisheries	It is not clear how the key fisheries were determined based on data provided earlier in Section 7.2. For example, a high catch weight was noted for Whelk in Table 7.8, but it is not included as a key fishery. It is difficult to assess potential fisheries, when species such as the Arctic surf clams are not mentioned prior to 7.2.5.	Provide further rationale for the determination of key fisheries. Update baseline information and effects assessment, as necessary.
DFO-15	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 1, Section 4.3 Study strategy and methodology	Page 8-2 to 8-3, Section 8.1.3 Potential Effects, Pathways and Measurable Parameters	With respect to pathways of potential effects, spread of aquatic invasive species (AIS) is not included.	Include AIS in list of pathways of potential effects. Provide rationale or revise potential

		Part 2, Section 7.3.1 Fish and fish habitat		The two potential environmental effects do not seem to capture the suite of pathways described. For example, the EIS notes "Changes in the availability, distribution, or quality of food sources…", but this does not seem to fall under the potential environmental effects. Changes in food sources and behavioural effects should be clearly incorporated into the potential environmental effects. In Table 8.1, the effect pathway for Change in Habitat Qualify and Use should include light. Measurable parameter(s) and Units of Measurement are incomplete for both potential environmental effects. For Change in Risk of Mortality or Physical Injury, it is important that physical injury and health be assessed in addition to mortality. For Change in Habitat Quality and Use, assessment of changes in habitat use should also be incorporated.	environmental effects to incorporate behavioural effects and changes in food sources. Update effects assessment, as required. Update Table 8.1 to include light as an effect pathway and to provide parameters for injury, health and habitat use. Update effects assessment, as required.
DFO-16	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.4 Mitigation measures	Pages 8-10 to 8-11, Section 8.3.1.2 Mitigation Pages 8-19 to 8-20, Section 8.3.2.2 Mitigation	Regarding VSP and the commitment for consistency with the SOCP, it is recommended that the Proponent commit to minimizing the unnecessary introduction of sound in 8.3.1.2.	Update Section 8.3.1.2 to include minimizing sound during VSP. Update Sections 8.3.1.2 and 8.3.2.2 to include conducting a

				Regarding discharges, this section should describe the Proponent's commitment to conduct an imagery-based seabed survey at the proposed well sites to confirm the presence or absence of corals and sponges, as well as possible mitigations (e.g., well relocation). DFO should review the survey plans and results from surveys. Mitigations relevant to well abandonment and presence and operation of a MODU should be described in 8.3.1.2 and for well abandonment in 8.3.2.2. If any mitigations will be applied to reduce effects of lighting during supply and servicing, these mitigations should be described in 8.3.2.2.	seabed survey (and potential mitigations). Provide mitigations specific to each physical activity with potential to cause an environmental effect in 8.3.1.2 and 8.3.2.2. If applicable, describe lighting mitigations for supply and servicing in 8.3.2.2.
DFO-17	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.3.1 Fish and fish habitat	Page 8-12, Section 8.3.1.3.1 Presence and Operation of a MODU (final sentence) Page 8-13, Section 8.3.1.3.2 Vertical Seismic Profiling (paragraph 1, sentence 6) Page 8-14, Section 8.3.1.3.2 Vertical	Characterization of sound levels and areal extent of sound effects require rationale. It is not clear why sound levels are presented from Matthews et al. (2018), when acoustic modeling was completed for this project in Appendix D. No reference is provided for the statement "While sound levels are anticipated to extend potentially 40 km beyond the	Justify the inclusion of Matthews et al. (2018) when describing sound levels for the Project or revise EIS to include information from Appendix D. Provide a reference for the propagation of sound levels beyond the Project Area.

			Seismic Profiling (paragraph 3, final sentence) Page 8-21, Section 8.3.2.3.1 Presence and Operation of a MODU (paragraph 2) Page 8-23, Section 8.3.2.3.2 Vertical Seismic Profiling (paragraph 2)	Project Area into the LAA…" (page 8-14). For the statements "Based on qualitative guidelines recommended by Popper et al. (2014)…potential behavioural effects on marine fish from exposure to continuous underwater sound are not predicted to extend beyond the Project Area" (page 8-21) and "the risk of behavioural effects would be high within tens of metres of the air gun source array for most fish species. For fish with swim bladders involved in hearing, this high risk of behavioural change could extend to hundreds of metres from the sound source. It is unlikely that behavioural effects on fish as a result of exposure to sound from VSP source arrays would extend beyond the Project Area" (page 8-23), it is not clear how Popper et al. (2014) guidelines were applied to these specific distances.	Explain how Popper et al. (2014) guidelines were applied to characterize distance of sound effects.
DFO-18	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat	Part 2, Section 7.3.1 Fish and fish habitat	Page 8-17, Section 8.3.1.3.3 Discharges (paragraphs 4 and 5) Page 15-89, Section 15.5.1.3.3 SBM Spill from	It is recommended that a more conservative threshold of 1.5 mm be applied when assessing effects of drill wastes on corals and sponges, including an SBM spill.	Update discussion of potential effects of drill wastes on corals and sponges to include a 1.5 mm threshold.

			the MODU and the Marine Riser (paragraph 1, sentence 4)		
DFO-19	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.3.1 Fish and fish habitat	Pages 8-23 to 8-24, Section 8.3.2.3.3 Discharges	Description of effects of discharges on change in habitat quality and use is insufficient. For example, there is no description of potential effects from deposition of drill muds, nor is there mention of discharges other than drilling muds and cuttings.	Update 8.3.2.3.3 to more thoroughly discuss effects of discharges.
DFO-20	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.3.1 Fish and fish habitat	Page 8-24, Section 8.3.2.3.4 Well Abandonment	There is no discussion of effects of removal of a wellhead (i.e., mechanical cutter, explosives) on habitat quality and use.	Update 8.3.2.3.4 to describe effects of wellhead removal.
DFO-21	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.3.1 Fish and fish habitat	Section 8.3.4 Summary of Project residual Environmental Effects Page 14-24, Section 14.2.6 Cumulative Effects Summary and Evaluation (paragraph 2, final sentence)	There are inconsistencies in the residual environmental effects characterization throughout the document. In Table 8.6, Direction should be N-A and Duration should be LT based on Section 8.3.2.3.4. The text on page 8-40 does match Table 8.6. For example, supply vessel operations are not considered for change in risk of mortality or physical injury in Table 8.6, but are included on page 8-40. Duration of project effects on page 14-24 does not match Table 8.6.	Ensure consistency in residual environmental effects characterization throughout the EIS.

DFO-22	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.6.3 Cumulative effects assessment	Page 14-16, Table 14.3	For production projects, environmental effects should be consistent with Table 8.3. For example, change in risk of mortality or physical injury should be listed for underwater sound from drilling activities and operational discharges (bullets 3, 7). Additionally, the statement "Potential residual effects from offshore petroleum production drilling projects are similar to those potentially associated with the Project" (bullet 1 of VC-specific Spatial and Temporal Considerations) should be revised. There are inherent differences between exploratory and production drilling that are not simply because production drilling is confined to a fixed location or is longer-term (e.g., volume of produced water).	Update information pertaining to production projects.
DFO-23	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.6.3 Cumulative effects assessment	Page 14-21, Section 14.2.4 Potential Cumulative Environmental Effects (paragraph 2) Page 14-22 (bullet 1) Page 14-22 (bullet 6)	Regarding drill muds and cuttings (Page 14-21), it should be specified whether or not other wells have been drilled in the vicinity of the Project. Regarding underwater sound (page 14-22, bullet 1), the discussion should include VSP, as well as the overlapping soundscape between Project activities and other offshore activities.	Specify if other wells have been drilled in the Project vicinity. Update discussion of cumulative effects for underwater sound to include VSP and spatial overlap between sound generated from this and other projects.

				It is not clear why interactions between drill waste discharges and underwater sound is discussed (page 14-22, bullet 6). Context is required.	Clarify discussion of interactions between drill waste discharges and underwater sound.
DFO-24	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.6.3 Cumulative effects assessment	Page 14-23, Section 14.2.5 Species at Risk (paragraph 3)	In the assessment of cumulative effects for wolffish, sound does not seem to be taken into account. For example, how will sound from various projects overlap to influence wolffish in the Northeast Slope EBSA or proposed critical habitat?	Update cumulative effects assessment for wolffish to include sound.
DFO-25	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.6.1 Effects of potential accidents or malfunctions	Section 15.5.1.3.1 Subsea Blowout	Regarding a subsea blowout, potential effects to species at risk should be described. Provide rationale for the statement "In the event of a large blowout incident, the area affected is unlikely to encompass all the spawning locations for any one species" (page 15-87) given that "Stochastic modelling results indicate that the geographic extent of a residual change in habitat quality and use for marine fish could spread beyond the RAA (Appendix F)" (page 15-84). Change potential effects to beyond the RAA and short to long term in duration.	Update effects assessment for a subsea blowout to include species at risk, provide a rationale regarding spawning locations, and revise residual environmental effects characterizations.
DFO-26	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.6.1 Effects of potential	Section 15.5.1.3.2 Marine Diesel Spill	Based on page 15-78, batch spills included a spill from the MODU and a spill from a PSV in	Include discussion of results from modelling

		accidents or malfunctions		transit to or from the MODU. Results from the PSV in transit should be described.	spill from a PSV in transit.
DFO-27	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.6.1 Effects of potential accidents or malfunctions	Section 15.5.1.3.3 SBM Spill from the MODU and the Marine Riser	The proponent did not complete project-specific SBM modelling, but referenced Nexen's SBM spill modelling. The applicability of Nexen's modelling to the Project should be described. Changes to the water column and effects on species that occupy the water column have not been discussed. It is not clear how the thickness of SBM is taken into account in the discussion of benthic recovery.	Justify use of Nexen's SBM modelling to replace project-specific modelling. Discuss effects of an SBM spill on water quality, and resulting consequences for species occupying the water column. Where possible, relate the thickness of SBM to the anticipated benthic recovery.
DFO-28	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.3.8.3 Special Areas	Section 15.5.4 Special Areas	The EIS does not address the following requirement in the EIS Guidelines: - Effects on special areas, including, but not limited to: use of dispersants.	Describe effects of dispersants on special areas.

ANNEX 3: Advice to the proponent

Table 3: Additional advice to the proponent, such as guidance or standard advice related to your departmental mandate

ID	Reference to EIS	Context and Rationale	Advice to the Proponent
DFO-29	Page 6-14, Section 6.1.6.1 Grand Banks Shelf (paragraph 2)	Based on Table 6.1, brittle star, sand dollar and Boreal Astarte, and not basket star, should be listed for Prena et al. (1999). Murillo et al. (2016) could also be referenced in this paragraph.	Revision recommended.
DFO-30	Page 6-20, Table 6.4	It is not clear why the Depth Zone and Survey Type are the same within the Table.	Revision recommended.
DFO-31	Pages 6-52 to 6-53, Section 6.1.9.2 Atlantic Salmon	For the Labrador and Nunavik DUs, it is stated that "Migration routes back to these DUs are thought to be like the routes out to sea"; however the routes out to sea are not described. A description would be useful.	Revision recommended.
DFO-32	Section 6.4.2 Special Areas Designated by the Federal Government of Canada, Table 6.19 Section 15.5.4.1.1 Potential Effects of a Subsea Blowout on Special Areas, Table 15.38	There is no Farmer's Island Lobster Area Closure (LAC).	Revision recommended.
DFO-33	Section 7.2.1.1 Jurisdictions and Boundaries Section 13.1.1 Regulatory and Policy Setting	There is no reference to the fishery management organization called the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT). The ICCAT is an inter-governmental fishery organization responsible for the conservation of tunas and tuna-like species in the Atlantic Ocean and its adjacent seas.	Revision recommended.
DFO-34	Page 7-11, Section 7.2.2 Domestic Commercial Fishing by NAFO Divisions (final sentence)	It is not clear how the percent of yearly catch weight by cell is incorporated in Figures 7-10 to 7-13.	Clarification recommended.

DFO-35	Page 7-38, Figure 7-32	It appears that Figure 3-32 reflects data from Table 7.12 (Project Area). The use of NAFO unit areas 3Le and 3Li is confusing.	Clarification recommended.
DFO-36	Page 7-38, Table 7.11	Table title indicates 2013-2017 and Table headings indicate 2012-2016. Table and associated text should be revised.	Revision recommended.
DFO-37	Page 7-41, Section 7.2.3.2 Current Foreign Commercial Fisheries within the NAFO Regulatory Area in the NAFO divisions that overlap with the RAA (paragraph 1)	It is unclear if this was intended to be illustrative only, but the list of species managed by NAFO is incomplete (e.g., does not include Greenland halibut and others). Also a number of these species (3LNO American plaice and 3NO capelin) have been closed to directed fishing for many years and comprise a very small percentage of the weight listed in table 7.13 (bycatch only). The only shellfish species managed by NAFO are shrimp in Divisions 3LNO and shrimp in Divisions 3M. Of those, only shrimp in 3LNO is under moratorium, shrimp in Division 3M re-opened in January 2020. NAFO manages 4 redfish stocks; pelagic redfish in Divisions 1F-2-3K, and redfish in Divisions 3LN, 3O and 3M. The only stock under moratorium is 1F-2-3K, the remaining redfish stocks are all open to commercial fishing.	Revision recommended.
DFO-38	Page 7-46, Figure 7-37	The Eastport Marine Protected Area is not located in Labrador. Figure should be edited.	Revision recommended.
DFO-39	Section 7.2.5.1.1 Northern Shrimp (paragraph 2)	The shrimp fishery in NAFO Division 3M re-opened in 2020 following a lengthy period of moratorium. The quota for shrimp in 3LNO (Area 7) is set by NAFO not DFO.	Revision recommended.
DFO-40	Page 7-51, Section 7.2.5.1.2 Snow Crab Fishery (paragraph 1, 2nd last sentence)	The statement, "There is no overlap between domestic commercial fishing activity for snow crab and the Project Area" should be revised, as Figure 7-43	Revision recommended.

		shows some overlap in the southern portion of the Project Area.	
DFO-41	Page 7-56, Section 7.2.5.2.2 Greenland Halibut (Turbot) (Existing and Potential)	NAFO manages the entire stock area of 2+3KLMNO for Greenland halibut. The 2+3K portion is allocated entirely to Canada. The Management Strategy Evaluation for the stock applies to 2+3KLMNO. The total TAC for Greenland halibut in 2+3KLMNO was 16,500t in 2018, 16,521t in 2019 and 16,926t in 2020.	Revision recommended.
DFO-42	Page 7-58, Section 7.2.5.2.3 Atlantic Cod (Potential)	There is a stewardship fishery with a maximum harvest level of 12,350t for 2019, not 2016. Paragraph 2 – Assume this is reference to 3M cod? 3M Cod TAC in 2019 was set at 11,145t. NAFO decision in 2018 maintains the moratorium for 3NO Cod for 2019, 2020, 2021.	Revision recommended.
DFO-43	Page 7-66, Section 7.2.7 Indigenous Fishing (sentence 1)	Consider changing "*Aboriginal food, social, and ceremonial (FSC) fisheries are present in areas of offshore NL"* to Indigenous food, social, and ceremonial (FSC) fisheries are present in areas of NL.	Revision recommended.
DFO-44	Section 7.3.1.1 Research Vessel	It should be noted that the Spanish RV survey occurs annually.	Revision recommended.
DFO-45	Page 7-68, Section 7.3.1.1 Research Vessel (paragraph 1, sentence 4)	RV trawls are not depicted on Figure 7-28. An appropriate figure should be included in Section 7.3.1.1.	Revision recommended.
DFO-46	Page 8-8, Table 8.3	It is not clear where surveys other than VSP are incorporated in physical activities. Additionally, well suspension does not seem to be included. Recommend including other surveys and well suspension.	Revision recommended.
DFO-47	E.g., Page 8-17, Section 8.3.1.3.3 Discharges (paragraph 5, sentence 1)	Based on page 6-21 and Figures 6-5 and 6-6, large and small gorgonian corals were not observed in the Project Area; however,	Revision(s) recommended.

	E.g., Page 8-23, Section 8.3.2.3.3 Discharges (paragraph 2, sentence 2)	it is noted throughout the document that they are present.	
DFO-48	Page 8-27, Table 8.5	For Roundnose Grenadier, the degree of project interactions is not specified (e.g., limited potential).	Revision recommended.
DFO-49	Page 8-40, Section 8.3.4 Summary of Project Residual Environmental Effects (final sentence)	In the situation where a wellhead is left in place, this would constitute a permanent alteration.	Revision recommended.
DFO-50	Section 11.1.1 Regulatory and Policy Setting, Table 11.2	The statement that EBSAs are identified to assist the delineation of MPAs is incorrect. The identification of an EBSA provides guidance on management measures that could be considered (which may include an MPA, but is not limited to this). EBSAs are a tool for identifying areas that have particularly high Ecological or Biological Significance and to facilitate provision of a greater than usual degree of risk aversion in management of activities within these areas.	Revision recommended.
DFO-51	Section 11.1.1 Regulatory and Policy Setting, Table 11.2	For the Northeast Newfoundland Slope Closure, prohibited activities include all bottom contact fishing activities as well as human activities that are incompatible with the conservation of the ecological components of interest may occur or be foreseeable within the area.	Revision recommended.
DFO-52	Page 13-2, Section 13.1.1 Regulatory and Policy Setting (paragraph 2)	Information on the *Fisheries Act* is outdated.	Revision recommended.
DFO-53	Page 13-7, Table 13.3	For direction, quantitative measure or definition of qualitative categories makes reference to special areas.	Revision recommended.
DFO-54	Page 13-10, Section 13.3.1.1 Project Pathways	There is no reference to potential effects from lighting. Update 13.3.1.1 to include lighting.	Revision recommended.

DFO-55	Page 14-13, Section 14.2.1 Past and Ongoing Effects (Baseline) (paragraph 1, final sentence)	To ensure consistency with the *Fisheries Act*, it is recommended that actual interpretations from the Act be provided here, particularly for fish habitat.	Revision recommended.
DFO-56	Page 14-23, Section 14.2.5 Species at Risk (paragraph 6, sentence 3)	"Identified critical habitat for Atlantic and spotted wolffish…" should be changed to "Proposed critical habitat for Northern and Spotted wolffish…".	Revision recommended.
DFO-57	Page 14-54, Section 14.7.1 Past and Ongoing Effects (Baseline) (paragraph 3, 2nd last sentence)	The statement "The lack of shrimp fishing saw an increase in the catch weight and value of snow crab" suggests there is causality between the quantity of shrimp allocations and the quantity of crab allocations. Species allocation are based on science and species value is also a function of global market prices for species.	Revision recommended.
DFO-58	Section 15.1.1.1 Vessel Collision, page 15-3	The statement, "*Entering and exiting the port of St. John's will require the mandatory assistance of a pilot captain on the bridge of the vessel who is brought onboard from the St. John's Port Authority*", should be confirmed.	Clarification recommended.
DFO-59	Section 15.2.6.2.1 Representative Cases: Surface, Water Column, and Shoreline Oil, Figure 15-21	The title block and legend area on the figure is blurry and difficult to read.	Revision recommended.
DFO-60	Section 15.2.6.2.2 Batch Spills, Figure 15-29	It is difficult to distinguish colors representing the surface oil thickness. Recommend changing colors so they are easier to distinguish from the background blue.	Revision recommended.
DFO-61	Page 15-88, Section 15.5.1.3.2 Marine Diesel Spill (paragraph 2, final sentence)	For the statement "Predictions at the end of the 30-day simulation were that 64% would evaporate, 35% would degrade, 11% would remain entrained in the water column…", 35% should be 25%.	Revision recommended.
DFO-62	Section 15.5.6 Commercial Fisheries and Other Ocean Users	There is no directed fishery for American Plaice - currently under moratoria (bycatch	Revision recommended.

		only). There is no directed fishery for cod in NRA in 3L or 3NO (under moratoria). There is no directed American Plaice fishery in 3LNO - under moratoria (bycatch only).	