

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Refer to Annex 2 (DFO-03, DFO-05, DFO-24, DFO-25).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Refer to Annex 2 (DFO-10, DFO-12, DFO-13, DFO-14, DFO-15, DFO-17, DFO-18, DFO-21).
Alternatives Assessment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
Environmental Effects Assessment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	Yes.

Questions	Responses/Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the predicted effects described in objective and reasonable terms (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible)? 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
Mitigation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would you propose different or additional mitigation measures? If so, provide a description of the mitigation measure(s), with rationale. 	No.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Pre-drilling benthic survey based on drill cuttings dispersion modelling and setback based on survey results to mitigate impacts to sensitive benthic habitat, e.g. corals and sponges.

Questions	Responses/Comments
Residual Adverse Environmental Effects	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 possible, indicate how these residual effects can be best described. If there is uncertainty, what are the options for increasing certainty? 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
Determination of Significance	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were appropriate methodologies used in developing the conclusions on significance? 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree with the proponent's analysis and conclusions on significance? Provide rationale. 	Yes.
Monitoring and Follow-up	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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)? 	Yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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)? 	No.
Additional comments, views, advice	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	Part 2, Section 7.1.2 Marine environment	Page 40, Section 2.3 Project Location and Designated Project Areas Page 125, Section 5.2 Bathymetry	Inconsistent water depths stated in each section.	State water depths of ELs consistently throughout the EIS.
DFO-02	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 1.2 Project overview	Page 51, Section 2.7 Project Schedule	It is stated that the pre-drill survey will take 1-2 days to complete. This differs from the Flemish Pass EIS which states 3-7 days.	Where differences are noted from the FP EIS, an explanation should be provided.
DFO-03	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 1, Section 3. Scope of the Environmental Assessment Part 2, Sections 7.1. Project setting and baseline conditions, and 7.1.2. Marine Environment	Pages 61-62, Section 2.9.5.2 Sound Emissions	The EIS Guidelines state that the “The abridged EIS should... provide a rationale for the applicability of the analysis and conclusions of the Flemish Pass EIS.” Furthermore, the EIS Guidelines state that a description should be provided of the “acoustic environment (ambient noise levels from natural sources, shipping, seismic surveys, and other sources), including information on geographic extent and temporal variations	Provide rationale for the applicability of analyses for estimated sound levels at potential shallow water (i.e. 40 m) sites.

				<p>and how the acoustic environment may be affected by the project.”</p> <p>The Abridged EIS states that “The estimated sound levels attributable to the operation of the drilling installation were qualitatively assessed by comparison to the previously modelled Scotian Basin Exploration Drilling Project (Zykov 2016), as the water depths and geoacoustic profiles in the deep-water sites for the proposed activity are similar to those from the Scotian Basin project.” (page 61, paragraph 2, sentence 2).</p> <p>Water depths in the project area range from 40 m to 1020 m. There is no rationale provided on how the acoustic assessment for Flemish Pass applies specifically to areas that have a depth range as low as 40 m.</p>	
DFO-04	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 1, Section 3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries	Page 117, Figure 4-1 Environmental Assessment Study Areas	The EIS Guidelines require a description of local and regional study areas. While Figure 4-1 shows the Project Area and Regional Study Area, the Local Study Area (i.e., transit route) is not shown.	Clearly depict the Local Study Area in Figure 4-1.
DFO-05	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 1, Section 3. Scope of the Environmental Assessment	Pages 122-123, Section 4.5.1 Cuttings Modelling	The EIS Guidelines state that the “The abridged EIS should... provide a rationale for the applicability of the analysis and	Provide rationale of how modelling for Flemish Pass is

		Part 2, Section 3.1 Project Components		<p>conclusions of the Flemish Pass EIS.”</p> <p>Furthermore, the EIS Guidelines state that a description should be provided on the nature, composition and fate of drilling wastes using dispersion modelling.</p> <p>The Abridged EIS states that “Modelling results from ELs 1134, 1135, 1137, and 1142 are suitable to apply to ELs 1159 and 1160, and therefore re-modelling is not contemplated.” (page 123, paragraph 3, final sentence).</p> <p>However, there is no rationale provided on how the Flemish Pass modelling is specifically applicable to ELs 1159 and 1160. How model inputs used for the FP EIS (e.g. oceanographic conditions, grain size, etc.) are applicable to EL 1159 and 1160 should be provided to ensure prediction of effects on benthic habitat and species fall within the range predicted in the FP EIS.</p>	applicable to EL 1159 and EL 1160.
DFO-06	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat	Part 2, Section 7.1.1 Atmospheric environment	Section 5 Existing Physical Environment	Information on existing ambient night-time light levels in the project area and at any other areas where project activities could have an effect on light levels is missing.	Provide information on the existing ambient night-time light levels under different

					environmental conditions.
DFO-07	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat	Part 2, Section 7.1.2 Marine environment	Page 129, Section 5.5 Oceanography	Marine water quality information (i.e., pH, turbidity) is missing.	Provide information on turbidity and pH.
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	Page 133, Section 6.1.1 Plankton, Plants and Macroalgae	Description of primary and secondary productivity, with a characterization of season variability, is lacking.	Provide information on plankton blooms, including timing of blooms. State common species relevant to the Project, and how they relate to the predator/ prey relationships in the food web.
DFO-09	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 134, Section 6.1.3 Benthic Invertebrates	Description of benthic invertebrates is lacking.	Briefly explain what benthic invertebrates are, how they are distributed, and their importance for ecosystem function.
DFO-10	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 135, Table 6.1 Summary of Known and Potential Coral/ Sponge Occurrence in ELs 1159 and 1160.	Based on Figure 6-1, soft corals are present within ELs 1159 and 1160; however, they are not included in Table 6.1.	Update Table 6.1 to include soft corals and provide a stand-alone figure depicting soft coral distribution in and around the Project Area.
DFO-11	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 6.1.5 Finfish (Demersal and Pelagic Species)	Information on finfish is provided in tabular and graphical form; however, there is no summary/description accompanying the presented data. Consequently, the data presented are not justified.	Provide brief description of presented data. Ensure consistency between Tables and Figures, or provide

				There are inconsistencies between the Tables and Figures. For example, Figures 6-17 and 6-17 show distribution and abundance of Vahl's Eelpout and Eelpout, yet these species do not appear in Tables 6.2-6.5. Meanwhile, species identified as key or numerically dominant (e.g., Atlantic Cod, Roundnose Grenadier and Thorny Skate) are not depicted in the figures.	rationale for differences.
DFO-12	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk	Pages 160-161, Table 6.6 Marine Fish Species at Risk that are Known to or May Occur within the Project Area Page 160, Section 6.1.6 Species at Risk (sentence 1) Page 343, Section 8.4 Species at Risk: Overview of Potential Effects (sentence 1) Pages 343-344, Table 8.1 Marine Fish Species at Risk: Potential Interactions with Project Components by Life History Stage	There are errors in status/designation in Table 6.6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blue Shark (Atlantic population) is designated as Not at Risk by COSEWIC - Shortfin Mako is designated as Endangered by the COSEWIC (Atlantic population) and the IUCN (Global) - Roughhead grenadier is designated as Not at Risk by the COSEWIC There are species/populations missing from Table 6.6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lumpfish - Atlantic Salmon Inner Bay of Fundy and Outer Bay of Fundy populations - Smooth Skate (Laurentian-Scotian population) - White Hake (Atlantic and Northern Gulf of St. Lawrence population) 	In Table 6.6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update status/designation for Blue Shark and Shortfin Mako - Remove Roughhead Grenadier - Add missing species and populations - link status/designations to populations for Atlantic Salmon Update number of species at risk (e.g., page 160, page 343). Update effects assessment, as necessary (e.g., Table 8.1).

				For clarity, it should be specified which status/designation pertains to which Atlantic Salmon population in Table 6.6.	
DFO-13	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 Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Section 6.3.1 Species at Risk	Section 6.3.1 should include the status/designation and population name for each species at risk with the potential to occur in the RSA (e.g., see Table 6.6). As the Sei Whale (Atlantic population) has been designated as Endangered by the COSEWIC, it should be included in Section 6.3.1.	Update Section 6.3.1 to include status/designation and population names. Update Section 6.3.1 to include the Sei Whale (e.g., Table 6.18, Figure 6-48). Remove the Sei Whale from the discussion of non-species at risk (e.g., Table 6.16, Figure 6-36).
DFO-14	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Pages 220-221, Table 6.19 Proximity of Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas off Eastern Newfoundland and their Relevance to Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles Pages 224-226, Table 6.23 Ecologically and Biological Significant Areas	There are numerous errors and omissions in the EIS regarding EBSAs. EBSA name changes include: -Northeast Shelf and Slope = Northeast Slope -Eastern Avalon Coast = Eastern Avalon -Southeast Shoal and Tail of the Banks = Southeast Shoal -Placentia Bay Extension = Placentia Bay -Southwest Shelf Edge and Slope = Southwest Slope Laurentian Channel and Slope = Laurentian Channel EBSA size changes include:	Edit EIS to reflect the updated Placentia Bay/ Grand Banks Study Area EBSAs.

			<p>off Eastern Newfoundland</p> <p>Page 493, Section 15.5.4 Special Areas</p>	<p>-Northeast Slope = 19,730.84 km²</p> <p>-Virgin Rocks = 7,294.17 km²</p> <p>-Orphan Spur = 21,686 km²</p> <p>-Lilly Canyon-Carson Canyon = 2,180.33 km²</p> <p>-Southeast Shoal = 15,401.84 km²</p> <p>-Notre Dame Channel = 6,232 km²</p> <p>-Labrador Slope = 29,759 km²</p> <p>-Grey Islands = 11,285 km²</p> <p>-Labrador Marginal Trough = 16,933 km²</p> <p>-Hamilton Inlet = 11,001 km²</p> <p>St. Pierre Bank = does not exist anymore</p> <p>Missing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Bonavista Bay -Baccalieu Island -St. Mary's Bay (Table 6.23 only) -Haddock Channel Sponges (Table 6.23 only) 	
DFO-15	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	<p>Page 221, Section 6.4 Special Areas (paragraph 3, sentence 2)</p> <p>Page 229, Table 6.27 Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems off Eastern Newfoundland</p>	<p>Information from NAFO 2016 has been used to update Equinor's Bay de Nord EIS VMEs with new and updated information. Updates to the EIS should be made throughout to provide up-to-date information on VMEs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The following statement on page 221 could be revised to include more recent information: "<i>The</i> 	Update information on VMEs to incorporate more recent data.

			<p>Pages 404-408, Table 11.1 Special Areas Minimum Distances to ELs 1159 and 1160</p> <p>Page 412, Figure 11-2 Potential Zones of Influence Around ELs 1159 and 1160 Associated with Light, Sound, and Drill Cuttings</p> <p>Section 11.4.3.1 Potential Zones of influence</p> <p>Pages 460-461, Table 14.3 Special Areas Overlapping with Project Area and ELs 1159 and 1160</p>	<p><i>Newfoundland Seamounts and the Beothuk Knoll have been identified as potential VMEs (NAFO 2008)."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revise outdated information in Tables 6.27, 11.1 and 14.3 - Update Figure 11-2 - Update Section 11.4.3.1 	
DFO-16	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Page 222, Figure 6-53 Special Areas in Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador	Figure should show all Special Areas in and around the Project Area.	Update Figure to incorporate recommended changes to Section 6.4 Special Areas.
DFO-17	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Page 223, Table 6.20 Marine Protected Areas in Newfoundland and Labrador	<p>Information on MPAs needs to be updated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eastport MPA is a single MPA -Laurentian Channel is an MPA (since 2019) -Laurentian Channel size is 11,580 km² 	Update information on MPAs.

DFO-18	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Page 224, Table 6.22 Marine Refuges	Division 30 Coral closure is missing (although it is the same area as Southeast Shoal which is mentioned in Table 6.23). The size of Northeast Newfoundland Slope Closure is incorrect.	Include Division 30 Coral Closure Area. Change size of Northeast Newfoundland Slope Closure to 55,353 km ² .
DFO-19	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Page 226, Table 6.24 Refined PB / GB LOMA EBSAs Pages 404-408, Table 11.1 Special Areas Minimum Distances to ELs 1159 and 1160 Page 493, Section 15.5.4 Special Areas	LOMA is an outdated term.	Remove LOMA from Tables 6.24 and 11.1, and Section 15.5.4.
DFO-20	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Page 226, Table 6.24 Refined PB / GB LOMA EBSAs	Approximate Delineated Areas (2017) need to be double checked.	Ensure the Approximate Delineated Areas are up to date for 2017.
DFO-21	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Pages 230-234, Table 6.28 NAFO Fisheries Closure Areas off Eastern Newfoundland Pages 404-408, Table 11.1 Special Areas Minimum Distances to ELs 1159 and 1160	Areas of closure areas are inconsistent with NAFO website. The following should be updated: Sackville Spur = 988 km ² Northern Flemish Cap (7) = 258 km ² Northwest Flemish Cap (10) = 316 km ² Northwest Flemish Cap (11) = 60 km ²	Update information on NAFO Fisheries Closure Areas.

				<p>Flemish Pass/Eastern Canyon (2) = 5,417 km² Orphan Knoll = 15,779 km² Northeast Flemish Cap (5) = 2,874 km² Beothuk Knoll = 339 km² Eastern Flemish Cap (4) = 1,552 km² Beothuk Knoll (3) = 308 km² Newfoundland Seamounts = 15,415 30 Coral Area Closure = 13, 999 km² Fogo Seamounts (1) = 4,523 km² Fogo Seamounts (2) = 4,619 km²</p> <p>Eastern Flemish Cap (14) should be removed.</p>	
DFO-22	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.5 Species at Risk	Pages 389-391, Table 10.1 Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Species at Risk: Analysis of Potential Environmental Interactions and Effects	<p>There is missing/erroneous information in Table 10.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sei Whale (Atlantic population) is designated as Endangered by the COSEWIC, but is missing from the Table - Beluga Whale (St. Lawrence Estuary population) is listed as Endangered under SARA Schedule 1 - For Harbour Porpoise, it is the Northwest Atlantic population, not subspecies - For Killer Whale, it is the Northwest Atlantic/Eastern Arctic population - For Leatherback Sea Turtle, it is the Atlantic population 	Update Table 10.1 to include the Sei Whale and correct SARA Schedule 1 Status and population names.

				- Loggerhead sea turtle is listed as Endangered under SARA Schedule 1	
DFO-23	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 2, Section 7.1.9.1 Special areas	Pages 404-408, Table 11.1 Special Areas Minimum Distances to ELs 1159 and 1160	Division 30 Coral Refuge is missing.	Add Division 30 Coral Refuge.
DFO-24	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	Page 472, Section 15.4 Fate and Behaviour of Potential Spills (paragraph 1, sentence 4) Page 474, Section 15.4.1 Applicability of EL 1135 (shallow-water) and EL 1134 (deep-water) Modelling for Illustrative Purposes (paragraph 3, sentence 4)	The abridged EIS states on page 472 that "... all modelled unmitigated subsurface blowouts and batch spills resulted in the same predictions (i.e., surface oil would move eastward due to prevailing westerly winds), and therefore modelling specific to ELs 1159 and 1160 has not been carried out." This is contradicted by the statement on the following page 474 "Given the general trend indicated by previous models for oil to move in a southward direction.....a spill from EL 1159 or EL 1160 is expected to follow the same general trajectory (predominately north to the Gulf Stream)."	Clarification should be provided on the anticipated oil spill trajectory.
DFO-25	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species	Part 1, Section 3. Scope of the Environmental Assessment. Part 2, Section 7.6.1 Effects of potential	Section 15.4 Fate and Behaviour of Potential Spills	The EIS Guidelines state that the "The abridged EIS should... provide a rationale for the applicability of the analysis and conclusions of the Flemish Pass EIS."	Provide rationale of how the model inputs, including oceanographic conditions and fluid characteristics, are applicable to ELs 1159 and 1160.

		accidents or malfunctions.		<p>The Abridged EIS states that 15 of the previously modelled unmitigated oil spill scenarios are applicable to ELs 1159 and 1160 based on water depth and spill rates (page 472, paragraph 1).</p> <p>The Abridged EIS does not provide rationale of how the modelling is applicable in terms of oceanographic conditions or fluid characteristics anticipated in ELs 1159 and 1160.</p> <p>Model inputs other than depth and spill rate will influence the spill trajectory which should be discussed and rationale provided.</p>	
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 accidents or malfunctions	Section 15.4.3 Deterministic Results	<p>It is not clear if the percentages of oil presented here, “This is due to the highly volatile and soluble content of the crude oil and diesel product leading to large percentages predicted to evaporate (36% to 39% for EL 1135 and 30% at EL 1134) and dissolve and degrade (25% to 35% at EL 1135 and 39% at EL 1134). Entrainment into the water column ranged between 8% to 47% at EL 1135 and 3% at EL 1134.” (page 483, paragraph 4) refer to Bay du Nord crude or diesel or both. It is also not clear why ranges are not provided for EL 1134.</p>	Provide more clarity on the deterministic scenarios presented and verify percentages provided for EL 1134.

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-27	Page 63, Table 2.7 Summary of Alternative Means	In Table 2.7, it states that SBM drilling wastes will be disposed at sea, but based on Section 2.9.3.1, SBM cuttings will be disposed at sea and excess or spent SBM will be disposed on shore. Recommend specifying in Table 2.7 that disposal at sea is for SBM cuttings only.	Revision recommended.
DFO-28	Page 134, Section 6.1.4 Corals and Sponges (4 th sentence)	For clarity, scientific names and common names for corals should be linked. Sentence should read – Corals identified in the Project Area include alcyonaceans (soft corals), pennatulaceans (sea pens), scleractinians (stony coral), and antipatharians (black corals).	Revision recommended.
DFO-29	Page 144, Table 6.5 Numerically Dominant Fish Species (95% of Overall Abundance) in the Project Area – Southern Section by Depth Zone (Canadian RV Surveys, 2011 to 2016)	Based on Table 6.2, five species make up 95% of catch in the Deep Slope for the Project Area – Southern Section, but only four species are listed for the depth zone in Table 6.5. Recommend revising Table 6.2 or 6.5, as appropriate.	Revision recommended.
DFO-30	Page 200, Section 6.3 Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles (first and fifth paragraphs) Page 380, Section 10.0 Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles: Environmental Effects Assessment (second paragraph)	The number of sea turtle species that could be affected by the Project is inconsistent in the EIS. It should be clarified whether four or five species of sea turtles are found in the RSA.	Revision recommended.

DFO-31	Section 6.3 Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles	For clarity, recommend providing the time span in the titles of Tables 6.16 and 6.17 and the time span and dataset(s) for opportunistic sightings figures (Figures 6-36 to 6-52).	Revision recommended.
DFO-32	Page 205, Figure 6-39 Minke Whale Sightings in Eastern NL Offshore Area	Based on Figure 6-36, more Minke Whale sightings should be present in ELs 1159 and 1160 in Figure 6-39. Figures should be revised as required.	Revision recommended.
DFO-33	Page 332, Section 8.1 Environmental Assessment Study Areas and Effects Evaluation Criteria	For clarity, this section should refer to the map showing the Project Area, Regional Study Area, and Local Study Area.	Revision recommended.
DFO-34	Page 346, Section 8.5 Significance of Residual Environmental Effects	The last sentence refers to Tables 8.3 and 8.4, but effects tables are 8.2 and 8.3.	Revision recommended.
DFO-35	Page 488, Section 15.5 Environmental Effects Assessment (paragraph 3, sentence 6)	The sentence: "Equinor Canada will develop SIMAs and complete risk assessments on each response option, which may include surface dispersant application and SSDI, and the potential effects of resources of concern (e.g., birds, fish, marine mammals, sea turtles, corals and sponges, commercial fisheries, responder safety) will be further determined in the SIMAs" can be deleted. This information is stated above this sentence and doesn't need to be repeated.	Revision recommended.
DFO-36	Page 503, Section 17.0 Environmental Assessment Summary and Conclusions (4 th bullet)	"Updated information regarding the existing biological and human environments has been compiled and reviewed; however, it does not change the environmental effects assessments". A summary table of updated information included in this EIS should be included.	Revision recommended.