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.	Yes
• 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.	Generally, yes. One comment on spatial considerations used for cumulative effects of atmospheric emissions.
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.	Yes
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?	Yes
• 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
• Are the predicted effects described in objective and reasonable terms (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible)?	Yes
• 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, though one comment on spatial considerations used for cumulative effects of atmospheric emissions.
• 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
Create an ID # for each item e.g. CEAA-1, DFO-1	Select the section 5 effect to which your comment applies: 5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds 5(1)(b) Federal Lands /Transboundary 5(1)(c)(i) Aboriginal Peoples Health/ socio-economic conditions 5(1)(c)(ii) Aboriginal Physical and Cultural Heritage 5(1)(c)(iii) Current Use of Lands and Resources for traditional purposes 5(1)(c)(iv) any Structure, Site or Thing of Historical, Archaeological, Paleontological or Architectural Significance 5(2) Linked to Regulatory Permits/Authorizations (specify which legislation) If the interaction between the issue of concern and a section 5 effect is unclear, indicate the interaction pathway in the Rationale column.	Identify which section(s) of the EIS Guidelines are related to the comment. e.g. Part 2, section 6.6.1 Effects of potential accidents or malfunctions	Identify which section(s) of the EIS and appendices are related to the comment (Volume, section, page number). e.g. page 78, section 6.6.1 Accidents and malfunctions	Provide applicable background or rationale for requesting the information and why it is important for understanding the effects of the Project or for developing a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of EA predictions or the effectiveness of mitigation measures. e.g. The EIS notes that the modelled flow rate of oil released to the marine environment during the blowout scenarios would decline over the duration of the 30-day release. There was no rationale provided for the declining flow rate in either the main EIS document or the corresponding technical report.	Ask a specific question, or request specific additional information or clarification. e.g. Accidents and malfunctions – Provide rationale for using a declining flow rate in the modelling of the blowout scenarios, or update the analysis to reflect how using a constant flow rate would alter spill modelling results.

				Given that drilling has been conservatively proposed to occur year round. Can interpretations be made with the results obtained from the spring and fall modelling scenarios, and expected deposition patterns for winter and/or spring modelling?	
C-NLOPB-1	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat	7.3.1 Fish and Fish Habitat (and other VCs as applicable)	Section 9.3.4 Summary of Project Residual Environmental Effects, Table 9.5	Table 9.5 indicates the Frequency for Presence and Operation of a MODU, Discharges and Supply and Services and IR (Irregular event, and as defined in Section 5 as an effect occurring at no set schedule. Additionally, the proponent has made the assumption, that drilling may occur year round. Given that, and the proposal to drill up to 16 wells until 2028, is an irregular event the best description for activities for the presence of the MODU?	Please review the Frequency of effect identified for Fish and Fish Habitat (and other VCs as applicable) and assess whether the frequency of effect should be a Regular Event "R" and whether that would impact the determination of significance.
C-NLOPB-2	5(1)(b) Federal Lands /Transboundary	7.6.3. Cumulative Effects Assessment	15.2.5 Potential Cumulative Env. Effects to GHG Emissions	The spatial boundary considered under the atmospheric emissions baseline (Chapter 8) is described as "….the global area under the Earth's atmosphere".	Cumulative impacts should be considered outside the Project area. In doing so, does the determination of significance for

				The cumulative effects assessment for atmospheric emissions only considers cumulative impacts within the Project area (Section 15.2.5, Table 15.4). Given that GHGs are long-lived in the atmosphere, additional consideration should be given to cumulative impacts outside the project area for the activities listed in 15.1).	Atmospheric Emissions change?
C-NLOPB-3	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	6.1.1 Loss of Well Control / Subsurface Blowout	For clarification, the reference to "C-NLOPB regulation" in the third paragraph of this section should be deleted and replaced with "the federal Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations (SOR/2009-316)"	Revise as recommended for clarification.
C-NLOPB-4	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.4.1.1 Sources of Oil Inputs in Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore	Suggest that the first two paragraphs of this section do not contribute much value to the discussion of spills in the NL Offshore Area. A reference is not provided for the first paragraph, which refers to data from the 1990s for Eastern Canada in general. Similarly, the second paragraph states very general information, and the reference provided (Moir et al. 2013) is not included in the reference list. Recommend deleting the first two paragraphs and beginning	Revise as recommended for clarification.

				this section with the offshore exploration and production facilities information provided in the third paragraph.	
C-NLOPB-5	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.4.1.1 Sources of Oil Inputs in Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore	"Offshore exploration and production facilities have spilled a total of 2,759 bbl of oil in 478 incidents over the last 22 years activity in of Newfoundland and Labrador" For clarification: recommend replacing "over the last 22 years" with the date range for the dataset - i.e., "the last 22 years" could imply up to the time of writing in 2023, but it is noted that the dataset only goes to 2021.	Revise as recommended for clarification.
C-NLOPB-6	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.4.3 Summary	Similar to the comment above for Section 16.4.1.1, replace the reference to "over the last 24 years" and indicate the date range of the dataset instead.	Revise as recommended for clarification.
C-NLOPB-7	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.5.5 Wildlife Response and Monitoring	"Suncor will consult with ECCC-CWS during development of the plan" The C-NLOPB requires that Wildlife Response Plans are developed in consultation with ECCC-CWS and DFO. The statement should be revised to: "…consult with ECCC-CWS and DFO…"	Revise as recommended for clarification.

C-NLOPB-8	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.5.5 Wildlife Response and Monitoring	"Seabirds that live on or close to the sea surface have been identified as the biological resource most vulnerable to an offshore oil spill. Marine mammals (i.e., whales) are present in low numbers at selected times during the year and potential impacts on whale populations, even from major spills would be negligible" This statement and the following list of potential operations undertaken in the event of a spill should be revised to reflect that marine mammals and sea turtles are to be addressed by the wildlife response plan. Note that there are potential impacts of an accidental event on marine mammals and sea turtles, as described in Section 16.6.3.1, and that the development of a wildlife response plan is specifically indicated as a mitigation for potential impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles in Section 16.6.3.2. Section 16.5.5 should be revised to reflect this.	Revise as recommended for clarification.
C-NLOPB-9	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.1 Potential Accidental Events Scenario	"This EIS focuses on credible worst-case accidents that could result during exploration drilling, including a subsurface blowout, a batch spill or an SBM spill."	Please provide rationale for using a 1000 litre volume when a more realistic worst-case scenario

				1000 L batch spill is not a worst-case scenario. A more realistic worse case would be the loss of a fuel tank from a supply vessel or drilling platform.	would be the loss of a fuel tank of the rig or supply vessel.
C-NLOPB-10	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.5.1 Oil Spill Response Plan	"Suncor will consider all feasible response options that would be potentially effective in the Project Area and will develop their SIMA in consultation with ECCC, the Canadian Science Table, and the C-NLOPB." (p. 16-56) Note that SIMAs are required to be submitted to the C-NLOPB, and the C-NLOPB coordinates review by external agencies if required. Suggest revising to reflect the requirements of past Decision Statements: "Suncor will consider all feasible response options that would be potentially effective in the Project Area and will provide the SIMA to the C-NLOPB for review and prior to the start of the drilling program."	Revise as recommended for clarification.
C-NLOPB-11	5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds	7.6.1. Effects of potential accidents or malfunction	16.5.3 Blowout Contingency (Source Control) Planning	"The equipment is available for use on the majority of international subsea oil wells at water depths of up to 3,000 m." Capping stacks being installed in water depths of less than 100 m	Please add to this section a discussion of the technical limitations of capping stacks for less than 100 m of water and

				present various technical challenges which are not addressed in this section.	how Suncor plans on addressing these.

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
CNLOPB-12		Section 1.5.3, Table 1.2	Table 1.2 provides a summary of Key Relevant Offshore Legislation and Guidelines/Guidance. While it is understood that the information provided are current at the time of EIS filling, a description of the forthcoming Framework Regulations would be beneficial to include in support of the table, as it will amalgamate many of the regulations described in this table. It is almost certain the Framework Regulations will be in force when the Tilt Cove Project commences.	Recommend providing supporting text reflecting the Frontier and Offshore Regulatory Renewal Initiative Framework Regulations.
CNLOPB-13		Section 2.4.4 Well Suspension, Abandonment and Decommissioning	There is little information included in this section on the circumstances in which a well would be suspended vs abandoned (and cut below the seabed). Given the depth of the water, and likelihood for fishing activity in the area, long term suspension of wells, particularly in an unsuccessful case will be discouraged.	Provide additional information including possible circumstances for suspending a well following drilling.
CNLOPB-14		Section 2.11.3, Table 2.17	Table 2.17 states that Suncor will conduct an imagery-based seabed survey to confirm the absence is sensitive environmental features such as habitat-forming corals,	The seabed investigation survey plan will need to be prepared in consultation with the C-NLOPB and DFO in consideration of recent DFO guidance. It is possible that a buffer

			within a 500 m radius from the wellsite. Cuttings deposition models predicted during the Fall modelling scenario that depositional thickness of 1.5 mm were predicted up to 600 m from the wellhead.	of >500m around the wellsite will be required.
CNLOPB-15		Section 9.3.1.2 Mitigation (Fish and Fish Habitat)	Proponent states "This Project activity and component will be planned and conducted in consideration of relevant regulations and guidance including C-NLOPB guidance for drilling activities where cold-water corals may be present…."	DFO's "Regional Guidance on Measures to Protect Corals and Sponges During Exploratory Drilling in the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Area" was finalized in March 2023 and replaces the former C-NLOPB guidance for cold water corals. The seabed survey should be prepared in consideration of DFO's guidance.
CNLOPB-16		Section 11.1.4.2 Temporal Boundaries	Proponent states "Suncor is planning to drill up to 12 exploration and delineation /appraisal wells over the term of EL 1161". In Chapter 2, it is stated 12-16 wells may be drilled.	Inconsistences and clarification required.
CNLOPB-17		Section 16.5.2 Tiered Response	Proponent states "Use of chemical dispersants will be considered and must be authorized by ECCC"	The C-NLOPB provides authorization for the use of dispersants.