

NPD Environmental Impact Statement, March 31, 2020
CNSC Staff Completeness Check: May 2020 - FINAL – CNL Responses to NPD EIS Federal and Provincial Review Comments

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 1	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 2	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 3	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 4	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 5	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 6	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 7	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 8	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 9	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 10	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 11	Complete: No	Rationale: The response is incomplete or unclear with respect to environmental effects or impacts.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers to a specific section in the revised EIS. However, the text quoted in turn refers the reader to the entire Decommissioning Safety Assessment Report (DSAR) Technical Support Document (TSD) rather than the specific section where this information can be found and verified by the reviewer. Please refer to the specific and relevant section of this document.
Reference #: 12	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 13	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 14	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 15	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 16	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 17	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 18	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 19	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response indicates a new paragraph will be added to the revised EIS. This new text states that additional information is found in (Aikens 2019c). However, it is unclear how the reference provided supports the information provided in the response (e.g. does the reference provide the information for table 4.3-1, additional information or conflicting information?). Please provide additional context and detail as to how the information in the reference relates to the response.
Reference #: 20	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 21	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 22	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 23	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 24	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 25	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 26	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 27	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 28	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 29	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 30	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. For IRs that require a significant amount of technical information, this may mean that the response is summarized in the response table and that additional information is referenced and presented in an addendum document so as not to overwhelm the response table. The response does not contain sufficient technical information to respond to the IR. In particular, the IR requests that the applicability of the chosen analogues be discussed in context with the barrier system details of the proposed NPD Disposal Facility (NPDDF). The information linking the analogues to the barrier at NPDDF is currently very minimal or not included for most analogues. In order to allow for comparison between the analogues and the proposed barriers, this information should draw parallels between the age of the analogues and the barrier performance life for NPD including the environmental conditions of the barrier and those expected for the barriers at NPD in greater detail than is currently provided. Please provide sufficient information to guide a technical review.
Reference #: 31	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 32	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 33	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 34	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 35	Complete: No	Rationale: The response is incomplete or unclear with respect to environmental effects or impacts.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The response does not completely respond to the question regarding how the Maqarin analogue can be used to provide robustness to the NPDDF safety case. The response presents the observations of cement at the Maqarin site, and where they are, notes in the revised EIS and supporting documentation (although not the alkaline plume modelling report mentioned in the IR). However, the response does not indicate whether or how these observations were taken into account, e.g., any linkage between these observations and the long term behavior of grout at NPD. Please provide sufficient information to guide a technical review.
Reference #: 36	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 37	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 38	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 39	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 40	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 41	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 42	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 43	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 44	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 45	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 46	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 47	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 48	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 49	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 50	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 51	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 52	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 53	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 54	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 55	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 56	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 57	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 58	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 59	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 60	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 61	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 62	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 63	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 64	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 65	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 66	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 67	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 68	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 69	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 70	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 71	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 72	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 73	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 74	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 75	Complete: No	Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. For IRs that require a significant amount of technical information, this may mean that the response is summarized in the response table and that additional information is referenced and presented in an addendum document so as not to overwhelm the response table. The response also does not contain sufficient technical information to respond to the IR. The response indicates that sections, 8.10 and 9.10, have been added to the EIS to present information on Indigenous Socio-economic and Health Baseline and Effects, respectively. However, information specific to each Indigenous group is not included in these two sections as related to Socio-Economic and Health Baseline and Effects. Please clarify where this information may be found or justify why it is not presented. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information.
Reference #: 76	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 77	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 78	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers to specific sections in two documents. It is unclear if the information in these two documents is intended to be repetitive or complementary. Please provide a fulsome response to the IR, and summarize clearly in the response the relevancy of referencing these two documents in addressing this comment, including how either or both references contain information underpinning the response.
Reference #: 79	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 80	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 81	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 82	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 83	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 84	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 85	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 86	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 87	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 88	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 89	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 90	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
		The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. This response refers the reviewer to section 8.2.4.2 of the revised EIS, which includes the information requested in the IR. However, the key elements of how this information addresses the IR is not summarized directly in the response. Please summarize clearly in the response how this referenced information addresses the comment.
Reference #: 91	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 92	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 93	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 94	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 95	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 96	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 97	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 98	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 99	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 100	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 101	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 102	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 103	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 104	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 105	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 106	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 107	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 108	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 109	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 110	Complete: No	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. The IR response states, "CNL believes the

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
		The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) would agree with this interpretation as they asked and secured funding through the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to carry out a Traditional Knowledge and Land Use Study (TKLUS) that is relevant to CNL’s activities in the region.” Please clarify if the conclusion drawn by CNL in the response was validated with the MNO. If so, please provide details on these discussions. If not, please provide a rationale. In addition, sections 4.5.2, 6.1, 7.6, 7.9 and 8.9 of the revised EIS do not include the information specified by CNL in the response. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff’s expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information.
Reference #: 111	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 112	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 113	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 114	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 115	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 116	Complete: No	Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. In this response, CNL states that section 8.9 (Indigenous Land and Resource Use) has been added to the revised EIS, which includes the text from the IR response in section 8.9.3.1.2. However, there is no section 8.9.3.1.2. Please clarify where this information may be found in the revised EIS. As per the IR, CNSC staff’s expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information.
Reference #: 117	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 118	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 119	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 120	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 121	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 122	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 123	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self- contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers the reviewer to the EIS for information on mitigation measures, and to three other documents for information on monitoring programs, without including references to the specific and relevant sections of these documents. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the EIS and referenced documents.
Reference #: 124	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 125	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 126	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 127	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers the reviewer to three documents for information on follow-up monitoring programs, without identifying the relevant sections within these documents. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of these referenced documents.
Reference #: 128	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 129	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 130	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 131	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 132	Complete: No	Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR. The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response should also address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The response refers the reviewer to a reference (Taylor 2020) for additional information which would complement and complete the response. However, this reference document does not provide all the the requested information, including a detailed map of site structures/areas, and a full methodology for site selection, and a complete comparison of the alternatives according to the criteria listed in the IR. . . Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed.
Reference #: 133	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 134	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 135	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 136	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 137	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that all responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. The response indicates that section 6.3.3 contains a short section describing how valued components (VCs) suggested by Indigenous communities have been incorporated into the revised EIS. However, this section does not contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission and/or Indigenous Engagement Report (IER) include detailed information on how engagement with Indigenous groups helped define the selection of VCs for the aquatic environment. The response also contains incomplete information regarding engagement discussions and uses assumptions statements. Please clarify what validation and feedback was received from each Indigenous group and how CNL responded or incorporated this into the selection of VCs. This should also include how and where the information provided by MNO through the TKLUS was incorporated into the revised EIS and/or IER for this subject matter.
Reference #: 138	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 139	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 140	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 141	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 142	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 143	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 144	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 145	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers the reviewer to two entire sections of the revised EIS as well as three documents for information on trigger levels, without identifying the relevant sections within these sections and documents. In effect, the response does not contain sufficient information for review. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the EIS and referenced documents.
Reference #: 146	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 147	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 148	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 149	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 150	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 151	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 152	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 153	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review, on three points: 1- The response does not specifically indicate what "existing information" on traditional use was referenced to validate the indication "that the typical types of traditional activities such as hunting and fishing were being carried out by Indigenous people in the Ottawa Valley." As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to consider this information. Please provide a list of resources that are being referred to as "existing information" and any documentation that was used to validate the statements made in the IR response. CNSC staff expect all documents/information to be provided as part of the complete EIS submission in order to begin the technical review. 2- The response does not contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to include detailed information on how engagement with Indigenous groups helped define the selection of VCs.

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
			<p>3- The response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p>
<p>Reference #: 154</p>	<p>Complete: No</p>	<p>Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.</p>	<p>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review, on three points:</p> <p>1- The response does not specifically indicate what traditional knowledge was considered in the development of the assessment boundaries. Please provide a list of resources that were considered as well as any documentation that was used to validate the statements made in the IR response. CNSC staff expect all documents/information to be provided as part of the complete EIS submission in order to begin the technical review.</p> <p>2- The response and indicated sections of the revised EIS and IER do not contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to include detailed information on how engagement was conducted by CNL with Indigenous groups on this topic.</p> <p>3- The response references the MNO TKLUS under the “References” heading however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p>
<p>Reference #: 155</p>	<p>Complete: No</p>	<p>Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.</p>	<p>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review, on two points:</p> <p>1- There is very little detail included on discussions had and feedback received from each Indigenous group identified in table 7.3-1 in the revised EIS and how this feedback was taken into consideration or addressed by CNL in sections 7.6 and 9.9 of the revised EIS and section 4.5 of the IER. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to consider this information. CNL should demonstrate that through its engagement activities it had discussions with all identified First Nation and Métis groups regarding potential impacts to Indigenous and/or treaty rights, as well as potential impacts as per the requirements of the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> (CEAA 2012) and has tracked and addressed any issues/concerns/feedback in the EIS and/or IER. If these discussions did not occur with any group, CNL should provide justification.</p> <p>2- The response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.</p>
<p>Reference #: 156</p>	<p>Complete: No</p>	<p>Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.</p>	<p>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response and the referenced section 7.6 of the revised EIS do not specifically indicate whether the “renaturalization process” and its potential benefits to trapping, hunting, and gathering activities have been discussed with Indigenous groups, what feedback was received from each Indigenous group and how this feedback was taken into consideration or addressed by CNL.</p> <p>The response also indicates that sections 4 and 7 of the IER include an updated description of engagements, discussion and engagement results. However, these sections are broad and therefore these references are unspecific, and do not allow the reviewer to find and validate the referenced information. Please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where the information specific to engagement on the “renaturalization process” and its potential benefits to trapping, hunting, and gathering activities may be found within section 4 of the IER (or elsewhere in the submission) - where the information specific to engagement on the “renaturalization process” and its potential benefits to trapping, hunting, and gathering activities may be found within section 7 of the IER (or elsewhere in the submission).
<p>Reference #: 157</p>	<p>Complete: No</p>	<p>Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.</p>	<p>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. This response states that section 9.9.3</p>

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
			of the revised EIS includes specific reference to potential effects of First Nation and Métis fishing rights. However, neither the response nor the referenced section 9.9.3 of the revised EIS contain information specific to each Indigenous group or engagement with Indigenous groups. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission and/or IER to include detailed information on how CNL conducted engagement with Indigenous groups on this topic.
Reference #: 158	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 159	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. There is very little detail included on discussions had and feedback received from each Indigenous group identified in table 7.3-1 in the revised EIS related to CNL's conclusion that there will be no residual effects on Aboriginal Land and Resource Use VCs during all phases of the project and how this feedback was taken into consideration or addressed by CNL. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS and/or IER to consider this information. CNL should demonstrate that through their engagement activities it were discussions with all identified First Nation and Métis groups regarding potential impacts to Indigenous and/or treaty rights, as well as potential impacts as per the requirements of CEAA 2012 and has tracked and addressed any issues/concerns/feedback in the revised EIS and/or IER. If these discussions did not occur with any group, CNL should provide justification. In addition, the response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR. Finally, the response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provide in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.
Reference #: 160	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 161	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 162	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 163	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 164	Complete: No	Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self- contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. This response refers the reviewer to section 9.6.6 of the DSAR for further information regarding the stack collapse event. However, this information is not summarized in the response so it is unknown if this reference will address the sub-questions in the IR. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed and clearly summarize in the response the information contained in the DSAR supporting the response and the relevancy of referencing the DSAR in addressing the comment and its sub-questions.
Reference #: 165	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 166	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 167	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 168	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 169	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 170	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 171	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 172	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review. The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response refers to three draft monitoring plans for information. However, it is unclear if all the information requested is found in either or all of these documents. In addition, CNSC staff's expectation in the comment is that the information requested be included in the EIS. The response only states that a mention has been made in the EIS about the existence of these documents, and that they are being developed in consultation with Indigenous groups and the public, which does not respond adequately to the request to incorporate information into the EIS. Please update the revised EIS accordingly to include the information requested and clearly summarize in the response the supporting information and the relevancy of referencing the three draft monitoring plans in addressing the comment.
Reference #: 173	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 174	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 175	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 176	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. Please clarify if all Indigenous groups identified in table 7.3-1 of the revised EIS were engaged on the topic and if not please provide a rationale. Please provide details in the revised EIS and/or IER on which Indigenous groups provided feedback through engagement including what issues, concerns, and/or feedback were raised by each Indigenous group, as well as how CNL addressed these. In addition, the response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR. Finally, the response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provide in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of this IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff expect the revised EIS submission to consider this information.
Reference #: 177	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. Please clarify if all Indigenous groups identified in table 7.3-1 of the revised EIS were engaged on the topic and if

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
			<p>not, please provide a rationale. Please provide details in the revised EIS and/or IER on which Indigenous groups provided feedback through engagement including what issues, concerns, and/or feedback were raised by each Indigenous group, as well as how CNL addressed these.</p> <p>In addition, the response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR.</p>
Reference #: 178	Complete: No	Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	<p>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. In the response, CNL indicated that the information regarding the Algonquin Anishinabeg Nation Tribal Council (AANTC) was updated in table 7.3-1 of the revised EIS. This information has not been updated in the referenced table, it currently references a comprehensive land claim. Please update table 7.3-1 within the revised EIS with the appropriate information.</p>
Reference #: 179	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 180	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 181	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	<p>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. The response does not specify what changes were made to sections 7 and 9 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER to address the comment. Therefore, the reviewer cannot confirm if the response is complete nor technically sound. In the IR response, please summarize clearly for each specific section what changes have been made to address the IR.</p> <p>In addition, the response references the MNO TKLUS however does not provide details on how and where information provided in the TKLUS was incorporated or informed the revised EIS submission in the context of the IR. Please clarify where this information may be found. As per the IR, CNSC staff's expectation is that the revised EIS submission consider this information.</p>
Reference #: 182	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 183	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	<p>Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that responses should provide sufficient information to guide a technical review. In addition, the response should be self-contained, which means that while the response may refer to additional information contained elsewhere in the EIS or technical supporting documents, the response itself should summarize the key elements of this information and demonstrate how the information fully address the IR. Section 7.4 of the revised EIS and section 4 of the IER provide information on MOUs with two groups, AOO and MNO. However, it is unclear if the requested information on any planned engagement activities (or a rationale if none) with all Indigenous groups identified by CNL in table 7.3-1 in the revised EIS has been provided. Please clarify and provide information on planned engagement activities, if any, with all Indigenous groups identified by CNL in table 7.3-1 in the EIS. If there are no planned activities, please provide a rationale.</p>
Reference #: 184	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 185	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 186	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 187	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 188	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 189	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 190	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 191	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 192	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 193	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 194	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 195	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 196	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 197	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 198	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 199	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 200	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 201	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 202	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 203	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 204	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 205	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 206	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 207	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 208	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 209	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 210	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 211	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 212	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 213	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 214	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 215	Complete: No	Rationale: The supplementary material or changes to EIS documents or TSDs provided as part of the response is/are insufficient to adequately meet the request.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. This response refers the reviewer to an entire section of the Ecological Risk Assessment (EcoRA) TSD, entitled "Problem Formulation", without identifying the section(s) relevant to addressing the comment. Please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the EcoRA TSD and summarize clearly in the response the relevancy of referencing this document in addressing the comment.
Reference #: 216	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 217	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 218	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 219	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 220	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 221	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 222	Complete: No	Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. This response does not address the request to provide additional information on the "discharge to Shore" scenario. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed.
Reference #: 223	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 224	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 225	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 226	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 227	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 228	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 229	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 230	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 231	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 232	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 233	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 234	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: This response is sufficient for the purposes of the EA process. This does not exclude the safety case from undergoing a review as part of the licensing process.
Reference #: 235	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 236	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 237	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 238	Complete: No	Rationale: The information provided is insufficient to allow a technical review.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow guidance provided to CNL that within a response, references to the EIS or other supporting documents should be targeted and specific, such that the reviewer can easily find the information the response is referring to. The response provides information related to the demonstration of model parameters and the consideration of specific Features, Events and Processes (FEPs) for the various scenarios. However, the response refers the reviewer to combine tables in Appendix D with the entire Appendix E to find this information. This reference is too vague. It is further unclear how each of the sets of information relate to each other (e.g. how the FEPs described in Appendix D relate to or affect the model parameters described in Appendix E).The response further refers the reviewer to the entire section 5 of the Post closure Safety Assessment to find information responding to the sub-questions related to dominant transport pathways and release characteristics. Please summarize clearly in the response how this referenced information addresses the comment. For each sub-question, a summary response should be provided along with targeted reference to specific sections in supporting documentation for additional information. In addition, please refer to the specific and relevant sections of the Postclosure Safety Assessment.
Reference #: 239	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 240	Complete: No	Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The information provided in the response, while corollary, does not clearly answer the question asked. The response does not adequately explain the linkage between the start of the degradation times and the number of flushes. More specifically, the response does not specify the time scale corresponding to each stage (I, II and III), and the hydraulic conductivities at the end of each stage. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed.
Reference #: 241	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 242	Complete: No	Rationale: The response does not address each sub-question of the IR.	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: The response does not follow the guidance provided to CNL that the response should provide a direct response to the question within the IR. In the case of an IR with several sub-sections, the response should address every sub-question within an IR clearly. The response does not address the request to clarify how the assumptions for the exposure profiles were made. Please update the IR response to summarize how all sub-questions of the IR have been addressed.

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 243	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 244	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 245	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 246	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 247	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 248	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 249	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 250	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 251	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 252	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 253	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 254	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 255	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 256	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 257	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 258	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 259	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 260	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 261	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 262	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 263	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:

Reference #	Complete	Rationale	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response
Reference #: 264	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 265	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 266	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 267	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 268	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 269	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 270	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 271	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 272	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 273	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 274	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 275	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 276	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 277	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 278	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 279	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response:
Reference #: 280	Complete: Yes	Rationale:	Context and Information Required for a Complete Response: