Appendix 42: 2021 Annual Report Comments Concordance Table

Reference	Comments Received on the 2021 Annual Report	Agnico Eagle Responses to Comments Received on the 2021 Annual Report	2022 Annual Report Concordance
NIRB			
ECCC-2	ECCC recommends review of the modeling for ammonia and total phosphorus in CP1 to identify the source of the discrepancy in observed vs predicted concentrations, and that consideration be given to validating under-ice predictions.	Agnico Eagle acknowledges the recommendation by ECCC and consideration will be given to the recommendation and Agnico Eagle will assess how best to account for it in future annual reports.	Section 3.2.4.2 (CP1 Water Quality). As mentioned in the report, validation of cryo-concentrated water water quality predictions was not conducted in 2022 as low water levels resulted in CP1 freezing to bottom.
ECCC-4	Clarify the use of QA/QC blanks, noting the different purposes between field and travel blanks.	Travel blanks are recommended for the AEMP, but in 2021, none of the sampling events included travel blanks, this will be addressed during the 2022 AEMP sampling season.	Appendix A of Appendix 19 (2022 AEMP Report) Travel Blanks were collected during the August and September Sampling Events.
ECCC-10	ECCC recommends that the Proponent perform a quality assurance of the relative humidity data.	Upon review, values presented in Appendix B of the 2021 Air Quality Monitoring Report are maximum daily relative humidity, rather than average as indicated in the table caption. Average daily relative humidity is not specifically recorded by the Meliadine weather station. Agnico Eagle appreciates ECCC's thorough review and assistance in identifying this error and will ensure this is corrected in future annual reports.	Appendix 25 (2022 Air Quality Monitoring Report)
GN-01	The GN requests a response to this issue in a comprehensive manner. Accordingly, the GN recommends the following: 1. That the Proponent revise the 2021 Annual Report to include the following, in relation to Term and Condition #48 and the Road Management Agreement (AEM 2022, Section 10.2): a. Reporting of compliance with the 1 km no-shooting zone either side of the AWAR including presentation and analysis of the monitoring data used to assess compliance with this policy. b. A summary of incidents involving shooting across or along the AWAR, and any trends in these incidents since the AWAR entered operation. c. Information on the number of dedicated road monitors tasked with monitoring harvesting along the AWAR. d. Information demonstrating that caribou monitoring and caribou harvest monitoring along the AWAR was increased during periods when large aggregations of caribou (> 50 animals) were observed in the vicinity of the road (i.e., specific data on caribou group observations being linked to increased monitoring effort as required under the Road Management Agreement). 2. If harvest monitoring is taking place using other methods, it should be clearly stated that the aforementioned measures are no longer being used.	Agnico Eagle will add details on harvest monitoring in future annual report as recommended by the GN.	Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report) Appendix M (2022 Hunter Harvest Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GN-02	The GN offers the following recommendations with respect to this issue: 1. Report where road safety barriers or berms are associated with Project infrastructure, allweather access road and associated roads/trails are used.	Agnico Eagle thanks the GN for their comment and will include information on where road safety barriers or berms are associated with Project infrastructure, all-weather access road and associated roads/trails are used in future annual reports.	Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GN-04	The GN offers the following recommendations with respect to this issue: 1. Include information on the timing of green-up in the Annual Report.	Agnico Eagle thanks the GN for their comment and will include this information in future annual reports.	Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report), section 4
GN-06	To fully comply with Term and Condition # 49, it is recommended that a statement be included within the Proponent's Annual Monitoring Report if any scientific research licences were required and acquired for the annual monitoring period. The GN recognizes that the Proponent would only need to consult with the NRI if research activities are undertaken that would trigger the requirement for a scientific research licence under the Nunavut Scientists Act.	Agnico Eagle thanks the GN for their comment and will account for it in future years. As per 2021, no research activities were undertaken that would trigger the requirement for a scientific research licence under the Nunavut Scientists Act.	Section 10.1 (Active Permits)
KivIA-1	Agnico Eagle should clarify whether and when traffic volumes predicted in the FEIS will be attained, and if they won't be attained, what implications this has for assessment of impacts of the project on wildlife.	Agnico Eagle prepared a response on traffic volume on the AWAR relative to predictions for the Government of Nunavut (GN) (GN-TRC-07) as part of the Waterline FEIS Addendum in November 2020. The response acknowledges that traffic monitoring results have been reported in a number of different ways making comparison to the FEIS (Agnico Eagle 2014) and 2018 FEIS Addendum (Agnico Eagle 2018) challenging. GN-TRC-07 shows that the results from 2019 traffic monitoring were 35 round trips per day during July where as 44 and 49 round trips per day in July were predicted in the FEIS and 2018 FEIS Addendum, respectively, Traffic during the operations phase on the AWAR during July has been less than predicted in either the FEIS or the 2018 FEIS Addendum. Agnico Eagle will look into modifying Table 27 of the Annual Report (AWAR Monthly Traffic Summary) to facilitate the review of this Table for future Annual Reports.	2022 Annual Report section 10.3 Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report Section 12.4.3)

KivIA-6	Agnico Eagle should correctly identify in Tables 2 and 24 which monitoring method will be used to identify caribou deflections from AWAR. (TEMMP report)	Agnico Eagle thanks the KivIA for this observation. The text will be modified to provide some clarification. The 30-minute behavior survey was designed to document how caribou groups respond to different kind of disturbances and give a timeline of the recovery period. While it is possible to use the results of the behaviour study to get some sense of the occurrence of deflections for caribou observed immediately next to the road, behaviour surveys are not designed to measure deflections. This is because behaviour surveys are limited to caribou within visual range (up to a maximum of about two kilometers), and deflections may occur on a larger spatial scale. Behaviour monitoring also does not allow tracking of groups of caribou over time. The spatial and temporal requirements of detecting deflections necessitate the use of satellite collar data. The text in Table 2 and 24 will be modified to reflect that satellite collar data is the primary method that can be used for monitoring deflections.	Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report Section 12.2) Appendix J (2022 Caribou Behaviour Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
KIA-7	Agnico Eagle should: 2. Re-analyze the behaviour data to examine average behaviour within a 30-minute sampling period and separate cow-calf groups from non-calf groups; and (Caribou Behaviour)	Agnico Eagle thanks KivIA for their comment and wishes to clarify that the 2022 analysis are ongoing and will allow to confirm if the sample size allows for, examining behaviour within each survey period, as opposed to averaging over the entire survey period. In addition, data has been collected since 2021 on group composition (i.e. cows and calves, bulls, etc.) and will be included in the 2022 analysis.	Appendix J (2022 Caribou Behaviour Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
KIA-8	1. Agnico Eagle should continue the camera study but provide greater details on vehicle passage rate (minutes between passages) and timing of last vehicles passage relative to caribou crossing, i.e., table format for the data including numbers and kind (cow-calf or non-calf) of caribou that crossed, and assessment of expected and observed crossing rate based on traffic frequency); 2. Agnico Eagle should provide data that tests the assumption that a caribou within 5 m of the road actually crossed the road; 3.While the camera study is designed to be complementary to the objective of the caribou collaring program (TEMMP Section 4.7), KivIA recommends that Agnico Eagle examine if and how the cameras could also be complimentary with the behaviour study; and	1. Agnico Eagle thanks the KivIA for their comment. With the addition of another year of data from 2022 (which just concluded) there will be two years of detailed traffic data. This **will be used in the next report to** detail vehicle passage rate and approximate caribou group size and composition (cow-calf, etc.). It should be noted that there are some limitations to estimating group size and composition using photos, as it is difficult to differentiate individual caribou between photos, especially when the group is on the move. As for the assessment of expected and observed crossing rate, Agnico Eagle would like to note it will be difficult or impossible to estimate expected crossing rate with the cameras alone because there is no control dataset. Assessing the expected crossing rate would require additional input from satellite collar data to determine the extent to which caribou are deflecting out of the range of the cameras. Agnico Eagle welcomes discussion on how best to accomplish this with the available data. 2. Agnico Eagle notes that the photos themselves typically have enough of the adjacent road in the view to directly capture caribou crossing the road. These can be considered “confirmed” road crossing events. For scenarios in which caribou were travelling at an angle to the road or where the crossing itself was obscured or out of sight, the crossing may be considered “probable”. The caribou behaviour surveys and collar data allow to hypothesis that caribou that are hesitant to cross the road typically stay more than 100m from the road and would not be captured by cameras. The assumption is based on the fact that by the time they are within camera range, they are almost always on route to cross the road. However, as noted this is an assumption and **future analysis will include a breakdown of whether road crossings were “confirmed” or “probable”**. 3. Agnico Eagle acknowledges there are numerous opportunities to combine datasets, as the camera data is designed to fill in data gaps on a temporal scale, and the behaviour data fills in data gaps on a spatial scale. Both are relatively fine scale modes of data collection, and collar data would be required to gain a full picture at a broader scale**. The recommendation will be investigated for the 2022 data analysis.**	Appendix K (2022 Caribou Trail Camera Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
KIA-9	Agnico Eagle should provide greater detail in how it is meeting the Terms and Conditions relative to caribou and other wildlife. T&C 118 specifies weekly winter track surveying and summer and fall surveys undertaken on foot twice per month, but S 12.5 does not provide these data at the monthly scale and doesn't provide them in a format that examines trends throughout the year.	Agnico Eagle thanks the KivIA for their comments and will account for it in the 2022 Annual Report.	Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report), section 12.5
KIA-10	Agnico Eagle should integrate incidental sightings, road survey, behaviour and camera monitoring results with collared caribou data to clearly describe year-round monitoring for caribou and to evaluate the function and validity of the monitoring strategies.	Agnico Eagle thanks the KivIA for their recommendation and will account for it in future years.	Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
KIA-14	Agnico Eagle should continue to monitor the effectiveness of the current mitigation methods for dusting, and should characterize the sediment and the method transport related to dusting from the TSF.	Agnico Eagle will continue to monitor dust and the effectiveness of current mitigation methods and will investigate the sediment along the toe of the TSF. The result of this investigation will be reported in the 2022 Annual Report.	Section 4.1.10 (Follow-up on 2021 Annual Report Comments)
CIRNAC-1.1	CIRNAC recommends that moving forward AEM: • Track volumes of waste rock classified as Uncertain and PAG from the underground mine and open pits; and • Confirm that waste rock used for construction was not PAG.	Moving forward, Agnico Eagle will track the volumes of waste rock classified as uncertain and PAG and report this information in the Annual Report, if applicable. Since no waste rock sample was classified as PAG in 2021, Agnico Eagle confirms the waste rock used for construction purposes in 2021 was not PAG.	Section 4.2 (Geochemical Monitoring), and subsections 4.2.2, 4.2.3
CIRNAC-1.3	CIRNAC recommends that AEM include a section in future annual reports that explicitly discusses uses of CP-1 water in the mill and how AEM is complying with the licence condition to “maximize to the greatest practical extent, the use of Reclaim Water from Contact Water management facilities for use in the mill.”	In future Annual Reports, Agnico Eagle will include a section discussing the use of reclaim from Contact Water management facilities for use in the mill, drilling, and for dust suppression.	Section 3.1.9 Use of Reclaim Water from Contact Water Management Facilities

CIRNAC-1.5	The recommendation provided in CIRNAC's review of the 2020 Annual Report remains outstanding. CIRNAC recommends that AEM: • Provide an update on the outcomes of any consultation efforts undertaken with outfitting and guiding companies that operate in the Local Study Area and Regional Study Area regarding use of the area, specifically as it relates to hunting, fishing and guiding within proximity of the AWAR. • Report any updates to management plans based on consultation efforts. Future Annual Report submissions should endeavour to satisfy the information requirements of T&C 104 of the Amended Project Certificate.	In 2022, Agnico Eagle will work to increase consultation efforts with outfitting and guidance companies and will report for the results of those efforts in the 2022 Annual Report.	Section 11.7 (Community Engagement Initiatives) Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report), section 13
CIRNAC-1.6	The recommendation provided in CIRNAC's review of the 2020 Annual Report remains outstanding. CIRNAC requests that future Annual Report submissions include summaries of any interactions with local outfitting and guiding companies regarding the administration of its Hunter Harvest Survey, should they occur.	Agnico Eagle thanks CIRNAC for their comment and recommendation and will account for it in the 2022 Annual Report.	Section 11.7 (Community Engagement Initiatives)
CIRNAC 3	As cryo-concentration is already considered in the model, could the underestimated ammonia concentrations be the result of blasting?	Agnico Eagle would like to clarify that section 3.2.4 states the temperature-based ice algorithm was implemented to model cryo-concentration in CP1 only. This component of the model was not included for saline water storage of Tiriganiaq Open Pit 2 (Tiri 02). Thus, the increase in observed concentrations compared to model predictions is still attributed to cryo-concentration during ice formation in Tiri 02. AEM will assess the potential to include cryo-concentration water quality modeling for Tiri 02 in the future to validate this assumption.	As stated in Section 3.2.3.5 (Lake Ice Growth and Ice Melt), the lake ice growth algorithm is not applied to any other facilities than CP1, including saline storage facilities. AEM will assess the potential to include cryo-concentration water quality modeling for Tiri 02 in the future to validate this assumption.
CIRNAC-3	AEM should provide a discussion (e.g., effects of suppressing the freezing point; implications for ARD/ML) on whether the presence of elevated TDS in waste rock and tailings has the potential to affect the long-term performance of the WRSF and TSF.	Agnico Eagle thanks CIRNAC for their comment and will account for it in the 2022 Annual Report.	Section 4.1.10 (Follow-up on 2021 Annual Report Comments)
CIRNAC-4	Provide the year-over-year or cumulative quantities of ore and waste rock with comparisons to FEIS predicted quantities	Agnico Eagle thanks CIRNAC for their comment and will include this information in future Annual Reports	Table 13, Section 4.3 (Waste Rock and Ore Stockpiled on site)
CIRNAC-5	CIRNAC recommends that AEM provide a full citation to its Analysis of the Risk of Temporary Mine Closure, the relevant NIRB Public Registry Identification Number, and a brief statement on whether updates are deemed necessary in future Annual Report submissions.	Agnico Eagle thanks CIRNAC for their recommendation and will account for it in future Annual Report submissions.	Appendix 40 (NIRB Project Certificate Concordance Table), T&C 90
CIRNAC-7	CIRNAC recommends that AEM confirm whether or not it is making available necessary treatment and counselling services for employee and family well-being as encouraged in T&C 108 of the amended Project Certificate.	In future Annual Report submission, Agnico Eagle will ensure to provide updates on the accessibility of counselling and treatment programs.	Section 12.2.3 (Counselling and Treatment Programs)
GKD-2	Section 1.2.1: Why are Term & Conditions #43 (Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat – General) and #44 (Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat – Caribou Monitoring) not included in Table 1 (Concordance Table with NIRB Project Certificate 006 Terms and Conditions) as both relate to Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, refer to the Terrestrial Environment Management and Monitoring Plan and have an annual reporting requirement?	Agnico Eagle thanks GKD for their comment and will include Term and Conditions 43 and 44 in Table 1 (Concordance Table with NIRB Project Certificate 006 Terms and Conditions) of the TEMMP report in future annual report submissions	Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report), Table 1
GKD-3	Section 12.1: In both Table 2 and 24, Caribou Behaviour Monitoring is shown as the method to be used for the Monitoring Indicator for "Sensory Disturbance" and Proposed Threshold of "<10% caribou deflections from AWAR". However, this is not stated as an objective of the Caribou Behaviour Monitoring program nor is it specifically addressed in the results presented in this Section of the report. As a result, it is not clear how the Caribou Behaviour Monitoring program is intended to be used to for this Proposed Threshold.	The text in Table 2 and 24 will be modified to reflect that satellite collar data is the primary method that can be used for monitoring deflections.	Appendix K (2022 Caribou Trail Camera Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GKD-8	As previously noted, it is not a stated objective nor is it clear how the Caribou Behaviour Study will be used to quantify caribou crossings/deflections (a preliminary Monitoring Indicator/Threshold for measuring the accuracy of impact predictions) when crossings were observed on only 18 of 102 behaviour surveys conducted over two years (2020 & 2021).	**Agnico Eagle thanks GKD for their comment and will further discuss this matter in future annual reports.** The behaviour study is primarily designed to measure the degree to which caribou respond to disturbances on the road, and the various factors that influence this response. As stated in response to Comment 3. In order to form a complete picture of how caribou respond to the road, it is important to understand both their behaviour and their movement patterns. Movement patterns are a separate question and are best assessed by satellite collar data.	Appendix J (2022 Caribou Behaviour Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GKD-10	Section 7: There is lack of any discussion/conclusions/recommendations based on the key findings presented in the Summary related to the objectives of the Study or in the context of Term and Condition 57 of the Project Certificate. (Caribou Behaviour)	Agnico Eagle thanks GKD for their comment and will account for it in future annual reports.	Appendix J (2022 Caribou Behaviour Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GKD-11	Executive Summary: The statement that "All recorded caribou crossings occurred between 5 minutes and 8.75 hours of a vehicle crossing…" is not entirely accurate in that only four "vehicle cameras" (versus 27) and 43 caribou detections (versus 128) were used for this part of the analysis. (Caribou Camera)	Agnico Eagle thanks GKD for their comment and acknowledges this statement could benefit from further clarifications in in future annual reports as applicable.	Appendix K (2022 Caribou Trail Camera Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GKD-12	Section 5.1 & 6.1: According to Section 6.1, the field portion of the Trail Camera Study ended on July 12 and not the end of July as stated in Section 5.1. (Caribou Camera)	Agnico Eagles thanks GKD for their comment and will ensure information to this effect provided in future annual report is consistent.	Appendix K (2022 Caribou Trail Camera Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)

GKD-13	Section 6.2: It would have been useful to include the total number of caribou actually recorded by the camera somewhere in this Section (based on Figure 6.2.1 there appears to have been around 6000 but that is just a guesstimate). Also, it appears that a number of the results presented are based on the number of caribou detections versus actual caribou numbers (Figures 6.2 & 6.3 for example); would the same conclusions been reached had actual caribou numbers been used (that 27% of all caribou crossings occurred at KM 22 for example)? And is there a reason why the number of caribou detections were used in favour of actual caribou numbers? (Caribou Camera)	Agnico Eagle thanks GKD for their comment. As stated earlier in response to Comment #3, numbers of caribou (as opposed to detections of caribou) are necessarily estimates, and typically come with a range of uncertainty. The cameras along the road are set up to capture photos rather than video, to maximize the amount of data that can be captured during migration. Because caribou cannot be uniquely IDed without specific markings, group size estimates from camera triggers are based on the number of photos in a capture "event", the approximate number of caribou in each photo, and the approximate rate of travel of caribou. This analysis of photos is conducted by a qualified environmental professional. Because it is not possible to ensure 100% coverage of the road, and because caribou may walk behind the camera or out of trigger range, it is assumed that the numbers presented in Section 6.2 of the camera appendix are almost certainly underestimates. Because of the uncertainty around group size, it was determined that the detection rate was more reliable for analyzing rates of crossing than the number of caribou. **However, Agnico Eagle will be sure to place a greater emphasis on the group size estimates in future annual reports and include some comparisons of "hotspots" between detections and numbers, with the caveat that these numeric estimates are highly uncertain.**	Appendix K (2022 Caribou Trail Camera Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GKD-14	Section 6.2: It is unclear as to what is intended by the statements that "cameras are a far more effective way of capturing road crossings than collar data" and "the 91 and 128 caribou detection events captured on the AWAR cameras in 2020 and 2021 (respectively) represent a more than 540% increase from the average collar rate" when the scope and objectives of the caribou collaring program are very different than those of the caribou trail camera study e.g. the caribou collaring program was not intended to test for the association between caribou detections and road characteristics. It is the GKD's position that the Caribou collaring program and the caribou trail camera study actually complement each other, with both providing valuable information on the interaction between caribou and the AWAR. (Caribou Camera)	Agnico Eagle thanks GKD for their comment and agrees with the statement that the collaring program and the camera program are complimentary surveys operating at different scales. The statements from the report mentioned by the GDK are meant to highlight that the camera study was successful and provides added value when combined with collar data. The goal of the camera study was to monitor caribou along the road, which is a much more granular scope than the collar study and designed to capture more instances of crossing. In this way it was successful. **Agnico Eagle agrees that the wording could be altered so as to not undermine the value of collar data or mislead readers and will be modified in future iterations.**	Appendix K (2022 Caribou Trail Camera Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
GKD-15	Section 6.3: In the text it is stated that road structure features were compared to the "number of caribou detected in 2021", suggesting actual caribou numbers. However, the reader is subsequently referred to Figure 6.3-2 where the term "caribou detections" is used. As a result it is unclear to whether actual caribou numbers or the number of caribou detections was used in in this analysis. (Caribou Camera)	Agnico Eagle thanks GKD for their catching this and wishes to clarify the number of caribou detections were used in this analysis. The statement in section 6.3 should read the "number of caribou detections in 2021".	Appendix K (2022 Caribou Trail Camera Study) of Appendix 27 (2022 TEMMP Report)
NWB			
CIRNA-01	Establish a program to measure runoff quantity and quality from Ore Stockpile 2 (OP2)	Agnico Eagle will consider implementing a monitoring program to measure runoff quantity and quality (TDS) from Ore Stockpile 2 (OP2) for the 2022 open water season.	Section 3.1.8.1 (Ore Stockpile Runoff Monitoring Program)
CIRNA-03	Provide additional information verifying that tailings placement was in accordance with the Mine Waste Management Plan.	Agnico Eagle will provide a statement in future annual reports to indicate if placement was in accordance with the Mine Waste Management Plan.	Section 4.4.1 (Tailings Storage Facility Capacity)
CIRNA-07	Provide information illustrating actual vs. Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) predicted quantities of overburden, waste rock and tailings; Provide information illustrating actual vs. FEIS predicted quantities of ore stored annually; Include an actual as built plan or actual as built sections of the TSF for each year of the report.	The comparison with FEIS predicted quantities will be provided in future annual reports. Agnico Eagle would like to refer CIRNAC to Appendix 13 of the Annual Report, presenting TSF plans and sections at the end of 2020 and 2021. The plans and sections will be included in future annual reports as well.	Table 13, Section 4.3 (Waste Rock and Ore Stockpiled on site)
CIRNA-07	Assess the modelled and actual runoff quality, quantity and TDS loads from the ore storage area and investigate if viable alternatives to surface runoff from the ore storage to CP1 could be developed so as to reduce TDS levels in CP1 and discharge to Meliadine Lake.	Agnico Eagle will consider implementing a monitoring program to measure runoff quantity and quality (TDS) from Ore Stockpile 2 (OP2) for the 2022 open water season. If practical, TDS loads will be assessed and compared to model results. Should monitoring results reveal source term water quality inputs in the model to not be representative of current or future TDS loading conditions, appropriate adjustments to the model will be made. Per Water Licence A, Part E, Item 13, an updated Water Balance and Water Quality Forecast (i.e. model) will be provided in the Annual Report.	Section 3.1.8.1 (Ore Stockpile Runoff Monitoring Program)
CIRNA-08	In future Annual Reports, provide an appendix containing reports of all formal inspections/compliance carried out during the reporting year.	Agnico Eagle thanks CIRNA for their recommendation. Agnico Eagle would like to refer CIRNA to section 10.2 of the Annual Report, summarizing formal inspection/compliance reports from regulators. As per the NWB Water Licence 2AM-MEL1631, Schedule B, Item 24, a summary of actions taken to address concerns or deficiencies listed in the inspection reports and/or compliance reports filed by an Inspector will continue to be presented in future Annual Reports.	Section 10.2 (Inspections)
ECCC-2	Conduct limited winter sampling to identify total phosphorus (TP) levels under ice to validate the predicted spikes in TP concentrations due to cryoconcentration and/or internal recycling of phosphorus.	Agnico Eagle acknowledges the recommendation by ECCC and consideration will be given to the recommendation and Agnico Eagle will assess how best to account for it in future annual reports.	Section 3.2.4.2 (CP1 Water Quality). As mentioned in the report, validation of cryo-concentrated water water quality predictions was not conducted in 2022 as low water levels resulted in CP1 freezing to bottom.
ECCC-4	Clarify the use of QA/QC blanks, noting the different purposes between field and travel blanks.	Travel blanks are recommended for the AEMP, but in 2021, none of the sampling events included travel blanks, this will be addressed during the 2022 AEMP sampling season.	Appendix A of Appendix 19 (2022 AEMP Report) Travel Blanks were collected during the August and September Sampling Events.
ECCC-9	Assess the impact of the heavier 2021 summer precipitation on the reduced rate of dustfall.	Agnico Eagle will continue to apply dust suppressant and other best management practices to control fugitive dust along the AWAR in accordance with the Road Management Plan, and will continue to document and report rates of dustfall according to the Air Quality Monitoring Plan.	Appendix 25 (Air Quality Monitoring Report)