Environment Canada
Environnement Canada

Environmental Protection Branch
Suite 301, 5204 - 50th Ave
Yellowknife, NT
X1A 1E2
Ph. (867) 669-4700

March 31, 2003

Our File: 4703 001 016

Larry Pokok Aknavigak
Chairperson
Nunavut Impact Review Board
P.O. Box 2379
Cambridge Bay, NT X0E 0C0

By Facsimile: (867) 983-2594

Dear Mr Aknavigak:

Please find attached Environment Canada's submission to the Nunavut Impact Review Board in connection with the scheduled Pre-Hearing Conference concerning the conformity and adequacy of the Doris North Draft Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Miramar Hope Bay Ltd.

Should you wish clarification on any aspect of the submission prior to the public hearing please contact Colette Meloche at (867) 975-4639.

Sincerely,

Laura Johnston

Laura Johnston
Manager, Northern Division
Environmental Protection Branch
Prairie and Northern Region
Environment Canada
Yellowknife

cc: Peter Blackall Director, Environmental Protection, Environment Canada, Edmonton

Nunavut Water
2003
Public Registry

INTERNAL	
PC	JP
LA	PB
OM	
TA	
BS	
ST	copy
ED	copy
CEO	
BRD	
EXT.	

Environment Canada's Submission to the Nunavut Impact Review Board Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Submitted by Miramar Hope Bay Ltd. for the Doris North

Pre-Hearing Conference Conformity and Adequacy Review

April 2003

1.0 Introduction

Environment Canada (EC) has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) submitted by Miramar Hope Bay Ltd. (Miramar) for the Doris North Project. Miramar is proposing to construct, operate, and eventually decommission a gold mine on Inuit Owned Land in the Hope Bay Belt area of the West Kitikmeot region of Nunavut. The project is located at the north end of Doris Lake, approximately 160 km southwest of Cambridge Bay, NU. The project proposes to extract approximately 458,000 tonnes of ore and process it at a rate of 690 tonnes per day to yield 307,000 ounces of gold over a 24 month operating period.

The Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) has scheduled a Pre-Hearing Conference (PHC) to discuss a conformity analysis of the draft EIS and the identification of major issues. This submission takes into consideration all of the documents submitted with the Draft EIS, as well as the December 19, 2002 letter sent from Environment Canada to Miramar regarding the consideration of marine aspects in the EIS and the March 14 letter regarding water balance calculations.

Environment Canada is of the view that the Doris North Draft EIS largely conforms to the NIRB Final EIS Guidelines distributed on October 15, 2002. EC has, however, identified a number of inadequacies in the information provided. The following observations and recommendations are based on the information provided by Miramar. Should new or additional relevant information be brought forward by Miramar or be identified during the PHC, this submission will be re-examined. Within the context of the additional information, any changes in EC's recommendations will be brought to the attention of the NIRB.

In addition, **EC would like to emphasize that given the short review period established by the NIRB, a full technical review of the document has not been completed.** Once the technical review of the Doris North Draft EIS has been completed, EC will notify Miramar as well as the NIRB of any additional issues/information requests that may arise.

2.0 Environment Canada

The mandate of EC is defined by the *Department of the Environment Act*. This *Act* provides the Department with a general responsibility for environmental management and protection in terms of the need to foster harmony between society and the environment for the economic, social, and cultural benefit of present and future generations of Canadians. The Department shares this responsibility with the provinces and territories. Environment Canada is also responsible for providing specialist or expert information and knowledge for the preservation and enhancement of environmental quality.

The operations of the Miramar Doris North Gold Mine Project are subject to the following statutes administered by Environment Canada: Section 36(3) of the *Fisheries Act*, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act (CEPA)*, the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, the *Canada Wildlife Act*, and the *Species at Risk Act*.

Environment Canada's submission is based primarily on its mandated responsibility for the enforcement of Section 36(3) of the *Fisheries Act*. This section of the *Fisheries Act* prohibits the "...deposit of a deleterious substance of any type in water frequented by fish..." A first step towards compliance with this requirement is demonstrating that the effluent is non-acutely lethal. This may be demonstrated by an acute lethality determination such as *Biological Test Method: Reference Method for Determining Acute Lethality of Effluents to Rainbow Trout* (Reference Method EPS 1/RM/13, July, 1990) and amendments (May 1996), or other techniques and procedures.

3.0 Adequacy Review

In general, EC finds the draft EIS to be well organized and formatted. The Doris North Draft EIS addresses most of the items found in the Final EIS Guidelines. However, EC believes that additional baseline information specific to the Doris North Site needs to be collected by Miramar in order to verify many of the assumptions made throughout the body of the EIS. Without site-specific baseline information, it is difficult for EC to determine if the assessment of the impacts presented by Miramar is accurate.

Environment Canada recommends that a number of areas be given further attention in the final Environmental Impact Statement.

- *Waste handling/treatment/disposal facilities for the Doris North Site.* Additional details concerning the location of the treatment facilities, the location of the quarry where non-hazardous waste will be stored, and the disposal location for any sludges generated are required. This information should include detailed maps indicating the location of the facilities as well as any outflow pipes or sumps.

- *Impact of the project on migratory birds:*
    - The impacts of the project on migratory birds during all stages of the project. Environment Canada does not agree with Miramar's assumption in Section 5.3.9 that aside from accidents or malfunctions, no portion of the project will cause wildlife mortality. If construction occurs during the nesting season, there is a high probability that eggs and nests of migratory birds will be destroyed. Additionally, the potential for contact between migratory bird nests and infrastructure and/or personnel also exists. Hence, EC recommends that additional information regarding the potential impacts of the project on birds, as well as appropriate mitigation measures be considered.
    - The potential for interactions between marine shipping and migratory birds. Marine traffic has the potential to disturb migratory birds and other wildlife and should be included in the EIS.
    - The lack of baseline migratory bird data in the marine habitat. Since migratory birds use coastal area to stage and nest, EC believes it would be prudent to survey marine waters and coastal habitats for bird use, especially during the period when marine traffic would be occurring.

  - The scope of the Wildlife Management Plan. Environment Canada recommends that migratory birds be incorporated into the plan.
  - Clarification of the methodology used to collect the data in the "Terrestrial Wildlife of Hope Bay, Nunavut (An Integration of Data Collected from 1994-2001)". Additional information is necessary regarding the size of the transects used for breeding birds, as well as an indication of why the species diversity index was used rather than an index of species richness during the ground surveys for breeding birds. A species diversity index does not equal the number of species per hectare. Rather, this type of measurement is better referred to as an index of species richness. The dates that the aerial surveys of waterfowl were conducted should also be included in the methodology, and an explanation of why no transects were flown over the marine areas of Robert's Bay should also be discussed.

- *Cumulative effects assessment.* Environment Canada recommends that information be provided to ensure that the EIS adequately addresses the intent of the cumulative effects assessment outlined in the Final EIS Guidelines:
  - A clear indication of the size of both the temporal and spatial study area used for the cumulative effects assessment.
  - Additional information regarding why projects were included or excluded from the cumulative effects assessment.
  - An assessment of the potential cumulative effects of increased marine traffic. This includes the entire marine shipping route (including transboundary areas) that will be used in supplying the Doris North site.

The proponent states that "Coupled with the NIRB guidelines, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act [*CEAA*] requires that the environmental effects of existing projects or other planned projects that will be carried out must be examined in combination with the environmental effects of the projects(s) being proposed. By implication, only projects or activities that have already been approved must be taken into account…" The Agency's 1994 Reference Guide did advise that the assessment of cumulative effects in relation to future projects should focus exclusively on imminent projects, that is, projects that have been approved but not yet implemented or proposals waiting planning or other formal approval. However, the 1999 Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's Operational Policy Statement addressing cumulative environmental effects does not imply that only those projects that are *approved* need to be considered, but rather that the selection of future actions to considered in the cumulative effects assessment should reflect "the most likely future scenario". The Agency position has evolved to better reflect the broad objectives of the Act and the "best practices" approach of the Practitioners Guide. Therefore, recognizing the considerable development potential in the Hope Bay Belt, EC believes that the cumulative effects assessment of the EIS needs to be improved upon.

- *The abandonment and restoration plan.* Environment Canada recommends that the following items be addressed:
    - The cost and feasibility of going beyond mere reclamation by enhancing wildlife habitats as requested in the Final EIS Guidelines.
    - The potential for a longer monitoring period. The EIS Guidelines state that "the proponent shall discuss post-closure monitoring of such environmental components as wildlife, re-vegetation, landform stability, and water quality". The Draft EIS discusses post closure monitoring of water quality (Section 4.0, M-8), however wildlife, re-vegetation and landform stability have not been addressed. The proponent also indicates that "it is expected that monitoring would be ongoing at a reduced frequency for several years after reclamation is complete…" The land use objective for the mine site at closure also needs to be identified.
    - Further justification for, or alternatives to, Miramar's preliminary plan to leave the majority of the infrastructure at the site after mine closure to support ongoing mineral exploration.

- *The assessment of the impacts of the project on air quality.* Environment Canada recommends that:
    - The proponent quantify the Project's emissions and provide complete air quality modelling. Given the current lack of information, it is not possible to assess potential impacts to the environment, human health, plant phenology, wildlife, or the changes in albedo that may affect snowmelt. In addition, it is not possible to estimate whether ambient Air Quality Guidelines and Standards will be exceeded.
    - The proponent provide a complete list of all the emission control technologies being employed and the equipment they will be attached, the pollutants being controlled and the efficiency of the control technology, in order to understand the full benefit of the mitigation efforts proposed.

Environment Canada would like to commend Miramar for using emission control technologies. As part of the Canada-Wide Standards, the Keeping Clean Areas Clean strategy requires proponents to use the best available technology to mitigate adverse environmental impacts due to atmospheric emissions. Miramar has stated the emissions control technology will be installed on underground diesel mining equipment and the smelter (section 5.3.2.5).

- *The hydrology information presented in the draft EIS.* Environment Canada has concerns with the derivation of hydrology information in the draft EIS. These concerns were identified in a letter to Miramar dated March 14, 2003.

- *Impact of the project on water quality.* Environment Canada requests the following information:
    - Environment Canada also has concerns with the information presented in support of the EIS predictions for the potential impacts of acid rock drainage. Both the number of tests and types of tests were insufficient to base assessment predictions on. Given

that there are at least eight rock types capable of having high acid-generating potential and that each type should be tested two or three times. EC recommends that Miramar conduct 16 to 24 geochemical column leach tests. The duration of the tests should exceed 80 weeks.

- Descriptive statistics for results of water quality samples should be provided, along with results of the field QA/QC program.

4.0 Summary

Environment Canada has completed its conformity and adequacy analysis of the Doris North Draft EIS. While EC is of the view that the Draft EIS is generally in conformity with the EIS Guidelines, EC also made note of several areas where additional information is required.

As previously stated, given the tight timelines that interested parties were given for the review of this project, EC was unable to perform a thorough technical review of the Doris North Draft EIS in time for this submission. As such, EC would like to inform the NIRB that if additional major issues become apparent during the course of the ongoing technical review, EC will notify Miramar and the NIRB of such issues as they arise in order to ensure that they are addressed in the final EIS.

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᖏᑦ

ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᖏᓐᓄᑦ

ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ

ᐸᕐᓇᒃᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᐅᔪᑦ

ᑐᓂᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᑯᓇᖓᑦ **Miramar Hope Bay Ltd.**

for the Doris North

ᑲᑎᒪᕈᓯᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᒃᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ
ᐊᑲᐅᔪᒃᑯᖕᒐᒃᒪᖔᑕ ᕿᒥᕈᔭᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ

ᐊᐃᕆᓕᑦ 2003

1.0 ᐱᒋᐊᕐᓂᖓ

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᕿᒥᕈᓯᒪᒃᒪᑕ ᐸᕐᓇᒃᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᑐᓂᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ Hope Bay Ltd. (Miramar) for the Doris North Project. Miramar ᑯᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᓴᓇᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ, ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓴᓗᒪᖅᓴᐃᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᕕᒃᒥᒃ ᒍᓗᓯᐅᕐᕕᒃᒥᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᖁᑎᖃᓐᓂᑦᑐᒥᒃ Hope Bay ᖃᓂᒋᔭᓚ, ᕿᑎᕐᒥᐅᒥᑦᑐᖅ ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ. ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᕕᒃ ᑕᓯᐅᑦ ᖃᓂᒋᔭᓂᑦᑐᖅ, ᐅᖓᓯᒃᓂᖃᕐᓗᓂ 160 ᑭᓚᒥᑕ ᑲᓇᖕᓇᖓᓂ ᐃᖃᓗᒃᑐᑦᑎᐊᕐ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ. ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕕᐅᔪᒪᔪᖅ ᐱᔭᐃᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᕿᖕᒋᓐᓂᖅᑐᒥᒃ 458,000 ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒍᓗᓂᖓ ᐱᔭᕐᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᖃᐅᑕᒪᑦ ᐅᕿᖕᒋᓐᓂᓕᒃᒥᖅ 690 ᐱᔭᐃᖃᑦᑕᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓇᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᕿᖕᒋᓐᓂᓕᒃᒥᒃ 307,000 ᐊᐅᓐᓯᔅ ᒍᓗᒥᒃ ᑕᕿᓄᑦ 24_0ᓄᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᖅᕈᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ.

ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᕈᓯᕈᒪᒃᒪᑕ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᑦᑐᑎᒃ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᒃᒪᖓᑕ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᔪᒪᔭᖏᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᓇᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓗᒪᓗᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ. ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᓇᔭᕗᑦ ᐃᓯᒪᒃᓴᕐᓯᐅᕈᑎᒋᓪᓗᑎᒍ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐸᖅᓴᐅᑎᐅᔪᒥ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᖅ ᑎᓯᐱᕆ 19, 2002ᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᓄᑦ ᐱᔪᑎᖃᕐᓗᓂ ᐃᒪᕐᒥᐅᑕᓂᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᒃᓯᒪᔭᖏᓐᓂ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᒪᔾᔨ 14ᒥ ᐱᔪᑎᖃᕐᓗᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐃᒥᐅᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓂᖓᓂᒃ.

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᓯᒪᖃᕐᑐᑦ ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᑎᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᔪᒐᓗᐊᑦ ᐊᖏᓂᖅᓴᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᕿᒃᑕᐅᓂᑯᔪᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐃᑦ ᐅᑐᐱᕆ 15, 2002ᒥ, ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᓇᒪᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ. ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᓇᔭᕗᑦ ᐃᓯᒪᒋᔭᕗᓪᓗ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑯᔭᕗᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᑎᑦ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᓄᑕᓂᒃ ᐅᐸᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓚᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓴᕿᑦᑐᖃᕐᐸᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᒃᑯᓐᓂᑦ ᐅᐸᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᓴᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᔪᖃᕈᓂ ᑲᑎᒪᕈᓯᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓇᒪᖏᓐᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᓇᔭᕗᑦ ᕿᒥᕈᔭᐅᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ. ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᖅᑕᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᓕᖅᐸᑦ ᓄᑕᓂᒃ ᓴᕿᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᓯᓕᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᕈᑎᒃ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑯᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

ᐊᒻᒪᓗᑦᑕᐅᖅ, ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᑦᑎᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐱᕕᖃᑦᑎᐊᖏᓐᓂᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᕿᓚᒥᐅᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐊᕿᒃᓯᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᑦ ᕿᒥᕈᖅᑯᔨᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᕐᒥᓕᒪᖅ ᕿᒥᕈᓯᒪᖏᓐᓇᕐᑎᒍ ᐃᓗᓕᓕᒪᖏᑦ ᕿᒥᕈᔭᐅᓯᒪᖏᑦᑐᑦ. ᑕᒪᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᓗᓕᓕᒪᖏᑦ ᕿᒥᕈᔭᐅᓯᒪᓕᖅᐸᑕ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᑎᑦᑎᓗᑎᒃᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓂᐊᕈᑎᒃ ᐃᓯᒪᓗᑎᒋᔭᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓂᐊᕈᑎᒃᓐᓗᓂᑦ

2.0 ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ

ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᖁᔭᑎᒍᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ *ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᐅᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᖏᓐᓂ*. ᑕᓐᓇ ᐱᖁᔭᖅ ᐱᕕᖃᖅᑎᑦᑎᒃᒪᑦ ᑕᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᖃᕐᑎᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓴᐳᒥᔭᐅᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐱᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑎᒋᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᕙᑎᖓᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐃᓄᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ ᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓯᕗᓂᒃᓴᒥ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᓄᑦ. ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᖏᑦ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᒃᒥᒃᒪᑕ ᐊᕕᒃᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑦ ᐃᓗᐊᓂᑦᑐᓂ ᓯᑦᓗ ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ. ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᖃᕐᒥᒃᒪᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓴᐳᒥᔭᐅᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᕗᑦ.

ᐊᐅᓚᓂᖓ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕐᕕᐅᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᕙᓂᑦᑐᓂ: ᐃᓚᖓᓂ 36 (3) *ᐃᒪᕐᒥᐅᑕᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᖓᓂ, ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᐳᒥᔭᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᖏᑦ, ᐊᐅᓚᖅᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᖏᑦ, ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᒥᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᐃᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᐊᑦᑕᕐᓇᖅᑐᒥᑦᑐᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᖏᑦ.*

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᒃ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑦᑎᔾᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᓇᐊᖃᕐᑐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᖓᓂ 36 (3) ᒪᓕᒃᓗᒍ ᐃᒪᕐᒥᐅᑕᓕᕆᓂᐅᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᖏᓐᓂᑦᑐᓂᒃ. ᑕᓐᓇ ᐱᖁᔭᕐ ᐃᒪᕐᒥᐅᑕᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᖓᓂ ᐊᔪᕐᑎᑦᑎᒃᒪᑕ ᐃᒪᓐᓇ “ ᑯᕕᓯᖃᑦᑕᖏᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᓯᕗᕐᓇᕐᑐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᒃ ᐃᒪᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᖃᓗᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᒧᑦ..” ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐ ᐱᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᑐᖅ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᓂᐊᕈᑎᒃ ᐊᑐᓇᐊᖃᕐᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᑎᑦᑎᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᓄᕐ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᑯᕕᖃᑦᑕᕐᑕᖓ ᓯᕗᕐᓇᕐᑐᖃᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ. ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᕐᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᑐᖅ ᑯᕕᖃᑦᑕᕐᑕᖔᑦ ᓯᕗᕐᓇᕐᑐᖃᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᓯᕐᓗ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ *ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᖁᐱᕈᐊᕐᔪᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ: ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑎᑦ ᓯᕗᕐᓇᕐᑐᐃᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᕐᑐᓂᖏᑦ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᔪᑦ ᑎᓯᐊᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᖃᓗᒃᓄᑦ* (ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓂᑯᐃᑦ ᔪᓚᐃ 1990ᒥ) ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᕿᒋᐊᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ (ᒪᐃ 1996) ᐅᕝᕙᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑎᖃᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᑎᒃᓗ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃᓗᓐᓂᑦ.

3.0 ᓇᒪᑦᑎᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᕿᒥᕈᔭᐅᓂᖓ

ᑕᒪᕐᒥᒃ ᑕᑯᓪᓗᒍ, ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᕿᒥᕈᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔨᕈᓱᓚᐅᕐᑐᑦ ᐊᕿᑦᑎᐊᕐᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃᓗ. ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᑦ ᐊᖏᓂᕐᓴᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᑐᓇᐊᖃᕐᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒋᐊᖃᕐᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᒃᑲᓐᓂᖁᔨᔪᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᓂᒃ ᐃᓂᒋᓂᐊᕐᑕᖓᓂᖓᕐᑐᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᒃᑲᓂᕆᐊᓕᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓯᒪᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᑐᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᖓᓂ ᐱᒋᐊᕐᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ. ᓄᓇᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓂᒋᓂᐊᕐᑕᖓᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓯᒪᖏᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ, ᐊᔪᕐᓇᐸᓗᒃᒪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᓯᓚᕐᑎᐊᕋᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᓯᐊᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑎᖃᕐᑐᕕᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᑎᑦ.

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐊᑐᓕᖁᔨᕗᑦ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᖁᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᑕ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᑐᑦ ᐅᑯᐊᖑᔪᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖁᔭᐅᔪᑦ.

- *ᓴᓂᑦ ᓯᕗᐃᓪᓗ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᓂᖏ ᐃᒥᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᖏᓪᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃᒥ.* ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᒃᑲᓂᕆᐊᓕᑦ ᐱᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᓇᒥᓂᐊᕐᓂᖓ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᕐᓴᐃᕕᐅᓂᐊᕐᑐᖅ, ᓇᒥᓂᖓᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᑕᕐᕕᐅᔪᖅ ᓇᒍᓪᓗ ᑲᑎᑕᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᑐᐃᓐᓇᐃᑦ ᓯᕗᕐᓇᕐᑐᖃᖏᑦᑐᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᒥᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᑲᑎᑕᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᔪᑦ ᓴᓗᒪᕐᓴᐅᑎᕕᓂᑦ. ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓄᓇᖑᐊᒥᒃ ᑎᑎᕐᓯᒪᓗᓂ ᓇᒥᓐᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓴᓗᒪᕐᓴᐃᕕᐃᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑯᕕᕐᑕᕐᕕᑦᓗ ᖁᕐᕕᒃᑯᕕᓪᓗ.

- *ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᓂᐊᕐᓂᖓ ᐊᐅᓪᓚᕐᑕᕐᑐᓄᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᓄᑦ:*
  - ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᑐᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᓄᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᕐᑕᕐᑐᓄᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᑕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᖃᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᓂᒃ ᐃᓯᒪᒋᔭᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔭᖏᓐᓂ 5.3.9. ᐱᔭᓇᖏᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᓪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᓴᓇᓯᒥᐊᕈᑎᒃ ᐃᕙᓕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᖁᔨᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᒪᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᕙᕕᖏᓪᓗ ᓯᕿᒃᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᕿᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ. ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐃᓄᖃᓕᕈᓂᕐ ᐃᖃᓇᐃᔭᓕᕐᐸᑕ ᐱᖁᑎᖃᐅᓕᕈᓂᓗ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᓂᐊᕐᒪᑕ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᓄᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᖁᔨᕗᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᒃᑲᓐᓂᖁᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᓄᕐ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓯᕿᒃᑕᐅᔪᖃᕐᓂᐸᑦ ᒪᓐᓂᒃᓂᒃ ᐃᕙᕕᐅᔪᓂᒃᓗᓐᓂᑦ.
  - ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᒥᔪᖅ ᐅᒥᐊᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑕᐃᑯᖓᖃᑦᑕᓕᕐᐸᑕ ᐅᒪᔪᓄᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᓄᓪᓗ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᒥᔭᖏᓐᓂᓗ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔭᐅᓯᒪᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᑐᑦ.
  - ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐱᑕᖃᖏᓐᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᖃᕐᑎᒋᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐃᒪᕐᒥᐅᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ, ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᑕᑯᓇᖁᔨᕗᑦ ᓯᒃᔭᖓᓂᒃ ᑕᕆᐅᖓᓂᒃᓗ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᖃᓯᖑᓂᖏᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒻᒥᐊᕐᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓗᐊᕐᑐᒥᒃ ᐅᒥᐊᕐᔪᐊᖃᖃᑦᑕᓂᖓᑦ ᖃᖓᒃᑯᖓᓂᖓ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ.

  - ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᒋᔭᖓᑦ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᒥᒃᓴᓄᖓᔪᖅ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔨᓯᒪᖏᓐᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᓂᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔨᖁᔨᔪᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑕᐅᒃᒥᓗᑎᒃ.
  - ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕆᐊᖃᕐᒥᔪᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑕᐅᔪᕕᓂᖅ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᓇᓕᐊᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓐᓂᕐᒪᖓᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕐᕕᒥᓂᐊᕐᑕᖓᓂᑦᑐᑦ (ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑲᑎᑕᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ 1994ᒥᑦ 2001ᒧᑦ). ᐊᒻᒪᕐᑕᐅᖅ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᒃᑲᓂᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᖅ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᐊᖏᑎᒋᔪᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓐᓂᕐᒪᖓᑦ ᓄᓇᖓ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᓄᑦ ᐃᕙᕕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᑐᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᒻᒪᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᔨᒋᖏᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᖓᕐᓯᒪᒃᒪᖓᑕ ᐅᓄᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᖏᓗᑎᒃ. ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᐊᔨᒋᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᖓᕐᓂᕐᒪᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖓᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᑦ ᐅᓄᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᑦ ᐊᐅᓪᓚᕐᑕᕐᑐᑦ, ᐅᓪᓗᖏᓪᓗ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒥᔪᑦ ᑎᒃᒥᐊᑦ ᐃᒪᕐᒥᐅᑕᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔪᕕᓂᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᒻᒪᑦ ᖃᖏᕐᓗᐊᑕ ᐃᓗᐊ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᒻᒪᖓᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒥᔪᖅ.

- *ᑲᑎᑉᐸᓐᓕᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᖓ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ.* ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᖁᔨᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᖁᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑲᑎᑉᐸᓪᓗᐊᓗᓂ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᒋᔭᖓ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᕐᓯᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓂᐊᕐᒪᑦ:
  - ᓇᓗᓇᖏᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᖏᓂᖓ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᕕᐅᔪᖅ ᑲᑎᑉᐸᓕᐊᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᔪᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᒪᖓᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓗᓂ.
  - ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᑕᐅᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᓗᓂᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᒻᒪᑦ ᐃᓚᐃᓐᓇᖏᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᒃᒪᖓᑕ ᑲᑎᑉᐸᓕᐊᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᔪᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓗ.
  - ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓗᓂᓗ ᐅᓄᕐᓯᕙᓪᓕᐊᒃᐸᑕ ᑲᑎᑉᐸᓪᓕᐊᒃᐸᑕᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᒪᕐᒥᐅᑕᓄᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᔪᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᒪᖓᑦ ᐅᒥᐊᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑕᐃᑯᖓᖃᑦᑕᕐᓇᓕᕐᐸᑕ. ᑕᒪᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᓚᓂᑦᑐᑦ ᐅᒥᐊᕐᒧᐊᒧᑦ ᐊᕐᑯᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᑐᑦ (ᐃᖃᓯᐅᑎᓗᒥᑦ ᓯᓚᑕᓂᑦᑐᒐᓗᐊᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᕕᒋᓂᐊᕐᑕᖓᑕ) ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ.

ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᒃᒪᑕ ᐃᒪᓐᓇ " ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᖏᑦ, ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐸᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᐃᑦ ᐱᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᑎᑕᐅᒃᒪᑕ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᑐᑦ ᒪᓐᓇ ᐱᓕᕆᕕᐅᔪᒥ ᐅᕙᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᒃᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᕐᑕᐅᔪᒪᔪᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᕙᓪᓕᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᐸᕐᓇᒃᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑐᐊᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓯᒪᔪᓪᓗ ᐊᖏᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑐᐊᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᑦ.." ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᕕᓂᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᖏᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ 1994ᒥ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᓂᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓯᕗᓂᒃᓴᒥ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᖏᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᕐᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᒃᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓪᓗ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔭᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᑦ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ, 1999ᒥ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓂᑯᐃᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐅᔪᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᐅᑦ ᒥᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕐᓯᒪᒃᒪᑕ ᑲᑎᑉᐸᓪᓕᐊᔪᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᑐᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᑕᐃᑯᐊᑐᐊᖅ ᐊᖏᕐᑕᐅᓂᑯᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᔪᕐᓕ ᓯᕗᓂᒃᓴᒥ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᑐᑦ ᐃᓯᒪᒋᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓ ᓇᓗᓇᕈᓐᓂᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᑦ. ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐃᓚᐃᓐᓇᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᑕᒥᒃᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᓯᒃᒪᑕ ᐊᑲᐅᓚᒃᑯᖓᔪᒃᑯᕐᓯᒃᒪᑕ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖁᔨᔪᑦ ᑲᑎᑉᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᖓ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᔪᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᒪᖓᑦ ᐅᒪᔪᓄᑦ.

- *ᕿᒪᐃᒋᐊᕈᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᐃᓂᖏᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᖏᑦ.* ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᕐᑯᔨᕗᑦ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ:
    - ᐊᑭᒋᒐᔭᕐᑕᖓ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᐃᑐᐃᓐᓇᖏᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ ᐃᓂᒋᔭᖏᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᔭᐅᒐᔭᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒥᔪᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᖏᓐᓂ.
    - ᐊᑯᓂᐅᓂᖅᓴᒥᒃᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᒪᑐᓯᒪᓕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᒃᒪᑕ ᐃᒪᓐᓇ " ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᑦ ᒪᑐᓯᒪᓕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᑐᑦ, ᐱᕈᕐᑐᐃᓪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᓄᓇᐅᓪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᒥᐅᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ". ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᖓᓂ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᒐᓗᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᒥᐅᑦ ᐱᐅᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑲᔭᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ (ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᕐ 4.0.L_8). ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐅᒪᔪᐃᑦ. ᐱᕈᕐᑐᐃᓪᓗ ᓄᓇᖓᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓯᒪᖏᒻᒪᑕ. ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᒐᓗᐊᕆᓪᓗᑎᒃ " ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓂᖓ ᐊᑯᓚᐃᓪᓕᕙᓪᓕᐊᒐᔭᕐᑐᖅ ᐊᖁᓄᑦ ᐅᓄᐸᓗᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᒪᑐᓯᒪᓕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ.." ᓄᓇᐅᑦ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓ ᒪᑐᓯᒪᓕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᒃᑲᓂᕆᐊᖃᕐᒥᔪᖅ
    - ᑐᑭᓯᓇᕐᓯᑎᑕᐅᒥᐊᒃᑲᓂᕆᐊᓕᒃ, ᐅᐸᓗᓂᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᑎᖏᑦ ᐃᒃᓗᕈᔪᖏᑦ ᕿᒪᒃᑲᔭᕐᑕᖏᑦ ᒪᑐᓯᒪᓕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᕿᓂᕐᑐᓄᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ.

- *ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓴᑭᑎᒐᔭᕐᑐᖅ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᑕᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᓂᕐᑎᓇᔭᕐᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᓯᓚᒧᑦ.* ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐊᑐᕐᑯᔨᕗᑦ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ:
    - ᐅᔭᕋᒃᑕᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᓯᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᐊᖏᑎᒋᔪᒥᒃ ᐳᔪᕐᑎᑦᑎᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓯᓚᒧᑦ ᐳᔪᕐᑎᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᑐᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ. ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓇᑦᑎᐊᖏᓐᓂᖓᓄᑦ, ᖃᓄᐃᑐᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓ ᐊᔪᕐᓇᐸᓗᒃᒪᑦ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ, ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑎᒥᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᐱᕈᕐᑐᓄᑦ, ᐅᒪᔪᓄᑦ ᐅᕙᓪᓗᓂᑦ ᓯᓚᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐅ4ᐸᓕᐊᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᓯᓐᓂᐅᑎᒐᔭᕐᒪᖔᑦ. ᐊᒻᒪᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓇᖏᒻᒪᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒍᐃᑦ ᓯᓚᒧᑦ ᐳᔪᕐᑎᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖏᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ.
    - ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐳᔪᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᕆᓂᐊᕐᑕᖓᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᐃᑐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃᓗ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ. ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᑐᓂᖏᑦ ᐳᔪᐃᑦ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᒐᔭᕐᓂᖏᑦ, ᑐᑭᓯᐅᒪᓇᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑦ ᖃᓄᕐᑐᕈᑎᒋᔭᐅᓂᐊᕈᓂ ᖃᓄᑎᒋᓗ ᓴᓗᒻᒪᖅᓴᐃᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ.

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᐱᒋᔪᒪᔭᕗᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᓄᑕᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᕈᒪᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐳᔪᕐᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑎᓂᒃ. ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᒪᓕᒐᐅᔪᑦ ᓯᓚᕗᑦ ᐊᓂᕐᑎᓇᔭᕗᑦ ᓴᓗᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᒃᒪᑕ ᓄᑕᖑᓚᖑᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᓕᒃᓂᒃ ᐳᔪᖃᑦᑕᐃᓕᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᓱᐳᕐᐸᓪᓕᐊᔪᑕᐅᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᑯᔨᓯᒪᒃᒪᑕ. ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕈᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᕐᓯᒪᒃᒪᑕ ᓄᑕᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᓂᐊᕐᓂᕿᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓄᓇᐅᑦ ᐃᓗᐊᓄᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑎᖃᕐᓂᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ (ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᖅ 5.3.2.5).

- *ᐅᔭᕋᐃᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐸᕐᓴᐅᑎᖏᓐᓂ.* ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑎᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᓇᑭᖓᕐᑐᒥᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᒃᒪᖔᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᒃᒪᖔᑕ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᒋᔭᖕᒪᓂᑦᑐᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ. ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑎᒋᔭᕗᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᒃᑯᑦ ᑐᓂᔭᐅᓚᐅᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐅᓗᖃᕐᑐᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐ ᒪᔨ 14, 2003.

- *ᐅᔭᕋᒃᑖᕐᕕᒃ ᐃᒥᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᒃᐱᒃᓇᐅᑎᓂᖓ.* ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᕙᓂᒃ ᐱᕙᒪᒃᑲᓐᓂᕐᑐᑦ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ:
  - ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑎᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᕙᓂᒃ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᖏᓐᓂ ᓇᓚᐅᑦᑕᕐᓯᒪᕙᓂᒃ ᐅᔭᕋᐃᑦ ᓱᕈᕐᓇᕐᑐᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᓇᓴᐅᑎᒃᑯᑦ ᓇᓚᐅᑦᑕᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᕙᕕᓂᑦ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᒍᑎᒃ ᓇᒪᖏᓗᐊᕐᒪᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᑯᑎᒃ. ᐱᕙᑎᕆᓪᓗᒍ 8ᖑᒃᒪᑕ ᐅᔭᕋᐃᑦ ᐊᕿᕆᖏᕆᑦᑐᒃᑦ ᓱᕈᕐᓇᕐᑐᖃᕿᓐᓇᕐᑐᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᑐᓂ ᒪᕿᐃᕐᓱᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᖓᓱᐃᕐᓱᕐᓗᑎᒃᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᑕ ᑐᑭᓯᔭᐅᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓗᓕᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᕐᑯᕐᓯᕙᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓗᑎᒃ 16ᒥᑦ 24ᒧᑦ ᐅᖓᕐᓂᕐᑲᕐᑐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᕕᐅᕙᓂᒃ. ᐊᑯᓂᐅᓂᖓᓗ ᐱᓇᓱᐊᕈᓯᕐᖓᑦ 80ᖓᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓗᑎᒃ.
  - ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᕙᕕᓂᑦ ᐃᒥᐅᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᔭᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐱᕐᑲᓯᐅᑎᓗᑎᒃ.

4.0 ᓇᐃᒃᓕᕆᐊᕐᓗᒍ

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᔭᕆᕐᓯᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᒃᒪᖓᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᒪᑦᑎᐊᕋᓗᐊᕐᒪᖓᑕ ᐊᑐᕐᑕᐅᕙᓕᕙᑦ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓂᐊᕐᕕᒃᒧᑦ. ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐅᒃᐱᕈᓱᒃᑐᒐᓗᐊᑦ ᐊᖏᓂᕐᓴᐅᕙᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᓂᒃ, ᓇᓗᓇᐃᕐᔪᒃᑲᓂᖃᕐᑐᑦ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᓚᖏᑦᑐ ᐱᔭᐅᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᕙᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ.

ᐅᖃᓇᖃᐅᒪᑦᑕ ᐱᕕᖃᖏᓗᐊᕐᓂᑦᑎᖓᑦ ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᕿᒥᕈᑎᑕᐅᕙᑦ ᕿᓚᒥᐅᓗᐊᕐᑐᒥᒃ ᕿᒥᕈᑎᑕᐅᓂᖏᖓᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᔭᕆᕐᔦᓐᓇᖏᓪᒪᑕ ᑕᒪᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᓗᓕᓕᒪᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᕿᒥᕈᔭᕆᐊᒃᓴᖅ ᐅᓗᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᕕᖃᖏᓗᐊᕐᓂᖏᖓᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓂᖓᖓᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᑎᑦᑎᕙᒪᕙᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᖏᑦᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᒃᓇᕐᑐᕐᑲᓪᓚᑦ ᓴᕿᑐᕐᑲᓪᓚᕐᑐᓂᑦ ᓄᑕᓂᒃ ᕿᒥᕈᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑕᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᖃᐅᔨᑎᑦᑎᓂᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦᒥ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᔭᕋᒃᓯᐅᕐᑎᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑎᕆᔭᕐᒥᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᔭᕐᒥᓂᒃᓗ ᐸᕐᓇᐅᑎᕆᔭᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᕐᑲᓯᐅᑎᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᑐᓂᒃ.