AGNICO EAGLE

September 24, 2026

Ali Shaikh
Nunavut Water Board
PO Box 119
Gjoa Haven, NU X0B IJ0

Re: Response to 2AM-DOH1335 Water Licence Amendment – Operational Update – Final Written Submissions

Dear Mr. Shaikh,

Agnico Eagle thanks the Nunavut Water Board (NWB) for the opportunity to respond to the 2AM-DOH1335 Water Licence Amendment – Operational Update –Final Written Submissions. Our responses to final written submissions are provided in the enclosed.

As we reported at the end of the Technical Meeting in July, Agnico Eagle has resolved all issues relating to the Amendment with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association (KitIA), Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC), and Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO).

Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC) has indicated in their Final Written Submissions that they have some issues that remain outstanding. These issues can be sorted into main categories as follows.

- First, CIRNAC has requested a specific term relating to dry stack tailings that is duplicative of existing terms and conditions of the Water Licence that already serve the same purpose. CIRNAC also continues to request information (such as Agnico Eagle's internal analysis) which is not relevant to considerations under the *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act* (NWNSRTA) relating to tailings deposition methodology. In the enclosed submissions, Agnico Eagle explains why the existing Licence terms and conditions are a mechanism that ensures that NWB approval of plans will be required before the transition to dry stack tailings occurs while avoiding the confusion and inconsistencies that would result from CIRNAC's preferred wording.
- Second, several of CIRNAC's outstanding requests relate to information from the 2017 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that are not relevant to the determinations that must be made by the NWB in relation to the Amendment Application.

In addition, Agnico Eagle has compiled all comments/edits from parties in response to the draft Water Licence Framework issued on July 31, 2026 by Agnico Eagle and provided responses in Attachment A. Agnico Eagle reminds the NWB and reviewers that additional explanations for revisions were provided in the July 31, 2026 version to help further facilitate a fulsome review. As Agnico Eagle has emphasized in the past, the suggested amendments are focused on the changes that are triggered by the Amendment Application, and ensuring consistency with the modernized language reflected in the licenses issued by the NWB on other files in recent years. These changes enhance clarity and respect the approval role of the NWB and maintain the high-level of protection and responsibility reflected in the current licence.

Of note with the draft Water Licence Framework, Agnico Eagle, the KitIA, and CIRNAC are collaborating on language for inclusion in Schedule C of the Water Licence. Once agreement is in place, a copy will be provided to the NWB prior to or at the Public Hearing.

Agnico Eagle looks forward to a successful Public Hearing in Cambridge Bay on October 15-16, 2026.

Regards,



Colleen Prather
colleen.prather@agnicoeagle.com
Superintendent, Permitting & Regulatory Affairs

Table of Contents

Table of Contents iii

KITIKMEOT INUIT ASSOCIATION (KitIA) 1

CROWN-INDIGENOUS RELATIONS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS CANADA (CIRNAC) 4

ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE CANANDA (ECCC) 43

FISHERIES AND OCEANS CANADA (DFO) 47

ATTACHMENT A: RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT WATER LICENCE FRAMEWORK 54

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Responses to Comments on the Draft Water Licence Framework

KITIKMEOT INUIT ASSOCIATION (KitIA)

Interested Party:	**KitIA**	**Rec No.:**	**KitIA-NWB-01 to KitIA-NWB-21**
Re:	**Technical Review Comments**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
n/a

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle thanks KitIA for their comments during the technical review process and confirms that all twenty-one technical comments were resolved, as presented and communicated by the KitIA at the Technical Meeting in July.

Interested Party:	**KitIA**	**Rec No.:**	**KitIA-FWS-01 to KitIA-FWS-05**
Re:	**Draft Water Licence Framework**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
KIA has, in coordination with our water quality consultant, provided five technical comments on Agnico Eagle's proposed draft Water Licence. These comments are provided below.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle has compiled comments from all parties on the Draft Water Licence Framework and provided responses in Attachment A.

CROWN-INDIGENOUS RELATIONS AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS CANADA (CIRNAC)

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-01**
Re:	**Quality Of Water Sources**		

Request Made by Interested Party:

CIRNAC recommended that the proponent provide updated and consolidated seasonal baseline water quality and water source capacity information for Doris, Patch, and Windy Lakes, as well as long-term monitoring throughout the life of the mine. Agnico Eagle responded that sufficient baseline information already exists on the NWB registry and that the existing AEMP provides ongoing long-term monitoring, making additional information unnecessary for the amendment application.

This TRC is resolved as the NWB indicated that the proponent did not have to provide the information in the requested format.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-02**
Re:	**Discharge Criteria**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC recommended updating discharge criteria to include the full suite of current CCME freshwater quality guidelines. Agnico Eagle disagreed, stating that CCME guidelines are not intended to serve as direct discharge limits and that the existing licensed criteria remain protective and appropriate.

This TRC is resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	CIRNAC	Rec No.:	CIRNAC-TRC-03
Re:	Summary Table of Expected Quality and Quantity of Water and Adaptative Management Criteria		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested a consolidated summary of predicted water quality, water quantities, adaptive management triggers, and response actions throughout the site. Presenting water quality and quantity estimates, adaptive management criteria and water quality criteria, would allow detection of early warning signs of water management issues. In case of unplanned discharge or spill, this would decrease risk to the receiving environment. Agnico Eagle responded that this information is already contained within the Water and Load Balance Model and existing management plans, and that additional summary tables are not required.

This TRC is unresolved as the requested information was not provided and is not contained in the documents referenced by the proponent.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle disagrees with CIRNAC's position that information has not been provided.

In CIRNAC's technical comment submitted on June 19, 2026, CIRNAC requested Agnico Eagle provide:

- A summary table of expected water quantity and quality of water over time in all sumps and monitoring stations:
    i. *If applicable*, adaptive management criteria to benchmark if mitigation/contingency are to be implemented;
    ii. *If applicable*, water quality criteria; and
    iii. Management action.

In the July 3, 2026 submission, Agnico Eagle responded by referencing documents submitted in this Amendment Application, such as the Water and Load Balance Report (Appendix 4-F) and the Water Management Plan (Appendix 6-P) that provide technical evidence required to appropriately evaluate the Amendment Application.

Licence Amendment Review Process

A key issue from a water licensing perspective is confirmation that the surrounding Nunavut waters will be protected through appropriate management of water and waste within that same general area proposed in the Amendment.

As it pertains to impacts to water (the subject of this technical comment) a water and load balance model was developed (Appendix 4-F) that incorporates contaminant loading from industrial and domestic sources within the project boundaries. In this Application, as previously indicated, Agnico Eagle provided

documentation that demonstrates end-of-pipe MDMER criteria will be readily achieved (Appendix 4-F), favorable mixing in Roberts Bay will create a minimal mixing zone (Appendix 4-G), even during periods of high discharge, and receiving environmental water quality criteria will be achieved. This information is sufficient to demonstrate positive performance of the project from a water impact standpoint.

Annual Report Review Process

As it pertains to nodes within the boundaries of the mine site, such as sumps and ponds, Agnico Eagle provides results in the annual report, which is provided to intervenors and reviewers, such as CIRNAC, for comment. Summary tables are presented using analytical data collected from monitoring stations, and a comparative analysis is completed against model forecasts, regulated benchmarks, and/or internal benchmarks. Any issues or deviations are discussed in the annual report, and a description of mitigative measures is provided as needed. As a mature mine site, Hope Bay has now gone through over a decade of annual reports, all of which have been reviewed and commented on by CIRNAC.

Hope Bay mine site has well-established management plans such as the Spill Contingency Plan (Appendix 6-M), Water Management Plan (Appendix 6-P), and Groundwater Management Plan (Appendix 6-E). These plans all contain descriptions of how Agnico Eagle manages water on a day-to-day basis, including:

- Description of the Mine as it pertains to the relevant subject (i.e., spills, quarries, groundwater etc.);
- Applicable benchmarks or criteria;
- Applicable mitigations; and
- Actions plans.

Conclusion

The conclusion of the Water and Load Balance Report (Appendix 4-F) remains that Hope Bay will be able to manage expected water quantity and quality from industrial and domestic sources. The predicted discharge forecast demonstrated that a limited number of parameters will require treatment, and that those parameters will be well within the treatable range.

For these reasons, Agnico Eagle does not agree that this technical comment remains unresolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-04**
Re:	**Method(s) Of Extraction And Operating Of Pump(s)**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested information regarding water extraction methods and pump operating capacities to assess potential effects of increased water withdrawals. CIRNAC requested the information in a consolidated format, to ensure all information was up to date and reflective of the current site conditions and ensure that the present and planned capacity was sufficient for the proponent's requested withdrawal increase and that there were no obvious concerns related to drawdown at the identified water bodies. Agnico Eagle stated that existing water intake infrastructure is unchanged and previously approved, and that details for any future intake infrastructure would be provided through the normal design review process.

This TRC is considered resolved as the NWB indicated that the proponent did not have to provide the information in the requested format. On June 23, 2026, Agnico submitted the design report for an additional freshwater intake at Windy lake in order to have enough capacity for the planned increase in freshwater withdrawal, which was after the June 19 deadline for written submission by interveners for the TM and PHC.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

In addition, Agnico Eagle notes that CIRNAC provided comment on the Windy Lake North Intake Design Report, as part of the Part D, Item 1 review process.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-05**
Re:	**Water Management Infrastructure Information**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested updated consolidated information on reservoirs, crossings, diversions, and other water management infrastructure to verify their suitability under the amended project, given the planned increase in mine life, mining activity and age of the infrastructure. Agnico Eagle responded that these facilities were previously reviewed and approved and continue to be inspected and monitored under existing regulatory requirements.

This TRC is considered resolved as the NWB indicated that the proponent did not have to provide the information in the requested format.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-06**
Re:	**Prediction Of Climate Trends**		

Request Made by Interested Party:

CIRNAC recommended that the proponent produce climate change assessment using the higher-emissions SSP5-8.5 scenario to evaluate long-term project risks. The proponent responded that sensitivity analysis demonstrated minimal differences between SSP2-4.5 and SSP5-8.5 during the operational period and therefore maintained that SSP2-4.5 was appropriate for the amendment assessment.

This TRC is considered resolved based on the proponent's commitment WLA-19.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved and reiterates the commitment made as discussed at the Technical Meeting, as follows:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-19	CIRNAC	CIRNAC-TRC-06	Prediction Of Climate Trends	Agnico Eagle will consider climate change in closure related studies.	As applicable through the ICRP

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-07**
Re:	**Ice Road**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested information on anticipated water use, construction methods, monitoring, and safety measures associated with ice roads. Agnico Eagle responded that ice-road water use was approved under the 2018 licence amendment and remains unchanged, with activities continuing under existing licence conditions and DFO protocols.

This TRC is resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-08**
Re:	**Management Plans**		

Request Made by Interested Party:

CIRNAC recommended that the proponent correct inconsistencies in management plans and update water management, spill contingency, dam emergency, and emergency response plans covering all project phases. The proponent committed to updating the plans after licence approval and noted that management plans are routinely revised throughout the life of the project.

This recommendation is considered resolved based on the proponent's commitment WLA-01.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved and reiterates the commitment made as discussed at the Technical Meeting, as follows:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-01	CIRNAC	CIRNAC-TRC-8	Water Management Plan	Agnico Eagle will update the Water Management Plan to incorporate applicable updates reflecting the Water Licence Amendment, as shown in Table 1 to response to CIRNAC-TRC-8.	60 days from Minister approval of WL Amendment

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-09**
Re:	**Outstanding Information Requests With Commitment From Proponent**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested clarification regarding several information requests (IR-08c, IR-14, IR-25, IR-37a, IR-37b), for which the proponent had previously committed to provide follow-up information. Agnico Eagle responded that the requested information had been provided directly to CIRNAC on June 18, 2026, and was included as an attachment to its submission.

This TRC is resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-10**
Re:	**Tailing Volume Comparison and Reconciliation to FEIS**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested a reconciliation between proposed tailings quantities and volumes assessed during previous approvals, including the FEIS and that the proponent demonstrate that the approximately 90% increase in tailings production remains within the previously assessed environmental impact assessment envelope. The proponent responded that the amendment focuses on maximizing use of the existing TIA and maintained that sufficient storage capacity exists to accommodate the proposed tailings management strategy.

This does not answer CIRNAC's request for a numerical reconciliation of previously assessed or authorized mined and tailings quantities against the amended quantities. Nor does it provide the technical analysis requested to demonstrate that the approximately 90% increase in tailings inventory remains within the previously assessed environmental impact envelope.

This TRC is unresolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle disagrees with CIRNAC's position that this comment is unresolved. This is a request that is not relevant to the Amendment Application. CIRNAC does not have any particular specialized jurisdiction over TIAs, which likely forms some of the reason they are asking such questions.

Agnico Eagle provided responses to CIRNAC and KitIA on July 3, 2026 that confirms the adequacy of the TIA to store tailings for the proposed increase in production.

Numeral reconciliation of the estimated tailings volumes in the FEIS as compared to the current proposed tailings strategies would introduce irrelevant information into this Licence Amendment process. Agnico Eagle prefers to focus on including information in the process that directly matters to the items that the NWB is being called upon to consider in its decision making.

The NIRB environmental assessment process focuses on design concepts, at a high level. The conversion of Tail Lake into a TIA has been a key feature of the mine since it was proposed in the early 2000s. The environmental assessment question mainly focused on whether converting Tail Lake into a TIA would cause significant environmental effects. The NIRB concluded it would not. As would be expected, there is no term and condition of the Project Certificate that limits the number of tailings that can be put in the TIA, nor does it specify any particular tailings deposition methodology. Non-significant modifications to the project are permitted after an initial assessment, and the Amendment Application has already been deemed a non-significant modification. The fact that the mine overall remains within the same footprint and that all tailings would continue to be managed by deposition to the TIA was a factor in that determination.

The 2017 FEIS examined potential environmental impacts from mining related activities in a specific area. As noted previously, the overall area of the Hope Bay Mine has not materially changed - Agnico Eagle has worked to refine and optimize the operation of Hope Bay to ensure it is economical while remaining protective of the environment. Part of this optimization requires processing the previously assessed underground mines at a higher tonnage rate, meaning generating more tailings material. Agnico Eagle has been transparent that this will result in the generation of more tailings – and that all of these tailings will continue to be contained in the TIA.

The water licensing process is meant to focus on the detailed design issues, such as tailings volumes. That is why Agnico Eagle shared the estimated tailings volume going forward to be managed in the TIA as part of this Amendment Application. Obviously, the generation of more tailings and waste rock as a result of the Amendment Application is a change that triggers an amendment to the Water Licence. But the key issue from a water licensing perspective is not how many tonnes of tailings are deposited to the TIA (a licensed and approved facility) compared to original estimates, it is confirmation that the surrounding Nunavut waters will be protected through appropriate management of water and waste within that same general area proposed in the Amendment.

The overarching goal in this Licence Amendment is to use existing infrastructure where possible to ensure it is used to its fullest design capacity, which will help Hope Bay to continue to operate in a way that aligns with the original proponent commitments, within a minimized footprint, and reduce potential for negative environmental effects. Agnico Eagle provided in its Amendment Application, the conceptual deposition plan which describes the deposition of slurry, and a transition to filtered tailings (Appendix 3-A). Agnico Eagle has demonstrated that the proposed tailings deposition strategy remains within the existing Tail Lake catchment and utilizes the storage capacity of the already assessed and approved TIA. Figure 2-1 of Appendix 3-A clearly shows that the increased tailings quantity will remain within the previously assessed Tail Lake catchment area. Further details of dry stack tailings will be provided to the NWB for approval in the form of updated plans and designs that address the optimization at a later date post issuance of the amended Water Licence.

Agnico Eagle has provided the Board with what it needs to confirm our assumptions, including consideration of all of the actual relevant components in its tailings deposition plan and validated its assertion that the tailings will all fit in the TIA with evidence, as presented in Appendix 3-A.

Accordingly, Agnico Eagle maintains that CIRNAC's information requests are irrelevant to the issues before the NWB at his time and should not be introduced into this process. The appropriate information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed Amendment remains within the approved TIA catchment area and achieves the fundamental goal of optimization of tailings management that is protective of Nunavut waters.

For these reasons, Agnico Eagle does not agree that this technical comment remains unresolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-11**
Re:	**Waste Rock Quantities and Mining Area Reconciliation to FEIS**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested that the proponent reconcile mined tonnes and waste rock volumes with FEIS assumptions, confirm spatial limits or quantify expansions, identify increased total mining versus sequencing/throughput change only and demonstrate that geochemical and water-management effects remain within prior bounds.

The proponent responded that geochemical and water management effects remain generally consistent with previous assessments and that future facilities will continue to be governed by existing plans and design review requirements. The requested material-quantity reconciliation remains absent and the geochemical comparability conclusion materially understates the change identified in the proponent's data.

This TRC is unresolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle disagrees with CIRNAC's position that this comment is unresolved. Similar to the detailed reasons included in our response to CIRNAC-TRC-10 above; the Amendment Application has already been deemed a non-significant modification from the environmental assessment perspective, and was referred to the NWB for consideration as an amendment (Appendix 2-A from the Application) – which is the process we are in now.

As stated in Agnico Eagle's response to technical comments on July 3, 2026, future Waste Rock Storage Facilities (WRSFs) will be designed and operated to minimize the impact on the environment in accordance with the stringent terms and conditions established by the NWB, and waste rock will be managed as per the Waste Rock, Ore, and Mine Backfill Management Plan (Appendix 6-O from the Application), for example:

- Waste rock brought to surface is stored in designated surface stockpiles.
- Prior to closure, the majority of this material is planned to be transported underground for use as backfill. The final quantity of waste rock placed underground will depend on the extent to which paste tailings are utilized for backfilling, as they may replace a portion of the waste rock in underground voids.
- At closure, some waste rock characterized as suitable will be utilized for construction of surface infrastructure.

The request to compare mined tonnes and waste rock volumes from an environmental assessment versus management plans that are updated annually, or as required, would not provide useful information in this

Amendment process because ultimately the WRSFs need to be designed, constructed, and managed to the engineering and environmental design criteria, and runoff needs to be captured and managed.

As stated in Agnico Eagle's response to technical comments on July 3, 2026, geochemistry of the rock remains consistent comparing 2017 to 2024 datasets. This is detailed in Section 4.1.1 of the Main Application Document. CIRNAC suggests that an increase in material quantity directly relates to an increase in contaminant transport. This is incorrect. As presented in the water and load balance report (Appendix 4-F), the increase in mined tonnes and waste rock volume is consistent with the previous water quality predictions. Untreated water quality predictions in the report indicate predicted water quality can be managed through water treatment as required, as previously approved.

For these reasons, Agnico Eagle does not agree that this technical comment remains unresolved.

Interested Party:	CIRNAC	Rec No.:	CIRNAC-TRC-12
Re:	Life of Mine (LOM) Reconciliation with Increased Throughput		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested clarification of mine life, total mined tonnes, and implications for cumulative water withdrawals and discharges. Agnico Eagle confirmed a 14-year operational mine life consistent with previous assessments and advised that water use projections were incorporated into the amendment modelling.

- *R-12(a) – CIRNAC requested clarification regarding the remaining future Life Of Mine, which has been clarified as a 14-year future operating period by the proponent. This sub-recommendation is resolved.*
- *•R-12 (b),(c) and (d) – CIRNAC requested clarification regarding the total revised project duration, tonnes and cumulative water implications comparison between the original FEIS, actual operations to date and the proposed remaining operating period. These sub-recommendations remain unresolved due to the proponent declining to provide a clarifying table containing the requested information, which was proposed by CIRNAC during the TM and PHC.*

As a result, this TRC is only partially resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Similar to the detailed reasons included in our response to CIRNAC-TRC-10 and CIRNAC-TRC-11 above, Agnico Eagle disagrees with CIRNAC's position that this comment is unresolved. The Amendment Application has already been deemed a non-significant modification from the environmental assessment perspective (see Appendix 2-A of the Application), and was referred to the NWB for consideration as an amendment – which is the process we are in now. In addition, and as mentioned previously, the Operational Update is best understood as an optimization and refinement of the approved Hope Bay Mine, rather than a new project or a new type of activity.

Response to bullet b,c, and d
Agnico Eagle disagrees that these comments are unresolved. The key for a water licence application is not comparison to the FEIS, but comparison to previous water licence applications. CIRNAC is asking for high-level environmental assessment conceptual considerations, when what matters for an amendment application is consideration of detailed technical matters and design.

In the technical comment responses provided on July 3, 2026, Agnico Eagle confirmed that the life of mine would be approximately 14 years (the same number of operational years as was presented in the 2017 FEIS), and confirmed that water use implications have been considered for this Application. See response to comments KIA-NWB-06, KIA-NWB-08, KIA-NWB-09, KIA-NWB-19, KIA-NWB-20, DFO-TRC-02, and DFO-TRC-05 in the July 3, 2026 submission.

It is unclear how a table with summarized information may further resolve this information request, or more importantly provide any useful information to the NWB, given that the information has been previously provided in the application, and that mine plans naturally evolve through time.

For these reasons, Agnico Eagle does not agree that this technical comment remains unresolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-13**
Re:	**Multiple-Accounts Analysis (MAA) – Tailings Management Strategy Selection**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested the Multiple-Accounts Analysis supporting the selection of filtered tailings over alternative tailings management approaches. Agnico Eagle provided a short list of alternatives and a brief qualitative statement indicating that filtered tailings were preferred because they reduce water inventories, seepage potential, dam raising requirements, and support progressive reclamation. The response does not show how the alternatives performed against the relevant technical, environmental, closure, geotechnical and economic considerations; does not show the relative importance of those considerations; and does not present scores, rankings or sensitivity.

This TRC is unresolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle reminds CIRNAC that its information request on this topic was either for Agnico Eagle to produce its internal Multiple Accounts Analysis (MAA; which includes internal considerations that are not relevant to the decision the NWB would need to make to approve Agnico Eagle to proceed with dry stack), or to share a summary of its MAA. As invited by CIRNAC, Agnico Eagle produced a summary. It is clear that Agnico Eagle has already produced information in its responses that gave CIRNAC the information it was asking for – CIRNAC should not be allowed to continually shift its information requests.

As per responses to the information request (CIRNAC-IR-27; April 9), technical comment (CIRNAC-TRC-13; July 3), as well as discussions at the Technical Meeting (July 16-17), Agnico Eagle does not agree that the requested internal Agnico Eagle MAA is necessary or proportionate to the scope of the Amendment.

The request appears to treat the use of filtered tailings as though Agnico Eagle is seeking approval for a new tailings management facility, a new disposal location, or a fundamentally different project activity. That is not the case. Tailings generation and management are already authorized components of the Hope Bay Mine, and the proposed approach would continue to manage tailings within the existing TIA catchment (also see response to CIRNAC-TRC-10). The Amendment optimizes how the tailings are dewatered and deposited within the approved tailings management system. It does not introduce a new waste stream, a new receiving environment, or a new tailings management location.

As noted in response to KitIA-NWB-05 (July 3, 2026 submission), the overarching goal in this amendment is to use existing infrastructure where possible to ensure it is used to its fullest design capacity, which will help Hope Bay to continue to operate within a minimized footprint, limit incremental environmental disturbance, and reduce potential for negative environmental effects. As the KitIA have noted that their technical comment on the TIA is resolved (KitIA-NWB-05), and that they support deposition of dry stack tailings under this licence (see KitIA comment on the scope of the draft Water Licence; item 3a in Attachment A), it is interpreted that the KitIA have no remaining technical concerns regarding the method

of tailings disposal, but rather will continue to monitor the site and provide ongoing oversight for usage of this approved tailings area.

The relevant regulatory question is therefore whether the proposed deposition approach can be implemented safely to protect Nunavut Waters and whether its potential impacts on Nunavut waters are adequately characterized and managed. The Amendment materials address this question through evidence (i.e., the conceptual design [Appendix 3-A of the Application], water and load balance modelling [Appendix 4-F of the Application]). Providing criteria weightings, numerical scores, economic rankings, and sensitivity testing would not provide information necessary to determine whether the proposed activity is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, or consistent with the purposes of the water licence.

Agnico Eagle has not suggested that the selected approach was arbitrary or unsupported. The phased transition to filtered tailings was selected based on identifiable technical and environmental considerations. As noted in the July 3 Technical Comment responses, alternative tailings management approaches have also already been considered through the project's assessment and approval history. Dry stack tailings was evaluated during the 2017 FEIS and subsequent NIRB assessment process, and Tail Lake was selected as the tailings management location. Project Certificate No. 003, Term and Condition 6, expressly recognizes that modifications to the TIA may occur as project development proceeds. The proposed amendment is consistent with that contemplated adaptive and phased approach.

The deposition approach has received support from the KitIA, as well as other participating parties, and no information has been identified demonstrating that conventional slurry deposition would produce superior water-related or environmental outcomes within the existing TIA.

CIRNAC's request also extends beyond the matters necessary to evaluate the proposed amendment. Economic scoring and corporate decision weightings may influence project planning, but they do not determine whether filtered tailings can be safely managed under the water licence.

Accordingly, Agnico Eagle maintains that the information already submitted is sufficient for the Board to evaluate the proposed tailings management approach. The requested detailed MAA is neither necessary nor proportionate to the nature of the Amendment. Agnico Eagle therefore respectfully submits that requiring a detailed MAA would be disproportionate and unnecessary for the Board's decision. Agnico Eagle did the work in its MAA, as well as through many years of internal evaluation of Hope Bay operations strategies to narrow the options down to those being presented to the Board in the Amendment Application. At the end of the day, how the selected alternatives will perform is the key question for this application, not whether CIRNAC agrees with process Agnico Eagle used to choose the strategies it is putting forward to the Board for approval.

For these reasons, Agnico Eagle does not agree that this technical comment remains unresolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-14**
Re:	**Dry Stack Tailings Closure Strategy**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested additional details regarding closure design, performance predictions, and closure costs for the dry-stack tailings facility. Agnico Eagle responded that closure planning remains conceptual at this stage and will be refined through future ICRP updates, while noting that modelling considered geomembrane cover scenarios and predicted achievement of closure objectives.

- *R-14(a) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent provide a conceptual dry-stack closure design. The proponent initially confirmed that the dry-stack closure concept remains preliminary and no defined dry-stack cover, infiltration control system or closure water-management approach was provided. At the TM and PHC, the proponent committed to add a statement for inclusion to the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan of the conceptual closure concept of the dry-stack facility. (WLA-15). CIRNAC has reviewed the proponent's response to that commitment distributed by the NWB on August 7, 2026, which is contained in Annex B. Given that the information submitted as part of the proponent's response to commitments WLA-15 was found to not answer CIRNAC's concerns,* ***the sub-recommendation is unresolved.***
- *R-14(b) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent confirm the use of a geomembrane assumption in source-term/WLB modelling.* ***This sub-recommendation is resolved.***
- *R-14(c) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent provide incremental geomembrane closure cost.* ***This sub-request is being addressed through a parallel security process.***
- *R-14(d) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent model post-closure seepage under baseline and climate-change conditions. It is CIRNAC's position that this information should be provided for review prior to approval for transition to dry-stack tailing by the NWB. This sub-recommendation is in discussion as part of WLA-13 with the proponent and the NWB, with CIRNAC's position on the matter contained in Annex A.* ***This sub-recommendation is currently unresolved.***
- *R-14(e) – CIRNAC requested the proponent demonstrate that closure objectives can be achieved without long-term active treatment. It is CIRNAC's position that this information should be provided for review prior to approval for transition to dry-stack tailing by the NWB. This sub-recommendation is in discussion as part of WLA-13 with the proponent and the NWB, with CIRNAC's position on the matter contained in Annex A.* ***This sub-recommendation is currently unresolved.***

As a result, this TRC is only partially resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Response to bullet a)

As discussed and agreed upon at the Technical Meeting, commitment WLA-15 was "*Agnico Eagle will add a statement for inclusion to the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan of the conceptual closure concept of the dry-stack facility*".

Draft text to be included in the next version of the ICRP was submitted to the Board on August 6, 2026. The draft text is consistent with the text currently in the ICRP for conceptual closure of slurry deposition only in the approved TIA.

The information as agreed upon has been provided, and therefore Agnico Eagle does not agree that this technical comment remains unresolved.

Response to bullet b)

Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Response to bullet c)

As confirmed to the Board on September 23, 2026 by Agnico Eagle on behalf of CIRNAC and KitIA, CIRNAC has agreed to the Global Security Quantum, which includes tranches to support the tailings cover, as was previously documented in the submission the technical comment responses on July 3, 2026:

- Tranche 1 includes a 0.3 m erosion cover on current 176 ha TIA footprint as per the current slurry tailings design. This tranche also includes TIA shoreline protection, 0.5 m, and associated geomembrane for the final shoreline area of 45 ha.
- Tranche 2 includes 0.3 m erosion cover on final 191.1 ha TIA footprint as per the current slurry tailings design.
- Tranche 3 includes the final 191.1 ha footprint lined with geomembrane, should an isolation cover be required.

Response to bullet d, e)

Agnico Eagle feels strongly that our submitted commitment (initially provided on July 20, 2026, and repasted below) meets the requirements of the Licence and is directly related to this file. In addition, KitIA agrees with this commitment based on their review of the file.

> **WLA-13 - Commitment**
>
> Prior to proceeding with transition to dry stack tailings, Agnico Eagle will follow the existing Water Licence terms and conditions as follows, which will provide an opportunity for review of technical details of dry stack before it is implemented.
>
> In addition to the 60 day notice required under the Type A Water Licence, Agnico Eagle has committed to share the draft its (a)-(c) below with CIRNAC and KIA at least 30 days prior to submission to the Board, which will provide for a pre-application consultation period. 30 days will be reasonable, and this will include sign off by Agnico Eagles EOR, etc.

****

As per the existing Part B, Item 9 prior to transitioning to dry stack tailings or any other tailings management methodologies, Agnico Eagle will submit notice of such change in operating plans to the Board.

Prior to transition, Agnico Eagle will also submit the following items to the Board:

(a) A Tailings Deposition Plan per Part B, Item 13 for Board review and approval, which will include:

(i) a description of the rationale for the transition,

(ii) an update to the water quality and water quantity predictions;

(b) All relevant final design and Construction drawings in accordance with Part D, Item 1 for Board review and approval; and

(c) Any relevant modification notice required with respect to the Tailings Impoundment Area under Part G, "Conditions Applying to Modifications.

The Part B, Item 9 notice shall include notice of any applicable tranches in Schedule C to the security related to the transition and written confirmation to the Board that Agnico Eagle has shared items (a) –(b) with KitIA and CIRNAC at least 30 days prior to submission to the Board.

As per Agnico Eagle's commitment WLA-13 above, an update to the water quality and water quantity predictions will be provided as part of the submission of an updated Tailings Deposition Plan for approval to the NWB prior to transitioning to dry stack tailings or any other tailings management methodology. The predictions can include the post-closure period.

Agnico Eagle provided a response on July 3, 2026 to CIRNAC-TRC-14d,e regarding achievement of closure water quality objectives. Those statements are still valid.

For these reasons, Agnico Eagle maintains that the information already submitted, in combination with commitment WLA-13, addresses this technical comment.

Interested Party:	CIRNAC	Rec No.:	CIRNAC-TRC-15
Re:	Fugitive Dust and Air Quality – Dry Stack Tailings (Operational Phase)		

Request Made by Interested Party:

CIRNAC requested assessment of dust generation, contaminant composition, mitigation measures, and potential impacts on water quality. The proponent responded that dust management is already addressed through approved air quality and operational management programs and that dry-stack tailings are not expected to cause measurable adverse environmental effects.

- *R-15(a) – CIRNAC requested the quantitative dry-stack dust assessment. The proponent declined to provide a quantitative dry-stack dust assessment because the design remains conceptual and implementation is planned later in the mine life. This sub-recommendation is unresolved.*
- *R-15(b) – CIRNAC requested characterization of the expected dust composition, including key parameters such as arsenic. The proponent provided the bulk tailings chemistry, however bulk tailings chemistry does not characterize the wind-transportable particulate fraction and does not address the composition of material that may actually be dispersed and deposited to surface water. This sub-recommendation is unresolved.*
- *R-15(c) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent describe dry-stack-specific mitigation and monitoring. The proponent relies on the existing Doris TIA dust-control approach developed for subaerial slurry tailings. It does not provide a dry-stack-specific dust management approach addressing filtered-tailings handling, placement, haul traffic, compaction, exposed lift surfaces, inactive placement areas or progressive stabilization. This sub-recommendation is unresolved.*
- *R-15(d) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent demonstrate no measurable adverse environmental effects from fugitive dust associated with dry stack tailings. The proponent relies on predictions for the unbuilt Boston dry-stack facility rather than operating performance evidence. It does not address the directly relevant operating analogue at the proponent's Meliadine Mine, where dry-stack dust dispersion is known to be contributing to significant water-quality impacts. Reliance on an unbuilt facility while ignoring the proponent's own operating dry-stack experience does not resolve the concern. This sub-recommendation is unresolved.*

In commitment WLA-14, the proponent committed that "At least 60 days prior to transitioning to dry stack tailings or any other tailings management strategies, Agnico Eagle will submit a fugitive dust modelling report." However, CIRNAC maintains that the information should be provided prior to approval to transition to dry stack or another method of tailings management from the currently approved method, which is slurry tailings.

This TRC is unresolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle does not agree that the technical comment should remain unresolved as it appears CIRNAC has added or expanded several expectations, as described in detail below. Furthermore, the Water Licence process does not have jurisdiction over air quality matters and the Water Licence properly does not include any terms and conditions that regulate dust. However, Agnico Eagle made commitment WLA-14 to provide fugitive dust modelling results to the NWB.

Agnico Eagle has reviewed CIRNAC's comment and the request is not simply a restatement of the Technical Comment raised in the original request; which is how commitment WLA-14 was derived at the Technical Meeting, reviewed at the Technical Meeting round-table, and agreed to by Parties at that time.

Of particular importance, as outlined in the NWB's Pre-hearing Conference Decision (NWB Registry; page 22 of 42)

> "*On the morning of July 17, 2026, a draft of the List of Commitments made by the parties during the TM and prepared by Agnico Eagle, was also shared and discussed, and the Board included parties input when commitments proposed weren't fully satisfying expectations and asked parties whether the commitments were sufficient to resolve any outstanding technical issues or not,* ***and received parties' positive confirmation on this matter.***"

Agnico Eagle agreed to provide the following 60-days prior to the transition.

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-14	CIRNAC	CIRNAC-TRC-15a-d	Transition to Dry-stack Tailings Deposition	At least 60 days prior to transitioning to dry stack tailings or any other tailings management strategies, Agnico Eagle will submit a fugitive dust modelling report.	60 days prior to transitioning to dry stack tailings

Now, it appears CIRNAC has added or expanded several expectations. The time for making new information requests in this process has long since passed. The general issue was previously raised, but CIRNAC's new request expands the required technical scope, prescribes additional evidence, and changes the timing of the deliverable. Below is Agnico Eagle's evaluation of the additional requests from CIRNAC.

Topic	Original Request	New Information or Expectation Added	Evaluation
R-15(a): Quantitative dust assessment	Provide a quantitative assessment of fugitive dust generation from dry-stack tailings during operations.	CIRNAC records that the assessment was declined because the design remains conceptual and implementation is planned later in the mine life. CIRNAC then declares the item unresolved.	No major change to the technical deliverable itself. Note: Agnico Eagle agreed to provide this information as part of the future submission to the NWB as related to "transition to dry stack tailings or any other tailings management strategy".
R-15(b): Dust composition	Characterize expected dust composition, including arsenic.	CIRNAC now specifies that bulk tailings chemistry is insufficient because it does not characterize the **wind-transportable particulate fraction** or the material that could actually be dispersed and deposited to surface water.	**Expanded technical expectation.** The original request did not expressly require size-fraction-specific or transportable-particulate characterization.
R-15(c): Mitigation and monitoring	Describe dust mitigation and monitoring measures. The supporting text also requested operational dust controls specific to the dry stack.	CIRNAC now identifies particular sources and conditions that a dry-stack-specific approach must address: filtered-tailings handling, placement, haul traffic, compaction, exposed lift surfaces, inactive placement areas, and progressive stabilization.	**Substantially more prescriptive.** Dry-stack-specific controls were already requested, but the detailed activity-by-activity scope is new.
R-15(d): Environmental effects	Confirm that dust deposition will not result in measurable adverse effects on environmental quality, including surface water. The original request also referred to deposition to nearby water bodies and snowpack.	CIRNAC rejects use of predictions for the unbuilt Boston dry-stack facility and calls for consideration of operating-performance evidence. It identifies Meliadine as the directly relevant operating analogue and states that dry-stack dust dispersion there is contributing to significant water-quality impacts.	**Expanded evidentiary expectation.** The original request asked for confirmation of effects, but did not expressly require operating-performance evidence or prescribe Meliadine as the analogue that must be addressed.
Timing of modelling report	No explicit submission deadline or approval-stage requirement appears in the original request; but was discussed at the Technical Meeting.	CIRNAC cites commitment WLA-14, under which the modelling report would be submitted at least 60 days before transitioning to dry stack or another tailings strategy. CIRNAC now maintains that the information must be provided **before approval to transition** from slurry tailings.	**Clear new procedural request.** This changes the regulatory decision point for providing the modelling.

Accordingly, Agnico Eagle maintains that the technical comment is resolved by:

1. the commitment as is presented in WLA-14 (above)
2. the commitment and discussion as reviewed at the Technical Meeting
3. the Pre-hearing Decision Report

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-16**
Re:	**Updated Tailings Facility Design and Operation**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested clarification regarding references to future tailings remaining within the existing TIA footprint. Agnico Eagle clarified that the amended tailings facility would remain within the existing Tail Lake TIA catchment area and would not involve a new tailings disposal site or receiving environment.

This TC is resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-17**
Re:	**Justification of Maximum Water Withdrawal Rates (Dry Stack Transition)**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested justification for proposed freshwater withdrawal limits in light of increased water recovery associated with filtered tailings. Agnico Eagle responded that the proposed limits include a 20% contingency for operational flexibility and represent maximum possible requirements rather than expected annual withdrawals.

This TC is resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-18**
Re:	**Water Balance Stress Test (Non-Average Conditions)**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested stress testing of the water balance model under drought and extreme inflow conditions. Agnico Eagle responded that climate variability and extreme events were incorporated into its modelling and infrastructure design, and concluded that storage, pumping, and treatment systems are adequately sized.

This TRC was withdrawn as the subject was covered by other TRCs and IRs.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is withdrawn.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-19**
Re:	**No Freshwater Discharge Commitment**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested confirmation that no project-related discharges to freshwater would occur and requested details on contingency measures. Agnico Eagle responded that contact water would generally be routed to treatment and marine discharge, while existing authorized tundra discharges would continue under existing licence conditions.

This TRC is resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	CIRNAC	Rec No.:	CIRNAC-TRC-20
Re:	Source Term Conservatism and Sensitivity		

Request Made by Interested Party:

CIRNAC requested clarification of conservative modelling assumptions and sensitivity analyses for geochemical source-term predictions. The Interim Source Term Report provided estimates of constituent releases but the application does not identify whether these assumptions represent conservative conditions, nor did it evaluate sensitivity to key parameters such as arsenic, sulphate and nitrogen species. Geochemical source terms directly control predicted effluent quality and contaminant loading. Without the requested information, it is not possible to confirm that predicted effluent quality and associated loading remain within acceptable bounds under plausible conditions. Agnico Eagle responded that both base-case and conservative upper-case scenarios were modelled and that sensitivity analyses were completed for key parameters including arsenic and sulphate.

- *R-20(a) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent identify conservative source-term assumptions. The proponent identifies Base Case and Upper Case source-term methods using median and 95th-percentile weathering and solubility inputs. This is responsive only to parameter uncertainty within a preselected project configuration and is not sufficient.*
  The integrated environmental assessment is not conservative with respect to the more consequential configuration uncertainty. The WLB was run under a single Base Case configuration that assumes the transition to filtered tailings and, at closure, takes credit for a low-permeability geomembrane. The proponent has not committed to either the filtered-tailings transition or the geomembrane. The model therefore evaluates the most optimistic tailings-management and closure configuration among the configurations the proponent seeks to retain.
- *R-20(b) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent provide sensitivity analysis for arsenic, sulphate and nitrogen. The proponent identified Upper Case source terms, but did not propagate those Upper Case source terms through the integrated WLB to assess end-of-pipe concentrations, treatment requirements or receiving-environment loads. It also did not test continued slurry deposition or closure without the geomembrane.*
- *R-20(c) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent demonstrate acceptable effluent quality under a range of plausible conditions. The proponent's statement that predicted water quality is acceptable and that treatment is available relies on the single favourable Base Case. It does not demonstrate acceptable performance over the range of plausible source-term, tailings-management and closure configurations.*

To resolve this concern, the proponent committed during the TM and PHC to provide water and load balance results for slurry only deposition with comparison of results to the already provided model (Appendix 4-F; Commitment WLA-16). CIRNAC has reviewed the proponent's response to that commitment distributed by the NWB on August 7, 2026.

As part of this submission, the proponent has only presented 4 years of predictions beyond the operations period and has not provided the requested long-term post-closure water quality predictions for the TIA closure scenarios they are now proposing to construct (i.e., 0.3 m Run Of Quarry (ROQ) covers). Instead, the modelling provided is limited to the operational and closure phases which are not representative of long-term closure conditions.

CIRNAC also notes that the predictions are compared against the MDMER criteria, which are not appropriate performance benchmarks for closed sites. Similarly, the predictions only describe the seepage quality from the TIA and predictions have not been provided to demonstrate that water quality in the downstream receivers will protect aquatic life throughout the post-closure phase. On this basis, the proponent has not demonstrated that the site's long-term post-closure water quality will be acceptable and TRC-20 remains unresolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle disagrees that this comment is unresolved. Agnico Eagle has reviewed CIRNAC's comment and the request is not simply a restatement of the Technical Comment raised in the original request; which is how commitment WLA-16 was derived at the Technical Meeting, reviewed at the Technical Meeting round-table, and agreed to by Parties at that time.

Of particular importance, as outlined in the NWB's Pre-hearing Conference Decision (NWB Registry; page 22 of 42)

> "*On the morning of July 17, 2026, a draft of the List of Commitments made by the parties during the TM and prepared by Agnico Eagle, was also shared and discussed, and the Board included parties input when commitments proposed weren't fully satisfying expectations and asked parties whether the commitments were sufficient to resolve any outstanding technical issues or not,* ***and received parties' positive confirmation on this matter.***"

Agnico Eagle agreed to and fulfilled:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-16	CIRNAC	CIRNAC-TRC-20	Water and Load Balance Summary	Agnico Eagle will provide a water and load balance results for slurry only deposition with comparison of results to the already provided model (Appendix 4-F).	August 6, 2026

As it relates to the information provided for commitment WLA-16 on August 6, 2026, the agreed commitment was to provide water and load balance results for slurry only deposition with comparison to results already provided. Information provided in WLA-16 is consistent with the model horizon and prediction nodes provided in the water and load balance report (Appendix 4-F of the Application).

However, CIRNAC now requests predictions for a longer model horizon than what has been provided. Additionally, CIRNAC is also requesting predictions for downstream receivers. Neither requests were

discussed as part of the original commitment, and CIRNAC is now changing the terms of the commitment. Again, the time for new information requests in this process has long since passed.

Once these details in the cover design are available, Agnico Eagle will provide updated modelling through updates to the ICRP, which will be submitted to the Board for approval as previously indicated. We anticipate that CIRNAC would follow the established practice of asking questions and making reasonable information requests in relation to those plan updates as part of the Board's engagement on the draft at that time. It would be premature to try to create such information in this process at this time.

Accordingly, Agnico Eagle maintains that the technical comment is resolved by:

1. the commitment as is presented in WLA-16 (above)
2. the commitment and discussion as reviewed at the Technical Meeting
3. the Pre-hearing Decision Report
4. the information provided for commitment WLA-16 on August 6, 2026

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-21**
Re:	**Under-Ice/Seasonal Operations Constraint**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC requested clarification regarding operational constraints and water management under winter and ice-covered conditions. Agnico Eagle responded that seasonal conditions are already incorporated into infrastructure design and operational planning and that its experience operating in Nunavut supports effective winter management.

This TRC is resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle confirms that the technical comment is resolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-22**
Re:	**Uncertainty Register And Commitments**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
CIRNAC recommended that the proponent produce a formal uncertainty register identifying risks, mitigation measures, timelines, and commitments. The proponent declined the recommendation, stating that the identified issues do not represent significant project uncertainties requiring a formal uncertainty register. The current record contains multiple unresolved matters that the proponent proposes to determine through future analysis or design, including whether filtered tailings will be implemented, whether slurry deposition will continue, the final dry-stack configuration, the final closure cover, whether a geomembrane is required, closure performance without the geomembrane, Upper Case source-term implications and extreme-condition system performance. These are unresolved environmental-performance and design uncertainties.

This TC is unresolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
No other proponent in Nunavut has been asked to maintain an "uncertainty register" under a Water Licence, and as Agnico Eagle has demonstrated, there is nothing about the Amendment Application that is outside the typical range of uncertainty. As indicated in response to the Technical Comments (July 3, 2026) Agnico Eagle maintains its position and does not agree that a separate uncertainty register is necessary for this Application. All of the "uncertainties" CIRNAC has identified are typical operational decision making points, which will be tracked and addressed in the relevant Board-approved plans that address each of those specific topics. Creating a separate consolidated "uncertainty register" would be a duplicative document that would require management by Agnico Eagle and review and comment by the parties participating in the process, with no value from a water protection perspective. It would also create an unfair public perception that the Hope Bay Mine has a higher level of uncertainty than the facts support.

The matters cited by CIRNAC primarily reflect progressive engineering, operational, and closure-design development. The fact that technical details may be refined through future design work, monitoring, operational experience, or plan updates does not, by itself, constitute a material environmental uncertainty. It is well known by the NWB and anticipated by the Nunavut Agreement and NWNSRTA that technical details relating to water licensing can and do evolve over time based on the near constant monitoring data and non-significant modifications that are inherent in developing a complex mine in the Arctic environment. These matters can and will continue to be appropriately addressed through all of the means that the NWB has already established - applicable management plans, monitoring programs, design submissions, adaptive-management processes, reporting requirements, and Water Licence conditions. A separate uncertainty register would duplicate these established mechanisms without providing any environmental or regulatory benefit. Duplication for duplication's sake adds cost and risk of

confusion and inconsistency, particularly at the site level for the individuals that need to implement these plans. That is why Agnico Eagle rejects that addition of unnecessary administrative items such as the proposed “uncertainty register”.

Agnico Eagle maintains that a separate uncertainty register is neither necessary nor proportionate. There is nothing special about the “uncertainties” that are included in this Amendment Application – they are all better characterized as “known unknowns” that are all addressable using known technology and mining practices and will be answered in due course as more monitoring data is collected and detailed design advances. Any specific outstanding technical matter should be addressed (as it always has been) individually through the applicable design, management-plan, monitoring, adaptive-management, or licensing process.

For these reasons, Agnico Eagle does not agree that this technical comment remains unresolved.

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-TRC-23**
Re:	**Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan (ICRP) And Security**		

Request Made by Interested Party:

CIRNAC recommended that the proponent produce a more detailed ICRP and an updated closure security estimate reflecting the amended project scope. The proponent responded that an updated security estimate had already been provided and committed to further updating the ICRP following approval of the amendment.

- *R-23(a) – CIRNAC requested that the proponent provide closure elements, activities, quantities and schedules. The proponent acknowledges that the ICRP remains preliminary and states that it will update the ICRP after Ministerial approval of the Water Licence Amendment. However, closure assumptions are already embedded in the source terms and Water and Load Balance Model used to support the amendment. In particular, the modelling assumes a low-permeability geomembrane over the dry stack tailings even though the proponent has not selected or committed to that tailings management or closure measure. The proponent cannot rely on closure assumptions to obtain favourable predictive water-quality results and then defer the actual closure strategy until after licence approval. Commitment WLA-15 by the proponent indicates that the proponent will add a statement for inclusion to the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan of the conceptual closure concept of the dry-stack facility. CIRNAC has reviewed the proponent's response to that commitment distributed by the NWB on August 7, 2026, which is contained in Annex B. Given that the information submitted as part of the proponent's response to commitments WLA-15 was found to not answer CIRNAC's concerns,* ***the sub-recommendation is unresolved.***
- *R-23(b) – CIRNAC recommended that the proponent provide technical support for selected closure approaches. However, the proponent cannot provide technical support for the selected dry-stack closure approach because no closure approach has been selected. The geomembrane is characterized as one option and further analysis is proposed to determine whether mitigation is required. This sub-recommendation is in discussion as part of WLA-13 with the proponent and the NWB, with CIRNAC's position contained in Annex A.* ***This sub-recommendation is currently unresolved.***
- *R-23(c) – CIRNAC recommended that the proponent provide performance objectives and measurable acceptance criteria. The proponent response did not provide that information. Commitment WLA-15 by the proponent indicates that the proponent will add a statement for inclusion to the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan of the conceptual closure concept of the dry-stack facility. CIRNAC has reviewed the proponent's response to that commitment distributed by the NWB on August 7, 2026, which is contained in Annex B. Given that the information submitted as part of the proponent's response to commitments WLA-15 was found to not answer CIRNAC's concerns,* ***the sub-recommendation is unresolved.***
- *R-23(d) – CIRNAC recommended that the proponent provide closure security including the dry-stack. This sub-recommendation is being worked through during the parallel security process. As*

part of WLA-2, the proponent committed to updating Section 7 of the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan to reflect the agreed upon global security number, once an agreement is reached.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle maintains that with the agreement on Global Security Quantum (see response to CIRNAC-TRC-14c of this response package), fulfillment of commitments WLA-02 (following Minister approval), WLA-13, WLA-15, and WLA-16, and ongoing updates to the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan through the next 20 years of operation, these technical comments are resolved.

Response to bullet a), b), and c)
Agnico Eagle disagrees with CIRNAC's assertion that it is *deferring actual closure strategy*. Agnico Eagle's Water Licence Amendment Application is in line with standard practice for an *early operational update* whereby many closure concepts remain conceptual. Closure of the Doris TIA is not scheduled for nearly two decades, so Agnico Eagle has provided a menu of potential mitigations post-closure. As evident in Agnico Eagles response to CIRNAC-TRC-20 of this response package, the level of detail provided in the water and load balance for this application, and in response to commitment WLA-16, is in line with many other similar applications, most importantly the approved application submitted for Hope Bay in 2017.

Agnico Eagle also disagrees with CIRNAC's assertion that a closure strategy has *not been determined by Agnico Eagle.* The closure strategy proposed by Agnico Eagle is one that requires flexibility to implement various mitigative measures once more detailed technical information is available. The technical rationale for the geomembrane mitigation includes layered conservative assumptions, such as active layer depth, hydrogeologic behavior/permeability of materials, and long-term geochemical equilibrium. The conservative assumptions are clearly described in the application documents, namely Appendix 4-E. The geomembrane mitigation has been identified as the highest degree of engineered mitigation that *may be* required, whereas the ROQ cover is the lowest degree of engineered mitigation. In full transparency, Agnico Eagle has presented this menu of options and their corresponding costs in security tranches.

Response to bullet d)
Agnico Eagle, CIRNAC, and the KitIA have been reviewing security for many months to come to agreement on the Global Security Quantum, which includes tranches for the tailings cover.

As presented in the table below and confirmed to the Board on September 23, 2026, the Global Quantum and tranches, has been agreed to by CIRNAC, the KitIA, and Agnico Eagle.

Tranche	Activity	Total Security (Security held under the Licence)	Additional Security Required Per Tranche	Security Amount Held
1	2026 Water Licence Amendment + Security already held	$72,907,727	$25,163,867	$98,071,594
2	TIA Erosion Cover full footprint		$203,883	$98,275,477
3	TIA Geomembrane		$5,277,769	$103,553,246
4	All-weather Road Madrid-Boston, including quarries and crossings		$1,875,000	$105,428,246
5	Future Accommodation		$375,000	$105,803,246
6	Wind Turbine Pad 1, 3, 4, 5, 6		$1,837,805	$107,641,051
7	Cargo Dock		$525,274	$108,166,325
				$108,166,325

Interested Party:	**CIRNAC**	**Rec No.:**	**CIRNAC-FWS-24**
Re:	**Draft Water Licence Framework**		

Request Made by Interested Party:

The proponent submitted the Draft Amendment Licence Framework to the Board on July 31, 2026, in fulfillment of the commitment made by Agnico Eagle Mines Ltd. during the Technical Meeting and Pre-Hearing Conference held in Cambridge Bay on July 16 and 17, 2026. CIRNAC has reviewed the draft framework and provided its comments to the board on September 10.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle has compiled comments from all parties on the Draft Water Licence Framework and provided responses in Attachment A.

ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE CANANDA (ECCC)

Interested Party:	**ECCC**	**Rec No.:**	**ECCC-TRC-01 to ECCC-TRC-10**
Re:	**Technical Review Comments**		

Resolution / Request Made by Interested Party:

On July 3, 2026, Agnico Eagle Mines ('the Proponent') provided responses that resolved or partially resolved eight of ten ECCC technical comments.

During the technical session in Cambridge Bay July 15 to 16, the remaining partially resolved ECCC comments pertaining to Water Quality were addressed through three commitments from the Proponent (WLA -03, 04, and 06). WLA -03, 04 and 06 committed the Proponent to review and evaluate the newest versions of FEQG and CCME guidelines and to update the appropriate plans with any required changes. The remaining partially resolved comments were fully resolved through discussions and commitments (WLA -05, 07, 08, 09) during the technical session.

During the technical session, ECCC TC #3, regarding AEMP benchmarks, was resolved by two commitments from the Proponent (WLA -03 and 04) which aligned with ECCC's recommendations. The final outstanding technical comment, ECCC TC #5 regarding Updates to Water Licence and Water Management Location and Monitoring, was resolved by ECCC review of the Draft Licence in Aug 2026.

ECCC therefore considers all its outstanding technical comments to be resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle thanks ECCC for their comments and reiterates the commitments made as discussed at the Technical Meeting, as follows:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-03	ECCC	ECCC-TRC-02	Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan	Agnico Eagle will update Table 3-1 of the AEMP to include hydrological monitoring stations at Roberts Lake and Patch Lake. Agnico Eagle will evaluate the addition of an AEMP monitoring station in the southern portion of Patch Lake to monitor for indirect impacts due to proximity with Patch 7 activities.	60 days from Minister approval of WL Amendment
WLA-04	ECCC	ECCC-TRC-03	Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan	Agnico Eagle will review and evaluate any new FEQG and CCME guidelines for inclusion with the AEMP. Where the updated guidelines are not adopted, rationale will be provided.	60 days from Minister approval of WL Amendment
WLA-05	ECCC	ECCC-TRC-05	Monitoring Station Locations	Agnico Eagle will provide a sample station figure depicting monitoring stations in relation to relevant infrastructure with the 2026 annual report.	March 31, 2027
WLA-06	ECCC	ECCC-TRC-06	Incineration and Composter Waste Management Plan	Agnico Eagle will update Section D1.2 of the Incineration and Composter Waste Management Plan to reflect current practices at Boston (i.e., use of burn pan and incineration).	March 31, 2027
WLA-07	ECCC	ECCC-TRC-07	Emergency Response and Crisis Management Plan	Agnico Eagle will update Section 3.2 of the Plan to reflect the following text: *A level Two Emergency has the following characteristics:* *• Can be handled by employees who respond with help from their managers or fellow employees who have been called in before normal operations can resume; and* *• IC will alert Manager on Duty to Activate the Emergency Management Team. Generally, will require a site wide shutdown until the situation is under control. Notification: General Manager same day as event & Corporate office shall be notified in the normal reporting.*	60 days from Minister approval of WL Amendment

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-08	ECCC	ECCC-TRC-08	Spill Contingency Plan	Agnico Eagle will update the citation for the Emergency Response Guidebook to the 2024 version in the Spill Contingency Plan.	60 days from Minister approval of WL Amendment
WLA-09	ECCC	ECCC-TRC-10	Hydrocarbon Contaminated Material Management Plan	Agnico Eagle will add within Section 7 of the Hydrocarbon Contaminated Material Management Plan, the following sentence: *Some alternative remediation options could include biopiles, low-temperature thermal desportion, soil vapour extraction, and soil amendments.*	March 31, 2027

Interested Party:	**ECCC**	**Rec No.:**	**ECCC-FWS-11**
Re:	**Draft Water Licence Framework**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
ECCC has reviewed this file in accordance with our mandate and has no comments at this time.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle thanks ECCC for their review of the draft Water Licence and acknowledge there are no comments.

FISHERIES AND OCEANS CANADA (DFO)

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-TRC-01**
Re:	**Response Framework / Action Levels for Water Quantity**		

Resolution / Request Made by Interested Party:
Resolved with Commitment WLA-10:

Agnico Eagle will update the AEMP to include action levels (Low, Medium, and High) for water quantity thresholds for waterbodies where water withdrawals are proposed for the Operational Update (Patch, Windy, Doris).

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle thanks DFO for their comments and reiterates the commitment made as discussed at the Technical Meeting, as follows:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-10	DFO	DFO-TRC-01	Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan	Agnico Eagle will update the AEMP to include action levels (Low, Medium, and High) for water quantity thresholds for waterbodies where water withdrawals are proposed for the Operational Update (Patch, Windy, Doris).	60 days from Minister approval of WL Amendment

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-TRC-02**
Re:	**Additional Hydrology Modelling and Water Withdrawal Information Required for Review**		

Resolution / Request Made by Interested Party:
Part One: Agnico Eagle to provide additional hydrology modelling described above in their Fisheries Act Authorization Application submission to DFO.

Part Two: Resolved with Commitment WLA-17:
Should a proximal source be used, Agnico Eagle will include within the annual report the location of the proximal sources, lake volumes of these sources, confirmation of adherence to DFO guidelines for water withdrawal (i.e., intake screens, under ice, and flow thresholds), and reporting of the monthly and annual volumes.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Response to Part 1)
Agnico Eagle will provide hydrology modelling in the submission of the *Fisheries Act* Authorization Application to DFO.

Response to Part 2)
Agnico Eagle thanks DFO for their comments and reiterates the commitment made as discussed at the Technical Meeting, as follows:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-17	DFO	DFO-TRC-02	Proximal Sources	Should a proximal source be used, Agnico Eagle will include within the annual report the location of the proximal sources, lake volumes of these sources, confirmation of adherence to DFO guidelines for water withdrawal (i.e., intake screens, under ice, and flow thresholds), and reporting of the monthly and annual volumes.	Annually, March 31

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-TRC-03**
Re:	**Freshwater Withdrawal Monitoring**		

Resolution / Request Made by Interested Party:

Resolved with Commitment WLA-18:

Agnico Eagle will install continuous monitoring stations on Patch and Windy lakes in coordination with water withdrawal activities and will be evaluated through updates to the AEMP.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:

Agnico Eagle thanks DFO for their comments and reiterates the commitment made as discussed at the Technical Meeting, as follows:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-18	DFO	DFO-TRC-03	Freshwater Withdrawal Monitoring	Agnico Eagle will install continuous monitoring stations on Patch and Windy lakes in coordination with water withdrawal activities and will be evaluated through updates to the AEMP.	March 31, 2027

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-TRC-04**
Re:	**Request for Blast Vibration Monitoring Plan**		

Resolution / Request Made by Interested Party:
Resolved with Commitment WLA-11:

Agnico Eagle will provide a Blast Monitoring Report as an appendix to the full annual report. The report will be in accordance with NIRB Project Certificate No.003 Condition 29, and NIRB Project Certificate No.009 Condition 14, confirm compliance with the Guidelines for the Use of Explosives In or Near Canadian Waters (Wright and Hopky, 1998) as modified by DFO for use in the North, and adhere to guidance provided in Monitoring Explosive Based Winter Seismic Exploration in Waterbodies (Cott and Hanna, 2005), specifically adherence to the lower instantaneous pressure change threshold of 50 kPA. The first Blast Monitoring Report will be provided with the 2026 Annual Report, and will continue annually thereafter.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle thanks DFO for their comments and reiterates the commitment made as discussed at the Technical Meeting, as follows:

2026 WLA Commitment Number	Party	2026 WLA TC ID	Subject	Commitment (as of 17-Jul-26)	Commitment Timeline
WLA-11	DFO	DFO-TRC-04	Blast Vibration Monitoring Report	Agnico Eagle will provide a Blast Monitoring Report as an appendix to the full annual report. The report will be in accordance with NIRB Project Certificate No.003 Condition 29, and NIRB Project Certificate No.009 Condition 14. Confirm compliance with the Guidelines for the Use of Explosives In or Near Canadian Waters (Wright and Hopky, 1998) as modified by DFO for use in the North, and adhere to guidance provided in Monitoring Explosive Based Winter Seismic Exploration in Waterbodies (Cott and Hanna, 2005), specifically adherence to the lower instantaneous pressure change threshold of 50 kPA. The first Blast Monitoring Report will be provided with the 2026 Annual Report, and will continue annually thereafter.	March 31, 2027

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-TRC-05**
Re:	**DFO Offsetting Requirement**		

Resolution / Request Made by Interested Party:
DFO-TRC-05 will be resolved through the DFO Fisheries Act Authorization process which is outside of the scope of the NWB water license amendment process. As such, DFO considers this comment resolved.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle acknowledges the comment and confirms the appropriate details for an application of a *Fisheries* Act Authorization will be provided to DFO following the Water Licence Amendment process.

Interested Party:	**DFO**	**Rec No.:**	**DFO-FWS-06**
Re:	**Draft Water Licence – Part E Withdrawal Volumes**		

Request Made by Interested Party:
DFO has provided one comment on Agnico Eagle's proposed draft Water Licence. The comments are provided below.

Agnico Eagle's Response to Request:
Agnico Eagle has compiled comments from all parties on the Draft Water Licence Framework and provided responses in Attachment A.

ATTACHMENT A: RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT WATER LICENCE FRAMEWORK

Table 1: Response to Comments on the Draft Water Licence Framework

To facilitate review, Agnico Eagle has included the revisions presented in the July 31, 2026 submission of the Draft Water Licence Amendment Framework. Green text represents proposed additions, while orange text with strikeout represents proposed removals.

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
1	CIRNAC	Part A Scope	• *Withdrawal and use of Water ~~from Doris Lake, Windy Lake, and Patch Lake~~ for mining and associated activities and domestic purposes;*	Should remain	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the recommendation, as lake names allowed for withdrawal are specifically listed within Part E, Item 1 of the Licence and general language presented regarding scope is more consistent with recent licenses issued by the NWB.
2	CIRNAC	Part A Scope	• *Quarrying of materials ~~from specified locations~~;*	From approved locations	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the recommendation, as approved quarry locations are included within the Quarry Management Plan and general language presented regarding scope is more consistent with recent licenses issued by the NWB.
3a	KitIA-FWS-01	Part A Scope	• *Deposition of tailings (slurry and/or dry stack or other methods) into the Tailings Impoundment Area;*	AEM has proposed inclusion of the following text under the description of project scope: *"Deposition of tailings (slurry and/or dry stack or other methods) into the Tailings Impoundment Area"*. Understanding CIRNAC has expressed a desire for additional detail regarding the transition to deposition of dry stack tailings under the licence, and barring that detail excluding the option from the licence, KIA wishes to expressly support the inclusion of this tailings deposition method into the language of the water licence to codify this option for the project.	Agnico Eagle agrees with the KitIA comments and continues to recommend this addition to the scope details.
3b	CIRNAC			CIRNAC is of the position that the proposed wording of 'slurry and/or dry stacks or other methods' is overly broad and is placed in the section of the licence outlining authorized activity. This is presented as authorizing tailings deposition methods that have not been assessed through this licensing proceeding. CIRNAC does not consider sufficient information has been provided to support approval of dry-stack tailings or any other alternative tailings disposal method at this time.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with this comment, and is supportive of the KitIA comment to maintain inclusion of deposition of tailings into the Tailings Impoundment Area in this licence. As per commitment WLA-13, Agnico Eagle is not proposing to rely on the inclusion of dry stack within the scope of the licence alone before it proceeds with dry stack. The CIRNAC reviewer does not appear to understand the role of the "scope" section of the licence. As we have stated repeatedly, approval of dry stack tailings or alternative methodologies will only be complete after Agnico Eagle also provides the required details in the form of an updated plan and updated drawings for Board review and approval prior to a change in deposition method. This approach builds on the information on dry stack that has already been shared through this Amendment process. Dry stack has been considered at a conceptual basis as an included component in the Amendment Application. It is not appropriate for CIRNAC to suggest this change to the scope of the licence, which appears to be effectively aimed at amending Agnico Eagle's Application. Just because additional steps will be required before Agnico Eagle proceeds with a change to tailings deposition methodology, does not mean that it was not considered during this Amendment process.
4	CIRNAC	Part A, Scope	No comment was made from Agnico Eagle on this item.	*During post-closure, Effluent from the TIA will be discharged to inland fresh Water (Doris Creek).* *CIRNAC suggests to add "subject to meeting associated discharge criteria".*	Agnico Eagle disagrees with this comment. As per Licence Condition Part F, Item 18 (as in DWLF), discharge criteria will be determined in advance of the final closure and reclamation plan.
5	CIRNAC	Part A, Scope	Agnico Eagle proposed to remove "Scope of Existing Type A Water Licence No.2AM-DOH1323 Amendment No. 1, Amendment No. 2" from the Licence.	CIRNAC notes that removing details of the scope of the Licence has the potential to complicate tracking what was actually assessed and authorized given the history of the Project. CIRNAC recommends retaining sufficient details to identify currently authorized facilities and activities.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the recommendation. The introduction paragraph (Item 1a) outlines the history of Amendments; in addition, this approach is consistent with other licenses.

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
6	CIRNAC	Part B, Item 5	~~Water Resources Officer~~ Manager of Field Operations ~~Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada,~~ Nunavut District, Nunavut Region P.O. Box 100 Iqaluit, NU X0A 0H0 Telephone:(867) 975-4295 Fax: (867) 979-6445	Following April 12,2027 this will change and there should be a provision for updating of the license to reflect the new governing authority, without the need for an amendment process.	Agnico Eagle agrees with CIRNAC's proposed approach for this condition revision. This is a broader devolution issue that the NWB will need to consider for all Water Licenses, but we are confident a simple administrative fix will be identified. For clarity in this licence a sentence could be added to the effect "*or any such entity that assumes the role and responsibility of CIRNAC currently outlined in the NWNSRTA*."
7a	KitIA-FWS-02	Part B, Item 11	*The Licensee shall, for all Plans submitted under this Licence, include a proposed timetable for implementation. Plans submitted cannot be undertaken without subsequent written Board approval and direction, subject to the following exception. Unless otherwise directed by the Board, Plans submitted may be undertaken without further Board approval and direction after a ninety (90) day period has elapsed following submission to the Board by the Proponent. The Board may alter or modify a Plan if necessary to achieve the legislative objectives and will notify the Licensee in writing of acceptance, rejection, or alteration of the Plan.*	While KIA appreciates AEM's expressed rationale that "*they should be able to proceed with implementation of amended plans in order to ensure site is operated using most up to date protocols for operational efficiency and environmental protection*", KIA maintains that a degree of minimum oversight should still be codified in the licence. KIA recommends that the Board maintain their capacity to approve plans prior to implementation. To provide certainty to the proponent, we suggest that language surrounding a 90-day timeline be retained, putting the onus for compliance with that timeline on the Board. KIA views three months as a reasonable period for the Board to receive and approve/provide feedback on plan modifications.	Agnico Eagle agrees with the KitIA comment and maintains the 90-day review period. The current wording of the term and condition does not provide an expected timeline for review. Agnico Eagle proposed a 90-day public comment period which is a reasonable length of time, and provides certainty on regulatory timelines. The current approach has the undesirable effect of requiring the Proponent to operate under out-of-date plans, which is not optimal from an environmental standpoint.
7b	CIRNAC			(CIRNAC Reviewer 1) This proposal has the possible effect of having plans or operational activities undertaken without proper review. CIRNAC is not in favor nor support of this or any form of approval without review. (CIRNAC Reviewer 2) CIRNAC believes that this constitutes a fundamental change to the management plan approval process. This change would undermine the Board's, the relevant Minister's and the Land Owners authority over the co-management of water and waste in the project area. This is of particular concern in the context of a changing regulatory and application review landscape, with devolution taking place on April 1, which will affect the processes of both the Board and the interveners. Therefore, significant changes to management plans should not be approved automatically without review, outside of existing licence conditions. In addition, due to Part B, item 15, this change could signify that changes in plans that were neither reviewed nor approved by the NWB could become part of the terms and conditions of this licence.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the CIRNAC comments. As noted in the draft licence provided by Agnico Eagle, the addition to Part B, Item 15 (now 16) is consistent with recent standard licence terms and conditions (see for example Meliadine licence). CIRNAC's authority is only undermined if CIRNAC does not follow the established 90-day review timeline, which we expect is well within their abilities.
8	CIRNAC	Part B, Item 13	• *The Licensee shall, for all plans submitted under this Licence, implement the plan as approved by the Board in writing. Any changes to the plans deemed significant shall be reviewed by the Board to determine the process for the Board's review and approval of the amendment to the plan(s). Reflecting the scale and scope of the proposed changes to an approved plan, the Board may process the changes as solely an amendment to the plan, as a Modification under Part G of the Licence, or as an Amendment to the Licence. ~~considered as an amendment to the plan(s) or as a modification and must be submitted to the Board for approval in writing.~~*	CIRNAC is concerned that the proposed change is a fundamental change that could allow significant amendments to approved management plans to proceed without a formal licence amendment or modification process. This may prevent interveners from fully reviewing and providing input on changes relevant to their mandate before decisions are made. While the Board has the final decision-making authority, it relies on the various expertise and mandates of interveners when making such decisions.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comments. With any plan submission, Agnico Eagle will provide a Revision History table and identify where changes have been made. This will provide clarity to the Board to determine the process for review and approval of a plan update. It is normal course that often, plans can be updated without also triggering an amendment or modification. This is standard language that has been included in many Type A licenses approved by CIRNAC's minister.

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
9a	KitIA-FWS-03	Part B, Item 19	*The Licensee is encouraged to adopt an Adaptive Management approach to the management of uncertainty regarding potential for effects associated with the Undertaking, including identifying mitigation, monitoring or management actions.*	AEM has suggested the following language be included in the licence pertaining to adaptive management: *"The Licensee is encouraged to adopt an Adaptive Management approach to the management of uncertainty regarding potential for effects associated with the Undertaking, including identifying mitigation, monitoring or management actions."* KIA suggests that the phrase "encouraged" does not provide regulatory certainty that an adaptive management approach will be undertaken. KIA recommends the draft language be amended *to "The Licenses will adopt an Adaptive Management approach…"*	Agnico Eagle agrees with the KitIA's revised wording.
9b	CIRNAC			CIRNAC supports this process with the development of triggers and approved escalations measures to be included in such plans. Subject to approval of the board.	
10	CIRNAC	Part C, Item 7	*The Licensee shall submit, within the updated Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan as per Part J, Items 2 and 6, an updated reclamation cost estimate of the total mine closure restoration liability based on the requirements of the Act and Regulations ~~using the most current version of CIRNAC's RECLAIM Reclamation Cost Estimating Model, its equivalent or other similar method approved by the Board in writing, in accordance with principles of the INAC (as CIRNAC was previously known as) "Mine Site Reclamation Policy in Nunavut 2002".~~*	CIRNAC opposes removing references to RECLAIM and the Mine Site Reclamation Policy in Nunavut as established guidance for preparing reclamation cost estimates. Reclaim is the established benchmark for full-cost, third-party security estimates in Nunavut. Removing these references would reduce clarity regarding expectations for closure liability estimates while providing no clear benefit, particularly as the current licence already allows alternative approaches where justified if the proponent does not wishes to use the RECLAIM tool. Further , the current Policy is set to be devolved and adopted / mirrored by the GN as stated by the GN. Variations to this process at the last minute would throw a measure of uncertainty as to the process to be followed. If in future the GN or the Proponent would like to consider changes on such policy that can happen post devolution or at the next amendment application and will solely then be the decision of the Government of Nunavut.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comments. It has become clear in discussions relating to the recent proposed update to RECLAIM that the NWB confirms it does not currently follow an approach that automatically requires RECLAIM and that the NWB is open to other models that achieve the requirements of the Act and Regulations. The Act and Regulations do not require proponents to "justify" departures from RECLAIM, and so nor should the Licence. As an example, the Mary River Project does not follow RECLAIM and that has been accepted for many years. Agnico Eagle has taken comments into account and suggests the following: *The Licensee shall submit, within the updated Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan as per Part J, Items 2 and 6, an updated reclamation cost estimate of the total mine closure restoration liability based on the requirements of the Act and Regulations and a reasonable reclamation estimate model (for example RECLAIM 7.0) or another method applied or developed by a qualified professional*
11	CIRNAC	Part C, Item 8	*The Licensee shall submit, within the Final Closure and Reclamation Plan as per Part J, Items 3 and 6, an updated reclamation cost estimate of the total mine closure restoration liability, based on the requirements of the Act and Regulations. ~~using the most current version of CIRNAC's RECLAIM Reclamation Cost Estimating Model, its equivalent or other similar method approved by the Board in writing, in accordance with principles of the INAC "Mine Site Reclamation Policy for Nunavut, 2002".~~*		
12	CIRNAC	Part C, Item 9	*Upon the Board receiving notice under Part C, Item 4~~9~~, or upon receiving an updated reclamation cost estimate as required under Part C, Items 7~~10~~ and 8~~11~~, the Board may, on its own initiative, or upon application by the Licensee, the Minister and/or the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, conduct a periodic review of the outstanding reclamation liability associated with the Undertaking and may, as the Board considers appropriate, amend the amount of security held under Part C, Item 1. Any submission requesting an amendment to the security provisions of the Licence shall include supporting evidence to justify the amendment ~~and will be processed by the Board as an amendment to the terms and conditions of the Licence.~~*	CIRNAC is concerned that the proposed changes allowing revisions to closure security outside of a formal licence conditions amendment process would make the process unclear. There is no indication in the revised licence condition as to whether the proponent would need to seek approval from the Board prior to instituting the amendment or if notification with justifying evidence would suffice. This would reduce transparency and limit opportunities for interveners to review information necessary to assess reclamation liabilities and the adequacy of closure security and fully engage in the process. Further, security is a matter of significant public concern as was expressed many times over the last 27 years and it would be premature to change such an expectation prior to the Devolution Agreement taking effect. This treatment of issues of significant public concern is also echoed in the Regulations under the ACT.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with these comments, as outlined below. • As provided in our rationale for removal in the July 31, 2026 version, this revision is consistent with the Meliadine Type A Water Licence and therefore is not "*premature to change such an expectation prior*". In addition, through multiple meetings with CIRNAC through this Amendment process, CIRNAC agreed to the Schedule C approach. • The edits proposed by Agnico Eagle do not remove the opportunity for any party to conduct a review of security. • An amendment to security does not automatically mean an amendment to other licence terms and having the security value in Schedule C allows for those discussions without an unnecessary full licence amendment. • This is why there is a tranche approach in Schedule C.
13	CIRNAC	Part C, Item 10	*The Licensee, the Minister, or the Kitikmeot Inuit Association may apply to amend the amount of security required to be held under the Licence. Any submission requesting a review of the security provisions of the Licence shall include supporting evidence to justify the amendment ~~and will be processed by the Board as an amendment to the terms and conditions of the Licence~~*		

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
14	CIRNAC	Part C, Items 11	*The security referred to in Part C, Item 1, shall be maintained until such time as the Minister is satisfied that the Licensee has complied with all provisions of the approved Final Reclamation and Closure Plan and as it is fully or in part refunded by the Minister pursuant to Section 76(5) of the Act. This clause shall survive the expiry of the Licence or renewals thereof and until full and final reclamation has been completed to the satisfaction of the Minister. For greater clarity, the Board will reduce security referred to in Part C, Item 1 upon completion of progressive reclamation activities, in amounts that reflect the proportionate reduction of reclamation liability under the Act and Regulations, and full completion of the approved Final Reclamation and Closure Plan shall not be required in order to return security amounts for progressive reclamation.*	(CIRNAC Reviewer 1) CIRNAC recommends that this clarification clearly contain which processes will be used to determine the completion of progressive reclamation activities, such as evidence, inspection, as-built records, performance monitoring, landowner interests and Minister input. CIRNAC supports progressive reclamation, however clear benchmarks need to be established to ensure that the reduction of reclamation liability is reflective of fully achieved progressive reclamation objectives. (CIRNAC Reviewer 2) A Framework on Progressive reclamation is currently under discussion with the Chamber of mines to develop a policy for the territory and eventual approval by the Board. It is not likely to be completed prior to the license being drafted. It is recommended that further discussions take place on how , in its absence, progressive reclamation and performance may be validated prior to that framework being approved. CIRNAC recommends that the board , the proponent and regulators work to develop a condition where the Framework, once approved can be adopted to the license as a schedule versus develop something permanent now.	Agnico Eagle agrees with further development of a Progressive Reclamation Framework. Agnico Eagle has also suggested tranche language to be added to Schedule C of the Licence to support timely reduction of security for progressive reclamation. As per existing Licence conditions, changes can be made to Schedules without an Amendment process, thus including development of the Framework can be updated periodically and discussions are outside of the Hope Bay Water Licence Amendment process. The language that Agnico Eagle has proposed in Part C, Item 11 is simply a statement of applicable law and existing practice, in order to avoid leaving the project oversecured under the NWNSRTA and its Regulations. Further details can be added via policy, as CIRNAC suggests, but this fundamental statement as suggested for Part C Item 11 should not be controversial. Agnico Eagle is of the view its suggested language should be included in the Water Licence, as it aligns with NWNRTA and supports the public policy objective of encouraging progressive reclamation (rather than leaving all reclamation to the end of the mine life), which should be something that all participants in this process can support. In summary, if CIRNAC is taking the view that security can be required that exceeds the requirements of the Act and Regulations, or that no progressive reclamation should be reimbursed until after final closure at the end of the mine life that would be a real disconnect.
15	CIRNAC	Part D, Item 1	*The Licensee shall submit to the Board for review, at least sixty (60) days prior to Construction (unless otherwise approved by the Board), final design and for-Construction drawings accompanied with a detailed report ~~and prepared by a qualified Engineer(s)~~ in accordance with and for the following items and including information stated within the Schedule D, Item 1.* *a .Engineered Water works, i.e., Water Intake and causeway water control structures (dikes, berms, jetties, channels) and Water crossings (culverts, bridges)~~Water Management and Supply Facilities~~;* *b. Engineered Waste disposal facilities i.e., all Treatment Plants, Discharge Diffusers, Waste Rock Storage Facilities, overburden stockpiles, Tailings Impoundment Area, Landfill, Landfarm; and~~Waste Management Facilities;~~* *c. Bulk Fuel Storage and Containment Facilitie~~s; and~~ ~~All-weather roads.~~	• CIRNAC is concerned that the addition of variations of "unless otherwise approved by the Board" to multiple licence conditions could allow deviations from approved licence requirements without a formal licence amendment process. This may prevent interveners from fully reviewing and providing input on changes relevant to their mandate before decisions are made. While the Board has the final decision-making authority, it also relies on the various expertise and mandates of interveners when making such decisions. This comment could be repeated in many licence items in this Water Licence Draft, this is simply an example of one such case. • CIRNAC does not support removing the requirement for the final design, construction drawings and detailed report to be prepared by an engineer. This is a standard licence requirements and no justification has been provided for departing from established practice. • CIRNAC supports retaining all-weather roads within these requirements (Report pre and post construction) given their potential influence on drainage, erosion, groundwater movement, and other water management considerations outside of culvert and bridges.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with these comments, as outlined below. • In modern water licenses, it is common for the NWB to add “unless otherwise approved by the Board”. The Board typically solicits input from reviewers and that approach is entirely appropriate for items that fall below the threshold of things that should trigger a full expensive, lengthy and complex amendment process. • Schedule D, Part 1 outlines the requirements to support the requirements of the design report, which includes “Be signed and sealed by the appropriate qualified Engineer”. Agnico Eagle is not suggesting otherwise. The point here is to remove duplication and unnecessary length to the licence. • Agnico Eagle disagrees with keeping all-weather roads. Water Licence mandate is to regulate water and waste. Roads are not water or waste facilities. Where applicable, designs are provided for culverts and crossings which relate to NWBs mandate over water and waste. Again, this removal is also consistent with other Type A licenses. The focus is on the structures under Board jurisdiction, not structures like roads that are not.

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
16	CIRNAC	Part D, Item 11	*The Licensee shall submit to the Board for review, within ninety (90) days of completion of each facility referred to in Part D, Item 1, a Construction Summary Report prepared by a qualified Engineer that includes as-built plans and drawings, documentation of field decisions that deviate from original plans and any data used to support these decisions in accordance with Schedule D, Item 2~~, for the following items:~~* *~~Water Management Facilities;~~* *~~Waste Management Facilities;~~* *~~Bulk Fuel Storage Facilities; and~~* *~~All-weather roads.~~*	Due to the changes to Part D, item 1, all-weather roads would no longer be required that a Construction Summary Report be prepared. CIRNAC supports retaining all-weather roads within these requirements given their potential influence on drainage, erosion, groundwater movement, and other water management considerations outside of culvert and bridges.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment and refers to the above rationale on all-weather roads.
17	CIRNAC	Part D, Item 19b	*The Licensee shall construct and operate the Bulk Fuel Storage and Containment Facility in accordance with all applicable legislation and industry standards, including:* *a. Environmental Code of Practice for Aboveground and Underground Storage Tank Systems Containing Petroleum and Allied Petroleum Products, 2003 (Updated in 2013) or most recent;* *b. Relevant standards of the Canadian Standards Association (CSA);~~CCME~~; and* *c. National Fire Code, 2015~~0~~ or most recent.*	CIRNAC notes that no technical justification is proposed to change the reference to a specific standard (CCME), to a mention of «relevant standards of the […] CSA». This change would introduce more uncertainty into the licence, without a technical justification as to why this change is appropriate.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment that it "introduces more uncertainty to the licence", as this condition is reflective of other NWB licenses (e.g., 2AM-MEL1631 and 2AM-BRP1831). Further, the condition is specific to the <u>construction and operation</u> of fuel storage and containment where CSA is the appropriate standard, not CCME.
18a	KitIA-FWS-04	Part E, Item 1	*The Licensee shall obtain fresh Water from Doris Lake, Windy Lake, and Patch Lake for domestic camp use, mining, milling, and associated industrial uses. ~~from Windy Lake designated using the designated fresh Water Intake at Monitoring Program Station ST-7a, with the volume not exceeding forty-three thousand eight hundred (43,800) cubic metres per year. The Licensee shall obtain fresh Water for mining, milling, and associated industrial uses from Doris Lake using the designated fresh Water Intake at Monitoring Program Station ST-7, with the volume not exceeding one million nine hundred thirty thousand (1,930,000) cubic metres per year.~~ Drill Water may also be obtained from locations proximal to the drilling targets. Water for winter ice road construction may be obtained from proximal sources ~~and shall not exceed sixty thousand (60,000) cubic metres per year.~~ The total volume of Water use from all sources and for all purposes shall not exceed two million nine hundred sixteen thousand eight hundred fifty-five (2,916,855)~~wo million thirty-three thousand eight hundred (2,033,800)~~ cubic metres per year.*	We are concerned AEM's proposal reduces clarity as to the specific withdrawal limits from each source, instead posing a project wide water withdrawal limit. The lake specific limits are required to help ensure withdrawals from each water body do not exceed the proposed volume, resulting in excessive drawdown that may impact the aquatic environment. KIA recommends the licence maintain lake specific water withdrawal limits within the body of the licence. These lake specific limits may be provided in tabular form for ease of interpretation.	Agnico Eagle acknowledges the comments from parties and agrees with recommendations. Agnico Eagle suggests the following condition: *The Licensee shall obtain fresh Water from Doris Lake, Windy Lake, and Patch Lake for domestic camp use, mining, milling, and associated industrial uses. The total volume of Water use from all sources and for all purposes shall not exceed two million nine hundred sixteen thousand eight hundred fifty-five (2,916,855) cubic metres per year. The following limits will be respected, unless approved by the Board* • *2,637,125 m^3/year from Doris Lake* • *59,860 m^3/year from Patch Lake* • *159,870 m^3/year from Windy Lake* *Drill Water may also be obtained from locations proximal to the drilling targets. Water for winter ice road construction may be obtained from proximal sources.* • *60,000 m^3/year from proximal sources*
18b	DFO-FWS-01			The draft license provided by the Proponent removes set volumes for each lake and includes only the total volume permitted for all three lakes combined (i.e., 2,916,855 m^3/year). This number does not reflect volumes that adhere to DFO guidance nor protection of fish and fish habitat. DFO recommends that the License retain the specific volumes to be withdrawn from each lake (i.e., 2,637,125 m^3/year from Doris, 59,860 m^3/year from Patch, 159,870 m^3/year from Windy Lake, and 60,000 m^3/year from proximal sources) within Part E. 1. Inclusion of these values ensures that the License clearly reflects that which has been proposed for withdrawal volumes of each lake to ensure DFO guidelines are followed, and fish and fish habitat are protected.	
18c	CIRNAC			CIRNAC recommends retaining source-specific and purpose-specific caps, intake stations, and seasonal limits in the Licence for clarity purposes, as source-specific limits are present in the application and no technical justification was proposed for the removal of these from the Water Licence. CIRNAC notes that the purpose of removing the freshwater use limit from proximal sources is unclear, as the proponent has expressed the intention to retain this authorization as part of their licence.	

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
19	CIRNAC	Part F, Item 2	*Unless otherwise approved by the Board, ~~T~~the Licensee shall provide at least ten (10) days' notice to the Inspector prior to any planned discharges from any Waste Disposal Facilities. The notice shall include the estimated volume proposed for discharge and location. The Inspector and the Licensee may agree in writing to alternate notification requirements for ongoing, frequent, or regularly scheduled discharges.*	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion.
20	CIRNAC	Part F, Item 4	*The Licensee shall operate the Sewage Treatment Plant in accordance with the following:* *a. ~~All~~ Unless otherwise approved by the Board, all Sewage from the Doris and Madrid Properties shall be directed to and treated in ~~the~~ a Sewage Treatment Plant;* *b. Unless otherwise approved by the Board, all~~All~~ Effluent from the Sewage Treatment Plant may be discharged to the Doris ~~TIA~~ Tailings Impoundment Area or to the tundra. The discharge of Doris Sewage Treatment Plant ~~TP e~~Effluent onto tundra at Monitoring Program Station ST-8 shall not exceed the following effluent quality limits:* *c. All Effluent discharged from the Sewage Treatment Plant onto tundra shall be discharged to a location approved by an ~~I~~inspector;* *d. Unless otherwise approved by the Board, the ~~The~~ Licensee shall provide at least ten (10) days written notice to the Inspector prior to any planned discharge from the Sewage Treatment Plant to the tundra. The notice shall include the volume proposed for discharge and the discharge location.*	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion. .
21	CIRNAC	Part F, Item 8	~~*The Licensee shall submit to the Board for approval in writing, at least six (6) months prior to construction of the Landfill, a revised Non-hazardous Waste Management Plan that include details on the Landfill. The Plan shall take into account comments made by intervening parties throughout the regulatory process and consider the following at a minimum:Recycling/segregation Waste program;*~~ ~~*Incineration technology selected;*~~ ~~*Waste audit – amount and types of Wastes to be incinerated or otherwise disposed;*~~ ~~*Consolidation of Wastes;*~~ ~~*Operational and maintenance records;*~~ ~~*Operator Training;*~~ ~~*Emission measurements;*~~ ~~*Incinerator Ash disposal;*~~ ~~*Monitoring, characterization,*~~ ~~*Disposal of incinerator ash; and*~~ ~~*Any updates to final landfill location.*~~	This should be kept in the license in expectation that the proponent will construct more than one landfill over the duration of the mine life of the project, including at closure.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with this recommendation. The Non-hazardous Waste Management Plan did not include details on landfill management, prior to the version submitted in 2025. The term has been fulfilled as it was intended when the licence was initially drafted. Should Agnico Eagle construct an additional landfill during operations, the Non-hazardous Waste Management Plan would be updated accordingly and reviewed per Part B Licence conditions. Landfill management at closure will be addressed through the Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan, and ultimately the Final Closure and Reclamation Plan.
22	CIRNAC	Part F, Item 16	No comment was made from Agnico Eagle on this item.	CIRNAC recommends that the effluent quality criteria be updated to reflect current MDMER requirements. Maintaining outdated limits, such as for Arsenic and Lead, may create inconsistencies between the licence and applicable federal regulatory standards.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the recommendation. The discharge water noted in Part F, Item 16 is for discharge to land and not water, the MDMER do not apply. MDMER falls under the *Fisheries Act*; therefore, if you are not discharging to a waterbody you are not affecting fish. In addition, ECCC has not identified sumps as a final discharge point; therefore, applicable criteria is as described under the Licence.

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
23	CIRNAC	Part F, Item 17	*Unless otherwise approved by the Board in writing, t~~T~~he Licensee shall operate and maintain the Tailings Impoundment Area to engineering standards as described in the Operations, Maintenance, and Surveillance Manual: Doris Tailings Impoundment Area~~such that~~*	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion.
24	CIRNAC	Part F, Old Item 20-31	Agnico Eagle suggested removal of all terms as the detail may be better placed within the approve Plan	CIRNAC is concerned that replacing specific licence conditions with plan-level requirements could allow significant changes to tailings management to occur through revisions to management plans rather than through a licence amendment process. This is a particular concern, given the proposed modification to part B, item 13 of the licence which may be used to make changes to management plans without Interveners being able to review and comment on those changes.	As alternative tailings strategies were included in the Amendment Application and considered through this process at a conceptual level, amendments to the Water Licence should not be required to proceed with future strategies including dry stack. As Agnico Eagle has confirmed repeatedly dry stack will not proceed without additional Board approvals in any event – Board approval will be required over the updated designs as well as any updated plans. Both would be subject to a robust process of review and comment before any approval directed by the NWB, which CIRNAC and/or GN would no doubt participate in.
25	CIRNAC	Part F, Item 18	Discharge from the Tailings Impoundment Area ~~Effluent quality criteria in the TIA for discharge to the Doris System~~ during post-closure, will be determined in advance of the final closure and reclamation plan ~~and in consultation with the Board and other interested parties.~~	CIRNAC notes that the proposed change removes both specific commitments regarding post-closure effluent quality and the requirement to conduct consultation with the Board and interested parties for the determination of discharge criteria. CIRNAC is concerned this could limit regulatory oversight and opportunities for interested parties to assess potential impacts of post-closure discharge on water quality and the aquatic environment.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with this comment. As indicated in Item 4 of this table, discharge criteria will be determined in advance of the final closure and reclamation plan.
26	CIRNAC	Part F, Item 19	The Licensee shall demonstrate that Effluent discharged, from ~~monitoring station TL-1 and TL-4~~ the TIA pumphouse and/or saline pumphouse is non-acutely toxic in accordance with PART I, Item 14	CIRNAC notes that the proposed wording appears to remove the requirement to demonstrate that effluent discharged from the TIA end-of-pipe location is non-acutely toxic. There is no technical justification as to why this change is proposed, nor is there justification to remove these sampling sites.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with this comment. The licence term clearly makes reference to Part I, Item 14 which states: *The Licensee shall conduct Acute Lethality Testing in accordance with and as required by the "Metal and Diamond Mining Effluent Regulations".*
27	CIRNAC	Part G, Item 1	The Licensee may, without written consent from the Board, carry out Modifications provided that such Modifications are consistent with the terms of this Licence and the following requirements are met: The Licensee has notified the Board in writing of such proposed Modifications at least sixty (60) days prior to beginning the Modifications; Such Modifications do not place the Licensee in contravention of the Licence or the Act; ~~Such Modifications are consistent with the applicable terms and conditions of the NIRB Project Certificate No. 009;~~ The Board has not, within sixty (60) days following notification of the proposed Modifications, informed the Licensee that review of the proposal will require more than sixty (60) days; and The Board has not rejected the proposed Modifications.	CIRNAC notes that it was established during the Technical Meeting and Pre-Hearing Conference, that Part G is not appropriate to be used to assume approval of the transition from slurry tailing to another tailing management strategy. However, given the written submission from the proponent, following the TM and PHC, which indicated that Part G, item 1 could be used to simply notify the Board of the change instead of seeking approval, CIRNAC has proposed a new licence condition explicitly outlining that the proponent must seek approval prior to making the switch in tailing management strategy and what information must be provided as part of that process. More information can be found in Annex A. CIRNAC objects to the removal of the Project Certificate consistency test, as no technical justification for this change is presented. Modifications must be consistent with the applicable NIRB Project Certificate.	This requested change was simply a removal to be consistent with a recent change made in the Meliadine Licence Amendment, and Agnico Eagle proposed the change to be consistent with that licence. To respond to the additional comments which do not seem relevant to this change, Part G is designed specifically to address situations like this. Agnico Eagle disagrees with CIRNAC's suggestion that "it was established" that Part G is not appropriate. Approval is not "assumed". Approval and implementation of a transition to dry stack would only occur after Board approval of the plan and designs. It is very clear there is no "assumed approval" as suggested by CIRNAC. Agnico Eagle strongly disagrees with the new licence condition that is described in the CIRNAC comments, as our commitment is aligned with the Licence conditions.
28	CIRNAC	Part G, Item 3	Applications for modifications shall contain: a. A description of the facilities and/or works to be constructed; b. The proposed location of the structure(s); c. Identification of any potential impacts to the ~~r~~Receiving ~~e~~Environment; d. A description of any monitoring required, including sampling locations, parameters measured, and frequencies of sampling; e. A proposed schedule for ~~c~~Construction; f. Drawings of Engineered Structures stamped by an ~~Professional~~ Engineer where applicable; and g. Proposed sediment and erosion control measures.	CIRNAC notes that adding «where applicable» to this licence conditions without technical justification or benchmark to make this determination. This change would add uncertainty to the Water Licence.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with this comment regarding the edit to Part G, Item 3f – the need for drawings, reports, etc. prepared by a qualified Engineer(s) is already specified in Part D, Item 1. Thus this edit would not add uncertainty to the licence. It is well understood not every design needs an engineer stamp – that is a matter that is left to the discretion of the Engineer.

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
29	CIRNAC	Part H, Item 5	The Licensee shall perform weekly inspections of ~~petroleum products storage and containment facilities, fuel tanks and connector~~Bulk Fuel Storage and Containment Facilities, for leaks and settlement and shall keep a written log of inspections to be made available to an Inspector upon request. More frequent inspections may be requested by an Inspector.	CIRNAC notes that according to the modified licence conditions, the proponent would be required to inspect 'bulk fuel storage and containment facilities'. These are facilities designed for bulk storage, as described in the Spill Contingency Plan. However, there is no formal definition of 'bulk fuel storage or containment facilities' in the Spill Contingency Plan. In the absence of a formal list of facilities or a definition, it may be unclear which facilities need to be inspected weekly. The authority for an activity should rest within the act and be actioned or required by the regulations and set out in the license. The shifting of the onus to conduct activities to an operational plan prepared by the proponent is not consistent with current or regulatory practice.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with this comment and believes the proposed addition is acceptable. Per definitions in Schedule A: **"Bulk Fuel Storage and Containment Facility"** means the facilities designed for the bulk storage of fuel as described in the *Spill Contingency Plan*; The Spill Contingency Plan (section 4.1.1) states: *All bulk fuel facilities are located in secondary containment (i.e., tank farms which have containment designed to contain volumes equivalent or greater than 110% of the aggregate or total volume of the largest container in the containment – whichever is greater).*
30	CIRNAC	Part I, Item 1	The Licensee shall implement the ~~Hope Bay Project~~ Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan (AEMP) ~~as approved by the Board.~~	CIRNAC notes that the requirement that the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan be approved by the Board has been remove, however no justification has been provided for this change. CIRNAC is unclear why this change would be necessary	Agnico Eagle agrees with CIRNAC's recommendation to leave "as approved by the Board".
31	CIRNAC	Part I, Item 5	Unless otherwise approved by the Board, the Licensee shall measure and record the following on a Monthly basis in cubic metres or as otherwise stated: a. The volume and use of fresh Water obtained from Doris Lake, Windy Lake, and Patch Lake ~~for domestic use~~; ~~The volume of fresh Water obtained from Doris Lake for process water and otheruses;~~ c. The volume of ~~r~~Reclaim ~~w~~Water obtained from Tailings Impoundment Area for process water; e. Tonnes of Waste Rock stored on the Temporary Waste Rock Pad and at other locations approved by the Board in writing, during Construction, Operations and Closure; d. Tonnes of Waste ~~r~~Rock returned underground on a monthly basis during Construction, Operation and Closure; and e. The volume of sewage sludge removed from the Wastewater Treatment Plant and the locations or method of sewage sludge disposal during Construction, Operation and Closure; f. Report the data in accordance to Schedule B.	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided. Consistent with WLA-17, CIRNAC recommends that monthly water use reporting include proximal water sources to ensure a complete accounting of freshwater withdrawals associated with the project.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion. Agnico Eagle agrees with CIRNAC's recommendation to include proximal sources in 5a as part of the monthly measurements and recording. The condition for Part I, Item 5a would read: • *The volume and use of fresh Water obtained from Doris Lake, Windy Lake, Patch Lake, and proximal sources;*
32	CIRNAC	Part I, Item 6	Unless otherwise approved by the Board, ~~T~~the Licensee shall measure and record in tonnes (unless otherwise stated) including the location of disposal (temporary and permanent) for the following: The daily dry tonnes of tailings placed in the Tailings Impoundment Area; The daily dry tonnes of detoxified tailings placed underground; and The monthly quantity of ore processed.	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion.
33	CIRNAC	Part I, Item 9	The Licensee shall undertake an annual geotechnical inspection of all surface infrastructure and earthworks described in Part D Item 1, annually ~~between July and September~~during snow-free conditions by an ~~Geotechnical~~ Engineer. The inspection shall be conducted in accordance with applicable best practices including the Canadian Dam ~~Association~~ Safety Guidelines for water and waste containment facilities	CIRNAC notes that given the modification of Part D, Item 1, the proposed change would exclude all-weather roads from annual geotechnical inspections. CIRNAC is concerned this could reduce oversight of infrastructure capable of affecting drainage patterns, erosion, and water management.	Agnico Eagle agrees with CIRNAC's recommendation and proposes the following Licence condition: *The Licensee shall undertake an annual geotechnical inspection of all surface infrastructure and earthworks, annually during snow-free conditions by an Engineer. The inspection shall be conducted in accordance with applicable best practices including the Canadian Dam Safety Guidelines for water and waste containment facilities*

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
34	CIRNAC	Part I, Item 10	The Licensee shall submit to the Board, as part of the Annual Report required under Part B, Item 2, an Engineer's Inspection Report. The Report shall include a cover letter from the Licensee outlining an implementation plan addressing each of the Engineer's recommendations. ~~The Licensee shall submit to the Board for review, within ninety (90) days of completion of the geotechnical inspection, a report in accordance with Part I Item 9 and/or the Annual Report. The report shall include a cover letter from the Licensee outlining an implementation plan addressing each of the Geotechnical Engineer's recommendations and shall include the following:~~ ~~All quantities in cubic meters of dike seepage from the North, West, and South Dams pumped back into the Tailings Impoundment Area;~~ ~~As-built drawings and a summary of the mitigation works undertaken along the shoreline of the Tailings Impoundment Area in response to erosion; and~~ ~~All data and information generated from the monitoring of all project geotechnical instrumentation.~~	The proposed changes would remove the reporting timelines of 90 days, the requirement for the inspection to be performed by a geotechnical engineer and reduce the scope of information required in geotechnical inspection reports. CIRNAC is concerned this would limit information available to assess infrastructure performance and identify potential risks requiring corrective action. The technical justification for this change is unclear.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with these comments. • With respect to reporting timelines: The current Licence conditions say [**emphasis added**] "*..shall submit to the Board for review, ninety (90) days of competition the geotechnical inspection, a report in accordance with Part I Item 9* ***and/or*** *the Annual Report*.". Therefore, Agnico Eagle is already authorized to submit geotechnical inspection reports with the Annual Report, has been the current practice, and would be respecting an already approved aspect in the Licence. • Requirements for geotechnical inspections are still outlined as a condition of the licence (Part I, Item 9). As outlined in item 33, Agnico Eagle has agreed to a revision to encompass all surface infrastructure and earthworks. • The revisions were made for consistency in other licenses (e.g., 2AM-MEL1631).
35	CIRNAC	Part I, Item 11	Unless otherwise approved by the Board, ~~T~~the Licensee shall visually monitor and record ~~observations~~volume levels, to be made available to an Inspector upon request, during periods of discharge onto the tundra from: Landfill Sump (on a daily basis); Landfarm Sump (on a daily basis); ~~Plant Site~~ Bulk Fuel Storage and Containment Facility Sumps (on a daily basis); ~~Roberts Bay Fuel Storage and Containment Facility Sumps (on a daily basis);~~ Sewage Treatment Plant (on a weekly basis); Reagent and Cyanide Storage Facility Sumps (on a daily basis); and Contact Water Ponds (~~on a daily basis~~every two weeks).	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided. The technical reasoning for reducing monitoring frequencies at the contact water ponds and removing the Roberts Bay Fuel Storage and Containment Facility sumps from monitoring requirements has not been demonstrated. CIRNAC is concerned these changes may reduce operational oversight and the early detection of site management issues.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion. Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment on removing fuel sumps and clarifies, we have not removed monitoring of the Roberts Bay Fuel facility. As outlined in Schedule A Definitions of the Licence, Roberts Bay fuel farm would be included in "Bulk Fuel Storage and Containment Facility", which means the facilities designed for the bulk storage of fuel as described in the Spill Contingency Plan. Further details are provided in response to item 29. Agnico Eagle acknowledges the comment with respect to the monitoring frequency of Contact Water Ponds and proposed the following revision, which would be consistent with other Licenses, *f. Contact Water Ponds (daily basis as long as water is present).*
36	CIRNAC	Part I, Item 12	The Licensee shall, within thirty (30) days following the month being reported, submit to the Board a monthly monitoring report in an electronic form. The Report shall include the following: All data and information required by this Part and generated by the Monitoring Program in the Tables of Schedule I; An assessment of data to identify areas of non-compliance with regulated discharge parameters referred to in Part F; ~~During Operations, a summary of monthly operational assessments of the water balance and water quality model; and~~ ~~Reports should document conditions during spring freshet, major rain events, and periods of sustained precipitation including flow measurements, photographs, and notes.~~	CIRNAC does not support removing monthly reporting on water balance performance, water quality model performance, and extreme operating conditions. This information is important for tracking changing site conditions, evaluating model predictions, and identifying potential issues before they result in adverse environmental effects. The technical justification for this change is unclear.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment and has **not** suggested removal of monthly reporting, in fact the Licence condition still states [**emphasis added**]: *"The Licensee shall,* ***within thirty (30) days*** *following the month being reported,* ***submit to the Board a monthly monitoring report*** *in an electronic form. The Report shall include the following"* As part of the Annual Report process, the water balance and water quality model is revisited and submitted. The monthly monitoring is used to inform the model. Monthly monitoring and reporting to the NWB will continue as outlined in the Licence.

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
37	CRINAC	Part I, Item 13	Unless otherwise approved by the Board or an Inspector, ~~T~~the Licensee shall keep a digital photographic record of all the Project's relevant watercourse crossings before, during, and after Construction has been completed.	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided. The addition of the term "relevant" watercourse crossing introduces uncertainty regarding which watercourse crossings must be documented and monitored. CIRNAC does not support this change, as no clearly defined criteria to determine relevance are presented and no indication is made of which entity will make that determination. This leaves uncertainty regarding which watercourse crossing the proponent will have a requirement to report on.	Agnico Eagle agrees to maintain the original condition. The condition would read as follows: *The Licensee shall keep a digital photographic record of all the Project's watercourse crossings before, during, and after Construction has been completed.*
38	CIRNAC	Part J, Item 2	The Licensee shall submit to the Board for approval in writing, every five (5) years following approval of ~~the~~an Amended Licence, an updated Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan, ~~prepared in accordance with "Guidelines for the Closure and Reclamation of Advanced Mineral Exploration and Mine Sites in the Northwest Territories, issued by the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB) and Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) in 2013 (MVLWB/AANDC 2013) and consistent with the INAC "Mine Site Reclamation Policy for Nunavut, 2002"~~ including an updated reclamation cost estimate of the total mine closure restoration liability referred to in ~~PART C, Item 5~~Schedule C	CIRNAC opposes removing references to applicable reclamation planning guidance and policy documents. Removing these references would reduce clarity regarding the standards and expectations applicable to closure and reclamation planning. As the Guidelines and policies outlined for reclamation planning are not legislative obligations, removing them from the water licence would leave no guidelines Closure and Reclamation planning must follow.	In response to these comments, Agnico Eagle suggests the following edit: *The Licensee shall submit to the Board for approval in writing, every five (5) years following approval of ~~the~~an Amended Licence, an updated Interim Closure and Reclamation Plan, taking into account applicable NWB policies or NWB-adopted policies, including an updated reclamation cost estimate of the total mine closure restoration liability referred to in ~~PART C, Item 5~~Schedule C*
39	CIRNAC	Part J, Item 3	The Licensee shall submit to the Board for approval at least twelve (12) months prior to the expected end of planned mining, a Final Closure and Reclamation Plan. The Final Closure and Reclamation Plan shall incorporate revisions, which reflect the pending closed status of the mine, and include: Soil Quality Remediation Objectives (SQRO) ~~reflecting~~ taking into consideration the applicable CCME Guidelines and the Government of Nunavut Environmental Guideline for Site Remediation; Environmental Site Assessment plans in accordance with the applicable Canadian Standards Association (CSA) criteria; and An evaluation of the human health and ecological risks associated with the Closure options proposed~~; and~~ ~~A Protocol for the disposal of any contaminated soil into the underground mine at closure.~~	CIRNAC notes that the proposed wording changes from "reflecting" to "taking into consideration" the CCME and Government of Nunavut Environmental Guideline for Site Remediation changes the licence condition from an obligation into a discretionary consideration of those objectives. The proponent has not presented technical justification as to why this change is necessary. CIRNAC is unclear what the technical justification for the proposed change and why disposing of contaminated soil into the underground mine at closure is no longer relevant to closure planning.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comments. "Reflecting" or "taking into consideration", would be used when and if SQRO are appropriate for the site or the location. This would be defined in the Final Closure and Reclamation Plan. To suggest that Agnico Eagle has indicated that disposal of contaminated soil underground is no longer relevant to closure is inaccurate. The purpose of the edit is to remove the need for a "protocol" to be included in the Final Closure and Reclamation Plan. Contaminated soil "may be" disposed of in the underground and the method to confirm the surface has been reclaimed will be determine through the SQRO, ESA, and/or HHERA. In addition, Agnico Eagle reiterates that the terms of this condition would be consistent with other licenses.
40	CIRNAC	Part J, Item 7	The Licensee shall include, with the Plans submitted under PART J, Items 1, 2, 3 and 6 an updated estimate of the total mine closure restoration liability based on the requirements of the Act and Regulations. ~~using the current version of RECLAIM, its equivalent or other similar method approved by the Board in writing, in accordance with principles of the INAC"Mine Site Reclamation Policy for Nunavut, 2002"~~	CIRNAC opposes removing references to RECLAIM and the Mine Site Reclamation Policy in Nunavut as established guidance for preparing reclamation cost estimates. Reclaim is the established benchmark for full-cost, third-party security estimates in Nunavut. Removing these references would reduce clarity regarding expectations for closure liability estimates while providing no clear benefit, particularly as the current licence already allows alternative approaches where justified if the proponent does not wishes to use the RECLAIM tool. Further , the current Policy is set to be devolved and adopted / mirrored by the GN as stated by the GN. Variations to this process at the last minute would throw a measure of uncertainty as to the process to be followed. If in future the GN or the Proponent would like to consider changes on such policy that can happen post devolution or at the next amendment application and will solely then be the decision of the Government of Nunavut.	Refer to items 10, 11, and 38 in response to comment

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
41	CIRNAC	Part J, Item 10	~~The Licensee shall submit to the Board for approval, at least twelve (12) months prior to the start of Closure works, engineering drawings and specifications of the tailings final cover system design.~~	CIRNAC notes that the proponent justifies the removal of this licence condition by mentioning that this would be included in the Final Closure and Reclamation Plan. However, there are no conditions in the licence outlining what must be contained in the FCRP. CIRNAC is concerned that removing this condition without incorporating the requirement elsewhere in the licence may eliminate an important closure planning obligation, including information needed to assess long-term tailings closure performance. In addition, this would remove the required timeline of 12 months.	Agnico Eagle maintains its position on the duplication with Part J, Item 3. Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment and maintains the suggestion to remove existing condition Part J, Item 10. Further to address CIRNAC's comment on "eliminating an important closure obligation". Nowhere has Agnico Eagle suggested that this item is not important nor would it be overlooked. However, there are already conditions in place (i.e., Part J, Item 3; Part D, Item 1) that would have to incorporate such details, like a tailings cover system. In addition, to suggest removal of the 12 month timeline is not accurate, as 12 months is clearly outlined in Part J, Item 3.
42	CIRNAC	Part J, Item 14	Unless otherwise approved by the Board, ~~A~~areas that have been contaminated by hydrocarbons from normal fuel transfer procedures shall be reclaimed to meet objectives as outlined in the Government of Nunavut's Environmental Guideline for Site Remediation, (2010 version or current version in place at the time of Reclamation). Materials such as soil and rock that have been contaminated by hydrocarbons may be disposed of in the underground mine to remain frozen with permafrost. [The use of reclaimed soils for the purpose of back fill or general site grading may be carried out only upon ~~consultation and approval by the Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment and an Inspector~~approved by the Board in writing.]	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided. CIRNAC notes that the proposed change would remove the need to consult and seek approval for the use of reclaimed soils for back fill or site grading purpose from the GN department of environment and the inspector. However, the proponent has not demonstrated why approval authority for the use of reclaimed soils should be transferred from the existing regulatory authorities to the Board.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion. The edit specifies that areas contaminated shall be reclaimed; **and** this material may be used upon "approval by the Board". The comment by CIRNAC is unclear.
43	CIRNAC	Part J, Item 12, 13, 16, 17	Agnico Eagle had added Unless otherwise approved by the Board, to the beginning of each Item.	CIRNAC suggested "unless otherwise approved by the Board" not be included but no comment provided.	For the reasons described at item 15 above, Agnico Eagle requests the Board retain its power to approve adjustments to this administrative requirement where it is appropriate to do so, using their discretion.
44	CIRNAC	Schedule A	"**Amendment**" means a change to any terms and conditions of this Licence ~~through application to~~approved by the NWB, requiring a change, addition, or deletion of specific terms and conditions of the Licence not considered as a M~~m~~odification;	CIRNAC is concerned that the revised definition constitute a fundamental change that would allow amendments to be approved outside the established application process. This may limit opportunities for interveners to review and comment on proposed licence amendments and provide information relevant to Board decision-making. While the Board has the final decision-making authority, it also relies on the various expertise and mandates of interveners when making decisions to approve or deny an amendment request.	Agnico Eagle agrees to maintain the original condition. The condition would read as follows: *"**Amendment**" means a change to any terms and conditions of this Licence through application to the NWB, requiring a change, addition, or deletion of specific terms and conditions of the Licence not considered as a Modification;*
45	KitIA-FWS-05	Schedule A	"**Contact Water**" *means* ~~any~~ surface water or runoff that ~~may be~~ is physically or chemically affected by ~~mining~~ the Project mine development areas and activities; ~~and facilities, including all tailings water, process water, waste rock runoff, and ore stockpile runoff and seepage~~	The adjusted definition places the burden of proof when determining if water is "contact" or not on demonstrating that it has been affected by the Project. Further, it limits the definition to only apply to surface water, a particularly problematic change as the project impacts groundwater which is subsequently brought to the surface and managed. KIA recommends the verbiage "may be" be maintained within the definition of contact water to help ensure all water that has intersected the project and may be affected is managed as contact water. Further, we recommend the Board not accept AEM's proposed change from the term "any water" to "surface water" to ensure the definition encompasses groundwater that has been brought to the surface and subsequently managed to limit impacts to the aquatic environment. The other proposed alterations to the definition are accepted.	Agnico Eagle acknowledges the comments and proposes revised wording as follows: *"**Contact Water**" means any Water that may be physically or chemically affected by mining activities;*

Item No.#	Party / FWS	Part, Item in Licence	Agnico Eagle Proposed Edit Provided on July 31, 2026	Parties Comment	Agnico Eagle Response
46	CIRNAC	Schedule A	"**Tailings Impoundment Area**" means the ~~Water body~~engineered facility designated to receive slurry and/or dry stack tailings as described in the Waste Rock, Ore and Mine Backfill Management Plan and/or the Operations, Maintenance, and Surveillance Manual: Doris Tailings Impoundment Area;~~as a Tailings Impoundment Area under Schedule 2 of the Metal and Diamond Mining Effluent Regulations related to the Project~~	CIRNAC notes that given the uncertainty in the present application around the futur[e] tailing deposition method, a definition that rely on a management plan is not appropriate. A definition for Tailing impoundment Area should rest within the license. The shifting of the definition to an operational plan prepared by the proponent is not consistent with current practice, especially given other proposed changes in the licence that could lead to modification of plans without the input of Interveners.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comments. As per the wording proposed by Agnico Eagle in Commitment WLA-13, prior to transition to dry stack tailings or any other tailings management methodologies, reports will be submitted to the Board for Board review and approval. Agnico Eagle proposes revised wording as follows: *"**Tailings Impoundment Area**" means the engineered facility designated to receive tailings as described in the Waste Rock, Ore and Mine Backfill Management Plan and/or the Operations, Maintenance, and Surveillance Manual: Doris Tailings Impoundment Area and/or Tailings Deposition Plan*
47	CIRNAC	Schedule C	Agnico Eagle incorporated proposed security schedule milestone.	CIRNAC does not support inclusion of proposed security milestones that have not been agreed to by all parties involved in establishing them. Inclusion of these milestones is premature pending resolution of security discussions.	Agnico Eagle acknowledges that the milestones submitted with the Draft July 31, 2026 Water Licence Framework were indeed draft and were presented with a note of alignment with KitIA. Since the July 31, 2026 submission, KitIA, CIRNAC, and Agnico Eagle have agreed on the Global Quantum as discussed in responses to final written statements; and confirmed to the Board on September 23, 2026.
48	CIRNAC	Schedule D, Item 2	The Construction Summary Report referred to in Part D Items 11 shall include: e. Documentation~~ and detailed explanation~~ of field decisions that~~reflecting any~~ deviate~~ions~~ from original~~ Construction drawings and~~ plans, and ~~how such deviations may affect performance of engineered structures~~ relevant data used to support these decisions;	CIRNAC notes that the proposed change would make unclear what «relevant» data the proponent would have to produce in the construction summary report. No technical reasoning for this change is proposed.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment. Agnico Eagle's proposed wording suggests that depending on the nature of the activity, there are various data that could be used when supporting a deviation (it is not one size fits all). Agnico Eagle has not suggested deviations be excluded from the Construction Report.
			i. Monitoring ~~of the performance of erosion protection measures and~~for sediment release from construction areas;	CIRNAC notes that evaluating the performance of erosion control measures is important for determining whether licences and best practices are being adhered to during construction. The technical reasoning for this change is not presented.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment and as noted in the July 31, 2026 version, these revisions were made to be consistent with other Licenses.
			~~k. Monitoring of contractor's activity to minimize ground impacts to the tundra (i.e. keeping vehicles off the tundra and on constructed roadways);~~ ~~l. Summary of the construction of the Tailings Impoundment Area South Dam and West Dams;~~ ~~m. Laboratory results of subsurface investigations of the dam foundations from undisturbed samples;~~ ~~n. Details of the geotechnical instrumentation and monitoring plan proposed to monitor the performance of the dams; and~~ ~~o. Results of subsurface investigations and laboratory analyses must be reviewed by the Licensee and the dam design modified accordingly under the supervision of a Geotechnical Engineer.~~ ~~p. Summary of the Quarry Rock Seepage Monitoring and Management Program referred to in Part D, Item 18.~~	CIRNAC notes that the proposed changes would substantially reduce the information required in Construction Summary Reports, including information used to assess environmental performance during construction, such as erosion control measures. No technical justification has been provided for reducing these reporting requirements.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the comment and as noted in the July 31, 2026 version, these revisions were made to be consistent with other Licenses.
49	CIRNAC	Scheule I, Table 3 (Monitoring Program and Thermal Monitoring)		General note : CIRNAC notes that the proponent has marked several stations as inactive, so no frequency has been established for monitoring purposes. However, the activity or infrastructure remains authorised under the Water Licence. CIRNAC recommends that, should the activity or infrastructure remain authorised, a clear pathway for reactivating those stations and determining the frequency of monitoring should be identified in the licence.	Agnico Eagle disagrees with the recommendation. Per Part B, Item 18, Schedules to the Licence can be updated without Amending the Licence; therefore, if an infrastructure becomes active, the associated monitoring station can be updated accordingly.