

## Draft Report Feedback and Committee Response

This table provides a summary of comments participants submitted to the Committee during the public review and comment period on the Draft Regional Assessment Report (October 1, 2024, to November 29, 2024). Participants provided comments directly on the Registry via the online commenting tool or emailed comments to the Committee. All comments are published on the [Registry](#), subject to the Committee’s [confidentiality procedure](#).

The Committee appreciates all comments received. Comments indicating support for the Committee’s work and agreement with Report contents (e.g., precautionary approach, Focus Area selection, constraints analysis, data gaps identified, recommendations) are not repeated here. The table below focuses on the comments received that the Committee felt required a response and/or change to the Report.

**Table 1. Comments on the Draft Report and Committee Response**

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
<b>General</b>			
The Report should have more information on certain topics, components, species, etc.		•	The Committee provided information to the extent necessary to meet the Agreement, that it was publicly available and/or provided by experts, and that it could within the time allotted for the Regional Assessment.
The Report is too lengthy.	•	•	The Committee has prepared an Executive Summary that provides an overview of the key points from the Report and lists all recommendations.
The recommendations listed throughout the Report should be compiled for ease of reference.	•	•	
Editorial changes (e.g., missing number, spelling errors, formatting errors)		•	The Committee has implemented editorial changes throughout the Report.
Suggestions for more engagement and/or research the Committee should do before the Final Report is released		•	The public review and comment period on the Draft Report closed on November 29, 2024. After this point, the Committee had little time remaining for additional engagement and research due to the January 23, 2025 deadline for submission of the Final Report to the Ministers. The Committee’s work during this time focused on review of comments received and making applicable updates and changes to the Report based on those comments. The Committee has made many recommendations throughout the Report for continued engagement and research on offshore wind development in Newfoundland and Labrador.
Comments noting differences and/or duplication between this Regional Assessment and the Nova Scotia Regional Assessment, and questions regarding the extent of collaboration between the two Committees	•	•	The Committees had very different starting points. For example, compared to Newfoundland and Labrador, significantly more work was already completed in Nova Scotia to identify potential offshore wind development areas, public policy and regulatory initiatives were already underway by the Government of Nova Scotia, and some offshore wind projects in the Nova Scotia offshore area were already proposed. The geography of the provinces also influenced

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
			the extent of in-person versus virtual engagements, especially in the time allotted. While there was some collaboration between Committees in the early stages of the regional assessments (e.g., completing administrative justice training, developing operational and confidentiality procedures, sharing literature sources, and requesting more time from Ministers to complete the assessments), the Committees had to diverge in their approaches to tailor to realities in each province.
Various federal and provincial government departments and agencies are working legislative, regulatory, policy, and research initiatives for offshore wind, but there appears to be little to no coordination, communication, or collaboration.	•		The Committee has noted the various initiatives of which it has been made aware and agrees there is an opportunity for improved coordination. The Committee has made recommendations in the Report regarding intergovernmental communication and collaboration.
Inquiring about updates to pending publications mentioned in the Draft Report	•		The Committee revised the Report text to reflect any updates since the Draft Report.
Inquiring about updates to any policy/regulatory/legislative processes mentioned in the Draft Report		•	
Suggestions for edits to existing maps and additional maps	•	•	The Committee revised the Report with edits to some maps and some additional maps.
Comments that describe the IAAC as completing the RA and indicating that they trust all comments necessitating a response will be answered promptly, before the publication of the Final Report	•		The IAAC did not conduct the Regional Assessment and was not responsible for reviewing the comments on the Draft Report or finalizing the Report. The independent Committee appointed by Ministers conducted the Regional Assessment and was responsible for reviewing all comments received and considering changes to the Report based on those comments.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Requests for direct responses to Draft Report comments (and in some cases, that the Committee respond before completion of the Final Report)	•		The public review and comment period on the Draft Report closed on November 29, 2024. After this point, the Committee focused on reviewing the comments received and updating the Report based on those comments. The Committee could not issue responses directly to each participant, but the intent of this table is to provide an indication of how the Committee considered comments received and the action taken.
Suggestions for additional references		•	Where the Committee could access the recommended reference, it was considered for inclusion and included in the Report if the Committee determined it added to the information/analyses already provided.
Lists of studies and/or initiatives planned or underway that are relevant to offshore wind development in Canada, Atlantic Canada, or Newfoundland and Labrador		•	The Committee has revised the Report text to acknowledge these studies and initiatives.
Suggestions to make the Committee’s recommendations more prescriptive (e.g., the Committee should recommend a timeline for filling each data gap, recommend design of future cumulative effects assessments (CEAs), recommend how governments could better communicate etc.,)		•	The Committee has made its recommendations to the best of its ability and to the extent it feels appropriate for the high-level nature of this Regional Assessment, which focuses on a potential new industry.
The Report is overly negative / does not include enough information on positive effects.		•	The Committee feels its Report balances precaution and support for offshore wind development.
The Report gives the perception that Newfoundland and Labrador is not “open for business” when it comes to offshore wind development.		•	The Committee has recommended numerous studies and initiatives in support of responsible development of offshore wind, including how the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador may take steps to further demonstrate the province’s readiness for offshore wind development.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Disagreement with characterizing offshore wind in Canada as an “emerging” industry		•	The term ‘emerging’ is used in the Report to communicate the industry is new to Canada. Offshore wind is established in other jurisdictions, and the Committee’s research draws heavily on the experience of these jurisdictions. Successfully establishing an industry in a new geography and jurisdiction requires a strategic, measured approach.
Clarify the use of the terms environmental assessment versus impact assessment versus site assessment.		•	The Committee revised the Report text to clarify these terms. Environmental assessment refers to the provincial process under the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> , impact assessment refers to the federal process under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> , and site assessment is the proponent’s responsibility.
Clarify who is responsible for each recommended survey, study, research program etc.,	•		The Committee revised the Report text to clarify responsibility to the extent it felt it appropriate to make such suggestions.
<b>Introduction</b>			
Clarification regarding provincial Minister approval needs to be added to the Report text on Bill C-69.		•	The Committee revised Report text to add this clarification.
The intended use of energy from offshore wind development is important and the extent of development and economics are unproven.	•		The Committee agrees. The Report already indicates that end use and economic viability are important considerations and that more work is needed on these topics.
Amend the MOU signed December 2023 with the Province to remove Bay St. George and Indian Head First Nation from defined Offshore Renewable Energy Areas.	•		The Committee is not involved in the MOU. This Regional Assessment is separate from that MOU process.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Indigenous groups indicated a lack of engagement on Bill C-49 (i.e., proposed amendments to the Accord Acts), and no awareness of the MOU. The federal and provincial governments should be increasing Indigenous involvement in these processes, including exploring joint management or some other elevated role for First Nations in the regulatory framework for offshore wind development.	•		The Committee is not involved with Bill C-49 and was also unaware of the MOU until announced. The Committee acknowledges these concerns, and has made recommendations regarding Indigenous engagement, and increased government communication and transparency to the public on these matters.
Suggest changes to the text presented in Table 1.1		•	The Committee did not apply the suggested changes to Table 1.1. Text in the table is taken from the Agreement the Ministers issued to the Committee; the Committee cannot alter this text.
Suggest revisiting use of “suitable” and “feasible” when talking about areas for offshore wind development		•	The Committee revised the applicable text throughout the Report.
<b>Committee conduct</b>			
Concern with how readers may interpret the following statement: "The Committee believes that as gaps are filled, projects are installed, impact assessments are conducted, and local evidence and knowledge builds, governments may be able to gradually ease precautionary measures."		•	The Committee agrees its intended message is unclear in this statement and could be misinterpreted. The Committee revised this text in the Report.
Suggestions for various definitions of precautionary principle and/or disagreement with Committee’s definition of precautionary principle (e.g., should be more conservative, is too conservative)		•	The Committee revised the Report text to instead refer to a precautionary “approach.” The Committee has not changed its way of describing its approach.
Concerns with use of the Marine Atlas due to data limitations		•	The Committee is transparent in communicating these limitations in the Report text.
Concerns with various datasets used			The Committee was obligated to use publicly available data. The Committee is transparent about gaps and limitations in its assessment and made recommendations to fill data gaps.
<b>Engagement</b>			

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
The Committee did not provide capacity funding for sufficient participation of select Indigenous groups and organizations.	•		Participant funding eligibility is determined and provided by the IAAC.
Nation-to-nation consultation was not done / needs to occur.	•		This Regional Assessment was not a Crown duty to consult process. Instead, the Committee engaged with all Indigenous groups and individuals, regardless of their status. Engagement was not based on the Indigenous groups and individuals being a section 35 rights holder.
One Indigenous group objected to IAAC's and Committee's recognition of another Indigenous group, and felt the Committee was dismissive of their concerns about this.	•		
Indigenous engagement was inadequate. The Committee has embellished the extent of their Indigenous engagement. Too late, too rushed.	•		Indigenous perspective was considered (as described in the Indigenous Participation Plan, then the What We Heard Report), throughout the Regional Assessment process. Section 3 of the Report and Appendix A outline engagement dates/participants. Section 7.1 describes how Indigenous perspectives are incorporated throughout.
The Committee did not engage Indigenous peoples who would be most affected by offshore wind development.	•		
First Nations should have been provided the opportunity to review the Draft Report before it was published online.	•		While the Draft Report was not provided to Indigenous groups prior to publication, the Committee did hold a 60-day comment period.
Taking exception to / making suggestions to change / asking what is meant by comments other participants shared with the Committee (as described in the Report and appendices)	•		The Committee welcomed all views. The Committee did not make any changes to participant comments based on what other participants had to say about those comments.
The Committee should add to the Report that engagement with small local recreational and traditional fishers is important.	•		The Committee revised the Report text so that at the first mention of "fishers" in the Report (Section 3) it specifies the term means commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishers.
Consideration of local knowledge that is not necessarily "Indigenous knowledge"		•	The Committee uses the term "Community knowledge" and valued this knowledge. Information individuals and communities shared with the Committee is presented throughout the Report.
Public, fisheries, and stakeholder engagement was inadequate. There was not enough time, more advance notice is needed, and various means of advertising is needed.		•	The Committee understands there were challenges to engagement with such a large scope of work to complete within the timeline given.
Advisory groups were not leveraged well.		•	

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
The Report does not mention any direct engagement with FNC Holdings Limited Partnership (and Indigenous fisheries organization).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Report demonstrates the Committee engaged extensively with Miawpukek First Nation, the only member of FNC Holdings Limited in Newfoundland and Labrador.
Comments from federal authorities with suggested corrections, clarifications, and updates to Report text describing information they previously provided to the Committee through their responses to Committee requests for advice.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Implemented throughout the Report.
Clear that there is a general lack of education and awareness about offshore wind development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee agrees and has made recommendations on this item.
<b>Generic Description of Offshore Wind Development Activities</b>			
More detail requested in this section (e.g., how life span varies depending on environmental conditions, project footprint sizes, etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		The Committee provided details to the extent it felt necessary to set the context for the subsequent constraints analysis and assessment of effects.
No mention of pre-construction activities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Pre-construction activities are mentioned under the "pre-construction" phase. The Committee used phases as described in Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) publications.



Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Focus Area			
Disagreement with Focus Area approach		•	<p>The Committee appreciates those in disagreement wish to repeat their concerns for the record. The Committee has previously responded to these concerns, and justified its rationale for the Focus Area approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Committee Decision Regarding the Focus Area for the Regional Assessment of Offshore Wind Development in Newfoundland and Labrador</a> (made available on the Registry in November 2023, appended to the <a href="#">Interim Report</a> in March 2024, and now appended to the Final Report)</li> <li>○ Appendix E of the <a href="#">Interim Report</a>, Summary of Feedback Received in February and March 2024 (added to the What We Heard Report)</li> </ul>
Remove Bay St. George region from consideration / requested removal until free, prior and informed consent is obtained / requested removal of Port au Port peninsula and Bay St. George	•		These areas have already been removed from the Initial Offshore Wind Licencing Areas for Consideration identified by the Committee because of the CCRI data used in constraints analysis.
Concerns that areas outside the Focus Area may eventually be opened to development without having had the full benefit of a complete high-level assessment	•		The Committee has been clear in its Report text (including its recommendations) that assessments should occur on any offshore wind project proposed anywhere in the Study Area.
Inconsistent use of / clarification needed for the terms “setback” and “buffer.”	•		The Committee revised the Report text to make this clarification.
Add location information for offshore wind projects mentioned.		•	The Committee revised the Report text to add location information.
Report does not recognize the important role of seabed geology and geological processes as potential constraints for offshore wind development.		•	Section 4 of the Report discusses seabed geology in relation to foundation types. The Committee added some additional information on geology in Section 5. Seabed geology and geological processes were not components for consideration in the Regional Assessment.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Conditions of the constraints used to eliminate offshore Labrador may change overtime. In this case, the area should be subject to a second, focused Regional Assessment. Policy decisions in this area should be based on site specific information collected in the future, rather than on the current Regional Assessment.	•		The Committee has made recommendations for numerous studies that should occur.
<b>Offshore Wind Licencing Areas</b>			
Disagreement with the Committee’s identification of any areas for potential development		•	<p>The Committee appreciates those in disagreement wish to repeat their concerns for the record.</p> <p>The Committee has previously responded to these concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">Committee Decision Regarding the Focus Area for the Regional Assessment of Offshore Wind Development in Newfoundland and Labrador</a> (made available on the Registry in November 2023, appended to the <a href="#">Interim Report</a> in March 2024, and now Appendix E of this Report)</li> <li>○ Appendix E of the <a href="#">Interim Report</a>, Summary of Feedback Received in February and March 2024 (now added to the What We Heard Report)</li> </ul> <p>The Committee has also changed terminology in the Report to refer to: “Initial Offshore Wind Energy Licencing Areas for Consideration” rather than “Recommended Offshore Wind Licencing Areas” to better communicate the areas it identified are not intended to become licencing areas but are a starting point to help inform the selection of licencing areas.</p>

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Once potential offshore wind development license areas are identified, effort must be made to understand potential impacts from likely land-based development scenarios on Indigenous activities and interests. Potential data gaps should be identified so they can be filled before project-specific impact assessments.	•		The Committee was not tasked with assessing land-based components that may be associated with offshore wind projects.
How were traditional/subsistence fisheries factored into the selection of potential areas for development?		•	Via the coastal buffer and CCRI data
Clarification needed regarding the removal of the 65 km area around Cape St. Mary's to reduce potential impact to Northern Gannet		•	Such details are already under Section 7.3 of the Report. The Committee revised Report text in Section 6 to direct the reader to this information.
Based on what is known about sedimentation effects on sensitive species such as sea pens, it has been recommended that there be at least a 2 km buffer around the Laurentian Channel MPA. Although this advice was specific to oil and gas activity, it is believed that sedimentation from installation of offshore wind infrastructure would be similar. See Cordes et al., 2016; DFO 2020; 2021.		•	The Committee adopted a recommendation that a 2 km buffer be implemented around the Laurentian Channel MPA to reduce the effects to the sensitive species within that MPA.
Many of the proposed licencing areas are small in size and incohesive in connectivity.		•	These areas are the result of the Committee's constraints analysis, with very little modification to area boundaries. The Committee updated the term "Initial Offshore Wind Energy Licencing Areas for Consideration" in the final iteration of their work to better communicate the areas it identified are not intended to become licencing areas but are a starting point to help inform the selection of licencing areas. Appendix F: GIS Methodology includes more details on how the areas were delineated.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
It is imperative that any re-evaluation activity not pause or delay development of offshore wind. It would also be important to allow for some flexibility in the timing of re-evaluating constraints in the case of new technologies, technological advances, and increased data over time.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee has revised the Report text so that "at fixed intervals" has been changed to "as necessary or appropriate" and "at the discretion of the CNLOER".
Clarification regarding what the Committee means by follow-up and monitoring		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee revised the Report text to clarify this statement.
Clarify what the Committee means by cooperation and coordinated action in terms of an offshore wind project proposed for waters under provincial jurisdiction.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee revised the Report text to clarify this statement.
To not delay offshore wind development, the various studies and initiatives the Committee has recommended should stipulate that both federal and provincial governments provide adequate funding support for research and innovation through multi-year budget commitments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee adopted such recommendations.
Suggest the Committee recommends that the C-NLOER requires developers to implement a follow-up and monitoring program for all offshore wind development projects and that the C-NLOER maintain a data repository to track ongoing results.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee adopted such recommendations.
Consideration of co-location with fisheries		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Applying the mitigation hierarchy and given the importance of fisheries to the province and to local harvesters, the Committee opted to avoid areas with the highest fishing density first and recommends considering co-location with fisheries in other areas.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Recommend increased buffers, beyond 5 km, around bird colonies to mitigate potential impacts.		•	A 5 km buffer is intended as a starting point. Section 7.3 of the Report includes recommendations on setting colony specific buffers during project-level impact assessments. Updated colony data, including current species composition, and more tracking data for colonial and coastal seabirds around breeding colonies are needed to set appropriate buffers.
Unclear if avoidance was the only mitigation measure considered in applying the constraints analysis		•	Avoidance and minimization of effects was considered in the constraints analysis.
Questions regarding steps taken in constraints analysis / calculations of areas		•	Appendix F: GIS Methodology was added to the Report and includes more details.
<b>Indigenous Knowledge, Activities, Interests, and Rights</b>			
Indigenous perspectives omitted	•		Indigenous perspective was considered throughout Regional Assessment process and are noted throughout the Report.
The land and waters are all traditional Indigenous territory	•		Where Indigenous groups asserted traditional territory and provided a description of that territory to the Committee, it is mentioned in the Report.
Cultural value of viewsapes from our coastal communities / Offshore wind development in these waters would irrevocably alter the natural and cultural landscapes that are the foundation of our way of life, and our ability to transfer Indigenous knowledge.	•		Section 7.9 of the Report includes recommendations that project proponents engage with Indigenous peoples on viewsapes.
We acknowledge that we do not have capacity or current data on hazards and vulnerabilities of a project of offshore wind development. However, environmental and socio-economic impacts within our territory cannot be underestimated.	•		Sections 9 and 7.13 of the Report discuss potential hazards and socio-economic impacts of offshore wind development respectively. The Committee's mandate concludes with the submission of this Report. The Committee has made recommendations for project proponents to engage Indigenous peoples further.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Going forward, we expect the federal and provincial governments to develop a regulatory framework for offshore wind that prioritizes the meaningful participation and consent of affected Indigenous communities like ours. We welcome the opportunity to work with you as partners in shaping this framework and any future decisions regarding the use of our traditional territory.	•		The Committee's mandate concludes with the submission of this Report. The Committee has made recommendations regarding Indigenous participation in government offshore wind initiatives.
We did not find any mentions of Food Social and Ceremonial fisheries (FSC) in the report. We understand that most FSC fisheries are located inshore. However, some important and culturally significant species (e.g., Atlantic salmon, American eel, etc.) use these waters and travel offshore. Considering FSC as part of the constraints is necessary.	•		FSC is mentioned throughout the report, as is Atlantic salmon and American eel. Section 7.7 is on Fisheries and addresses these topics most.
Lobster, salmon, eels and trout are all culturally significant species, found in various bodies of water where offshore wind may become viable.	•		The Report acknowledges the cultural significance and presence of lobster, salmon and eels. The Committee revised the Report text to clarify the significance of trout.
The Committee's deferred project-level assessments do not provide the necessary upfront protection for communities, nation and future generations.	•		A tiered approach for assessment is important. The constraints analysis used to identify offshore wind development areas served to avoid, eliminate, and mitigate effects as a starting point. The Committee also recommends numerous studies before development. Project level assessments will be an important way to address other potential negative effects, at local levels.
Call for a comprehensive, community led impact assessment of their rights and interests before further consideration of offshore wind development in their traditional territory.	•		This comment is applicable at the project level and beyond the scope of this Regional Assessment.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Demand commitments to collaborative agreements and frameworks that reflect genuine dedication to reconciliation and the protection of Port au Port Band's rights, as well as those of other affected Indigenous communities.	•		The Committee does not have the power nor authority to make such commitments. Such agreements and frameworks would be developed in the negotiation of impact benefit agreements (IBAs), strategic environmental assessments (which the Committee recommend the C-NLOER carry out), and during project-level impact assessments. Recommendations throughout the Regional Assessment Report call for Indigenous engagement and involvement in future offshore wind development planning, regulation and impact assessment process.
The potential environmental implications of offshore wind projects need thorough exploration, particularly regarding marine ecosystems and fish populations.	•		The Committee agrees and recommended project level impact assessments continue. The Committee also recommended two years of research in advance of any projects in various sections of the Report (e.g., 7.4 and 7.7).
Committee should have incorporated Two-Eyed Seeing		•	The Committee engaged extensively with Indigenous peoples and applied Indigenous knowledge throughout the Regional Assessment. While the Committee did not use the term Two-Eyed Seeing in the Report, it has been applied throughout the Regional Assessment.
Committee should have incorporated Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)		•	The Committee engaged extensively with Indigenous peoples and applied Indigenous knowledge throughout the Regional Assessment. While the Committee did not use the term TEK in the Report, it has been incorporated throughout the Regional Assessment.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
<b>Air Quality and GHGs</b>			
The Committee doesn't highlight the positive aspect of offshore wind development in this regard.		•	The Committee revised the Report text to more clearly identify positive effects. Section 10 of the Report, on Sustainability and Environment and Climate Change Obligations, also addresses this comment.
<b>Aerofauna</b>			
The word "relative" is used several times in this report to discuss an abundance. It needs to be clarified and more accurate. If the actual abundance is not known, it should be specified and the need for additional research should be highlighted.	•		'Relative' is used in this context to describe areas where or times when a species is in greater (or lower) abundance compared to other areas and times. Analysis and description in this way was intended to communicate potentially important areas and times in the Focus Area for a given aerofauna species. Specific data gaps and suggested follow-up, are detailed in section 7.3.6.
We did not find any details about the potential effects of offshore wind operation on the water column and changes in local vertical mixing of the water (e.g., nutrients mixing, primary production, diel migrations, etc.). Additional details are required (e.g., Floeter et al., 2017; Christiansen et al., 2023).	•		Section 7.4.3 of the Report identifies such impacts of subsea infrastructure (e.g., impacts to pre-existing turbulence and mixing; biogeochemistry; invertebrate, fish, eggs, and larvae distribution and behavior etc.,).
Recommend including Indigenous Communities alongside the appropriate federal or provincial agency that the proponent must work with on the development of species-specific avoidance, set back, buffer and mitigation protocols.		•	The Committee adopted such recommendations.
Clarify who the proponent is.		•	The Committee revised text throughout the Report to include this clarification.
<b>Marine Fish and Fish Habitat</b>			
Ignoring effects of UW noise on invertebrates, fish, sharks, and skates	•		Potential effects of underwater noise and vibration to various taxa including invertebrates, fish, sharks and skates are discussed under Section 7.4.3 of the Report.



Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Recommend clarifying what is meant by project specific assessments being part of long-term research programs. Is the intent for proponents to conduct research programs?		•	The Committee revised Report text to clarify this recommendation.
<b>Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles</b>			
Enhanced data integration should be considered (aerial, satellite, real-time monitoring) to allow for adaptive management based on actual, current data rather than reliance on historic or seasonal patterns. Collaborative reporting standards should be considered with a standardized data format for marine mammal and sea turtle reporting, tailored to include real-time updates.		•	The Committee adopted such recommendations.
Common language for marine mammal and sea turtle occurrence is “detected” rather than “found”. The frequency of detection is often a function of effort or reporting (e.g., survey effort or seasonal conditions such as winter often limit ability to detect and report on marine mammal and sea turtle presence).		•	The Committee updated the Report text to reflect the suggested terminology.
<b>Fisheries</b>			
Concerns regarding gaps in the Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) dataset used regarding commercial fisheries / Marine Atlas, etc.	•		The Committee agrees. Section 6.1.1. of the Report speaks to the limitations to data used. The Committee has made recommendations regarding how to address data gaps throughout the Report.
"The fishing industry should provide evidence on the financial, economic, and social impacts of offshore wind at the individual wind farm level, to aid the process of negotiating compensation arrangements." - Evidence should also be supported by the proponents or the regulatory organization which authorized the project in the first place. Additionally, compensation should be put forward as the last resort solution following avoidance.	•		The Committee includes a recommendation stating: Compensation agreements should only be used where negative impacts on the fishing industry cannot first be avoided or mitigated.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
How does the impact on fishery closure differ when comparing types of turbines? Such information should be assessed and added to the report before publication.	•		The Committee agrees that considering these differences is important. This is more appropriately addressed during project level assessments, when project design details are known.
There is a need to address how offshore wind installations might interfere with fishing activities that are essential to our economy and culture.	•		Section 7.7 of the Report focuses on potential impacts to fisheries.
Sections on Energy Regulators should be expanded to include descriptions of the Regulator’s fisheries experience and expertise and/or source of the fisheries expertise they will rely upon in their decision making. Ideally, this would include Indigenous representation in decisions that may affect Indigenous fishing rights and activity. Recommendations should also emphasize a commitment to funding Indigenous-led research to build capacity, help fill data gaps and provide early access to research licenses.	•		The Committee has already included recommendations on Indigenous engagement and involvement in the Report.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Once potential submerged land license areas are identified, provincial and federal governments must continue engagement with Indigenous fishery organizations to identify specific fisheries impacts (by vessel size, gear type, and species) within the license areas. At the same time, a dialogue on fisheries compensation must begin, so that the expectations of all participants can be shared before project specific impact assessments are started.	•		The Committee agrees that engagement needs to continue and has already included such recommendations in the Report. Compensation is to be worked out by regulators and future proponents. The Committee has considered all feedback about their recommendations related to compensation frameworks and has made revisions. For example, a recommendation was added to specify that compensation frameworks should be developed in collaboration with fishers, fishing industry groups and Indigenous and coastal communities.
Suggest the Committee take a firmer stance on the need for a compensation framework for fishers that are displaced by offshore wind project. In the event that Indigenous communities/fishers are adversely impacted by the displacement of fish harvesters, adequate accommodation measures must be provided to the community. Conditions surrounding accommodation measures must be determined collaboratively with the affected people prior to site construction.		•	
Suggestions to expand on compensation framework recommendations		•	
The Government of Nova Scotia has been conducting research on the topic of compensation frameworks for fishers that are displaced by offshore wind or experience gear damage or loss due to entanglement or damage caused by offshore wind farms. Rather than reinventing the wheel, sharing of information and studies related to offshore wind development between provincial and federal governments is encouraged.		•	The Committee revised Report text to expand on the existing recommendation. The Committee cautions against assuming Nova Scotia fisheries research can be applied without Newfoundland and Labrador - specific information and engagement.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Offshore wind licencing areas could have significant impact on the scallop fishery (participant provided geospatial data and information).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee added this information to the Report.
In the Draft Report, the Committee recommended establishment of a marine spatial plan for the water surrounding the province, with a preliminary focus on areas of competing uses and areas in which offshore wind developers are considering. This recommendation seems out of scope for the Regional Assessment given that it relates to provincial waters.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee revised the Report text to clarify the intent of this recommendation.
Unclear what “comprehensive review” with fisheries encompasses. Further guidance should be provided on what this would consist of and what regulatory bodies would provide oversight.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee revised the Report text to expand on and clarify this recommendation.
Does not include description of MFN and other First Nations’ commercial interests in the ECOSF.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	This information wasn’t provided to the Committee. The Committee has presented information on MFN and other First Nations’ commercial fishing interests where those groups shared it with the Committee.
The report recommends that governments conduct multiple rounds of identifying offshore wind licencing areas as more information and data becomes available. This recommendation should be expanded to include a requirement for direct consultation with the fishing industry for each round of identification of offshore wind licencing areas.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee has adopted this recommendation.
Suggest that the Committee provide guidance about how marine spatial planning (MSP) would be incorporated into future CEA.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	MSP can allocate space for competing ocean uses, thus providing a high level means of avoiding and minimizing impacts. A CEA should focus on areas where impacts can’t be avoided or minimized.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Suggest community benefits programs rather than compensation program		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee continued to use the term “compensation program.”
Suggest a recommendation for the development of a fund to compensate for impacts that cannot be attributed to a single development or for indirect impacts on the fisheries.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee has adopted a recommendation regarding a non-attributional fund.
We recommend that the Committee add a column of the stock status for commercial stocks in Section 7.7.1.4 to highlight the existing conditions of the stocks and to add emphasis to those that are in a depleted state and are therefore more vulnerable to climate change and disturbance from offshore wind development activities.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The column was not added; however, section 7.7 of the Final Report includes details on key species over time. This includes information from scientific stock assessments and about past fisheries management decisions to understand the current health of commercial fish species.
Recognize the importance of recreational scallop fishery		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	This fishery occurs within the 10 km coastal buffer the Committee applied during the constraints analysis used to identify the Initial Offshore Wind Energy Licencing Areas for Consideration. It is therefore within an area the Committee recommends not be made available for development at this time.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
<p>The value of commercial fish species changes through time depending on variables such as market demand and resource availability which are influenced significantly by global supplies. Therefore, what may not be considered a highly lucrative species today may be so in the future.</p> <p>Lower levels of activity in a fishery do not necessarily degrade the socio-economic importance of that fishery to the businesses and Newfoundland and Labrador communities that rely on it. It may not be sufficient to consider the potential impacts of offshore wind development on just a species-specific basis; the entirety of their operations and quota holdings must be considered.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>The Committee revised Report text to acknowledge data and knowledge gaps related to these points.</p>
<p>There is no official advisory committee established in the Newfoundland and Labrador region that brings together governments, regulators, the fishing industry, or other stakeholders with a mandate to discuss offshore wind development. Acknowledge this gap and recommend the creation of an official forum for information sharing with the fishing industry, regarding ongoing offshore wind matters. This type of forum is needed immediately, as important discussions on offshore wind energy development are already happening.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>The Committee has revised Report text to identify this gap and adopted such recommendations.</p>

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
<b>Other Ocean Uses</b>			
Exclusion of scientific survey vessels from areas of offshore wind farms may result in the inability for the survey to sample stock biomasses within that area and can risk underestimation of fish stock biomass levels with resulting reductions in total allowable catches and quotas for the fishing industry.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Regional Assessment does not preclude research vessels from offshore wind areas. Section 7.7 of the Report outlines mitigation strategies that could help minimize the potential impacts of wind turbines on scientific research and surveys.
Discuss impacts to tourism		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	This topic was addressed in the Regional Assessment to the extent that information was available to the Committee.
<b>Viewscapes</b>			
Indigenous communities should be included in the recommendation that the C-NLOPB consult with federal and provincial authorities when completing visual assessments to identify sensitive landscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		The Committee revised this recommendation accordingly.
Clarify several recommendations pertaining to visual aesthetics and viewscapes.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee revised these recommendations to provide more clarity.
<b>Noise</b>			
Suggestions for additional references to review and consider/incorporate.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee reviewed and considered incorporation of the suggested references.
<b>Protected and Special Areas</b>			
Where we are unsure of the potential impact of an activity on a species in an area which is ecologically important (e.g., EBSAs), more research needs to be conducted before authorizing said activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		The Report includes recommendations regarding research that should be completed before development proceeds.
MPAs could overlap with offshore wind development areas to limit the space of fishery exclusion. More insights on Marine Spatial Planning are needed before implementing anything.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>		DFO requested the Committee remove MPAs. The Committee has also made recommendations regarding completion of a Marine Spatial Plan as an important step in planning for offshore wind development.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
There is value in adding recommendations regarding MBS and NWAs. While these areas will always be land based, there are implications for habitat use around these sites, including in offshore environments as well as movement to and from the areas. As well, future NWAs or MBSs have the potential to be established along the coast adjacent to the Focus Area. It would be important to include recommendations at this stage of the industry.		•	Section 7.3 of the Report includes such recommendations.
Recommend that the responsible federal and provincial Ministers issue joint direction to the C-NLOER that prohibits issuance of submerged land licenses in MPAs and OECMs, and, that the Governor in Council create a regulation under the amended Accord Act to prohibit offshore wind developments in any existing or future MPAs and OECMs.		•	The Committee's Report reflects DFO's direction and advice regarding MPAs and OECMs.
Points of information regarding Federal MPA Protection Standards that could have implications for the Offshore Wind Industry		•	The Committee revised Report text to add this information.
<b>Physical and Cultural Heritage</b>			
The report does not identify or map the physical and cultural heritage sites of importance within the Focus Area. Implement comprehensive cultural assessments and engage with the Port au Port Indian Band to identify and protect culturally significant areas.	•		This Committee was not presented with any physical and cultural heritage site data. The Committee has recommendations on continued Indigenous engagement/involvement at the project level.
Suggest the Committee identify who it recommends complete preconstruction surveys to identify the physical and cultural heritage features of an area.		•	The Committee revised the Report text to specify proponents should conduct preconstruction surveys to accurately identify these features.



Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Suggests that the Committee include Indigenous communities in the recommendation that relevant departments review proposals to ensure adequate and proper protection and consideration is given to sensitive sites.		•	The Committee adopted a recommendation that Indigenous communities and peoples be engaged during all phases of project development to ensure the preservation and avoidance of their culturally significant areas.
Urge the Committee to recommend that Indigenous communities also be consulted with respect to protection and consideration of cultural and heritage sites within proposed development areas.		•	
<b>Human Health</b>			
Recommendations for baseline data on human health and environmental conditions collection prior to the development of the offshore wind industry to gauge potential impacts on Indigenous communities.		•	The Committee adopted such recommendations.
Include consideration of Canada's Ocean Noise Strategy		•	The Committee has referenced ongoing work by DFO in Section 7.10 of the Report, including this strategy.
<b>Communities and Economy</b>			
Consider impact of projects on women (spouses away for work, work camps, cost of living, etc.).	•		Section 7.13 of the Report includes some consideration of these impacts and mitigation/enhancement measures. The Committee additionally retained the services of the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAW) to support GBA Plus considerations in the Regional Assessment. CRIAW's report to the Committee "Harnessing the potential for a more equitable future in Newfoundland and Labrador: Applying Gender-Based Analysis Plus (GBA Plus) to offshore wind development" is in Appendix G of the Report.
Consider culturally relevant, accessible, educational and employment pathways specifically for women and Indigenous women.	•		

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Outline specific commitments to create job opportunities and provide training for community members as part of the development process. This aligns with Canada’s Action Plan on UNDRIP, which aims to enhance economic development opportunities for Indigenous communities.	•		The Committee cannot make commitments on behalf of the Crown or a future project proponent. The Committee has made recommendations regarding economic development opportunities for Indigenous peoples.
There is a lack of clarity regarding proposed mitigation measures and the collection of data to create a baseline to evaluate and monitor results.		•	The Committee revised the Report text to more clearly structure the presentation of mitigation and enhancement measures in this Section of the Report. Since the completion of the Draft Report, CRIAW <sup>1</sup> also submitted their final report to the Committee, (Appendix G in the Committee’s Report). CRIAWs report includes clear recommendations for a data strategy, which is intended to fill gaps in socioeconomic data, in a manner that would allow for the application of GBA plus considerations in the assessment and monitoring of project impacts.
What is meant by “tech fund”?		•	The Committee revised the Report text to clarify they recommend that the provincial and federal governments revisit the offshore development fund (established to help prepare the province for industrial growth as a result of offshore oil development) and continue to support active industry associations (e.g., MRC, EnergyNL, econext, Oceans Advance, NetZero Atlantic, etc.).

<sup>1</sup> CRIAW was retained by the Committee to support GBA Plus considerations in the Regional Assessment.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
We strongly recommend that the Committee ensure that renewable energy development maximizes community benefits, particularly for Indigenous and local communities, with a focus on job creation, training, and local ownership opportunities.		•	The Committee agrees that development should maximize community benefits. Mitigation and enhancement measures identified in Section 7.13 of the Final Report focus on measures intended to: increase local jobs and supply chain capabilities, promote equitable benefits, and address adverse impacts on community wellness.
Lacks information on the availability of any training and apprenticeships programs			Locally, information on training and apprenticeship programs is currently limited, as development and training must be aligned with the progression of the industry. The Committee is aware of and included in the Report, a reference to a new (May 2023) partnership between Qalipu First Nation and the DOB academy. More information on potential training requirements for offshore wind development jobs and sources of information regarding workforce training and education programs in other jurisdictions was also added to the report.
<b>Accidental Events / Effects of Environment</b>			
More comprehensive assessment of the potential effects of extreme weather on offshore wind projects is needed in the Report (e.g., more consideration of severe storms, hurricanes, better understanding of structural resilience).	•		The Committee has provided information to the extent it was available and shared, and to a level it felt was appropriate for the nature of this Regional Assessment.
Who would be responsible for the remediation and compensation for the environmental damage caused?	•		Operators are responsible for remediation and compensation when accidental events or effects of the environment on offshore wind development cause environmental damages.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Accident and malfunction assessment and preparation, including the requirement that monies be set aside by the proponent to address unforeseen incidents, need to be transparently addressed in the impact assessment process, and in the regulations and requirements that guide project permits and authorizations.	•		The Committee anticipates that such requirements will be specified by C-NLOER.
Government and the Energy Regulator should consider requiring proponents to hold insurance products that can compensate Indigenous commercial fishing enterprises in the event of sudden catastrophic impacts affecting these businesses.	•		Setting such requirements is beyond the scope of this Regional Assessment. The Committee anticipates that governments and the C-NLOER would set out such requirements.
The Regional Assessment incorporates climate resilience strategies for offshore wind infrastructures and information about how resilient those infrastructures will be to climate change. The Regional Assessment should consider the region's harsh weather and ensure that all future wind installations must be climate-proof to enable their long-term viability and minimize risks to marine life in case of structural failures or accidents.		•	Regulations will set out environmental and safety requirements proponents must meet, including the ability to withstand anticipated environmental conditions for the selected project site.
Wind turbines need to be tested in Newfoundland and Labrador conditions.		•	The Committee has recommended that the governments of Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador, in collaboration with industry and researchers, support research and development regarding offshore wind turbines under various local conditions. It has also recommended that there be proof of concept before full-scale development in regions where icebergs could be present.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
<b>Cumulative Effects</b>			
We recommend that the Committee provide specific recommendations to the government on scoping and structuring project-specific environmental assessments (whether undertaken provincially, federally or jointly) considering the knowledge gained by the Committee during this Regional Assessment.	•		Prescribing the scope and structure of project assessments is not within the Committee’s mandate. Impact assessments under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> (IAA) are required to consider any relevant regional assessment, and tailored impact statement guidelines (TISGs) are developed during the impact assessment process to set out specific assessment requirements for individual projects. The Committee expects development of TISGs would include considering Regional Assessments. The Committee has made several recommendations throughout the Report about the effects, mitigation measures and approach (e.g., regarding engagement) that should be considered during project level assessment.
Any future reconsideration by governments of the recommended offshore wind licencing areas and exclusion zones will necessarily entail tradeoffs. The Report would benefit from recommendations from the Committee that provide guidance to governments when making these trade-offs.	•		The Committee has made recommendations regarding marine spatial planning (which is an exercise in trade-offs).
The Committee now possesses specialized knowledge of how to undertake an offshore wind licencing area selection process, including how to make trade-offs, and we recommend that the Committee convey this knowledge to the governments in the form of appropriate recommendations.	•		The Committee’s knowledge is conveyed via the Report to the Ministers.
Issue with Committee’s use of term CEA / statement that the Committee wasn’t responsible for CEA		•	The Committee revised the Report text to clarify this point.
Cumulative effects under strategic assessments will have their own/the same challenges the Committee mentioned under this Regional Assessment.		•	The Committee views strategic assessments as the best possible means available to try to proactively address cumulative effects on a regional scale. Further cumulative effects work would be needed if/as projects develop.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Indigenous involvement in cumulative effects		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	In their recommendations, the Committee specifies that strategic assessment design and conduct should include engagement with Indigenous peoples, fish harvesters, residents of coastal communities with port infrastructure suitable for offshore wind development, and other segments of the population that are most likely to be adversely affected by offshore wind development.
Sufficient time should be allocated to the recommended CEA to support the required research, engagement and analysis.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee agrees. The Committee revised the Report text to clarify that "support" means more time and more budget.
To overcome the challenges associated with the Project Envelope Approach, CEAs should adopt scenario planning techniques that explore the cumulative impacts of multiple development trajectories and technology combinations at the regional scale.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee recommends the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC) and C-NLOER develop specific guidelines that define parameters for Project Design Envelopes, that consider the implications of a "worst case scenario" when it comes to CEA.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
To address data gaps, interested parties and proponents should establish collaborative data-sharing platforms that ensure continuous access to the best available information on baselines, existing conditions, and the effectiveness of mitigation measures. The sharing of information will facilitate contributions from offshore wind energy proponents, relevant stakeholders, and Indigenous communities to allow for more effective cumulative effects management.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee has adopted a recommendation that the C-NLOER establish such a platform.
Who maintains the Marine Atlas and Open Science and Data Platform (OSDP). How can proponents contribute?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	DFO maintains the Marine Atlas while NRCan maintains the OSDP. The C-NLOER has a central GIS tool for oil and gas development that pulls information from the Marine Atlas, OSDP and other systems. The Committee anticipates the C-NLOER will facilitate a similar tool for offshore wind development, including directing how proponents should contribute.
The first regional assessment committee did work on GIS after the report was submitted. This committee could start on something now.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The committee leading the first regional assessment was specifically mandated to build a GIS tool, and received approval from the Minister to produce that product after the Regional Assessment was completed. This GIS tool has now been absorbed by the C-NLOER. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> In this Regional Assessment the Committee was not mandated to build a GIS tool and felt it was more efficient to leverage existing systems (Marine Atlas, OSDP). The Committee recommends further support for and that the C-NLOER be the ultimate keeper of any such GIS tool.
The federal Minister of Environment and Climate Change does not exclude proposed offshore wind projects within the Study Area from future project-level impact assessments, including at sites within the recommended offshore wind licencing areas.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	A key assumption for this Regional Assessment was that impact assessments would occur for all offshore wind development projects (as described under the IAA) anywhere in the Study Area. The Committee has repeated this assumption and recommendation throughout the Report.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
The Committee should use scenarios for CEA.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee has no projections, targets, nor proposed projects from which to develop scenarios.
Did the Committee consider how CEA are conducted in other jurisdictions?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Yes, challenges related to CEA are also well documented in other jurisdictions. The Committee also found the context in which CEA is completed for offshore wind development in other jurisdictions is different from the current context in Newfoundland and Labrador. Other jurisdictions employ MSP to address CE on a regional scale. Furthermore, jurisdictions with established offshore wind industries have data on projects, local effects, and mitigation effectiveness that can be used to inform CEAs.
It is unclear whether the Committee has thoroughly reviewed how other federal departments assess cumulative effects. The Committee should conduct a comprehensive analysis of how other federal departments address cumulative effects to gain a clearer understanding of best practices and ensure consistency in the approach to evaluating these impacts.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Report clearly speaks to information obtained from federal departments regarding how they assess cumulative effects. The Registry includes the information federal authorities provided to the Committee, including any cumulative effects information.
While CEAs carried out at the project level might determine that certain impacts from offshore wind development are minor, these impacts could be considered significant when assessed in conjunction with other activities. Therefore, CEAs conducted for a singular project or activity may fail to understand the mitigation of the cumulative effects of offshore wind development on a regional scale.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Assessing cumulative effects requires some indication of where, how big, and what kind each project in the area is/will be, and at least some data on local effects and mitigation effectiveness. The Committee does not have sufficient information (nor any way of obtaining sufficient information) to produce reasonable assumptions about these matters at this early stage in offshore wind development. Having each project conduct a CEA that includes the consideration of existing projects as they develop would create an overarching CEA for the Study Area if enough projects are developed.



Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Suggest that a CEA would be best to understand impacts of offshore wind development on shipping, and to understand interactions and impacts between offshore wind development and shipping		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee has recommended Transport Canada be a part of a CEA on offshore wind development.
<b>Sustainability</b>			
Use of “licencing authority” should be specific wherever known (say C-NLOER when you know it will be C-NLOER)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee revised the Report text to add this clarification.
<b>Intersectionality</b>			
Participants won’t have chance to review and comment on the CRIAW report.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee acknowledges participants didn’t have a chance to review the completed GBA Plus report during the Regional Assessment process. The Committee spoke to their rationale for doing this in the Draft Report. The Final GBA Plus report is now available on the Registry.
Suggestions for what GBA should consider		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The Committee appreciates that CRIAW’s work was still underway at the time of the Draft Report publication. CRIAW’s report is now complete and appended to this Report (Appendix G).

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
Recommend including a reference to the disproportionate impact climate change has on Indigenous peoples, as well as Canada's commitment to support self-determined action in addressing Indigenous climate priorities. Measures to advance an Indigenous Climate Leadership Agenda are outlined in Canada's climate plan, A Healthy Environment and a Healthy Economy, and facilitated through distinctions-based senior bilateral tables.		•	This suggestion was not explicitly included, however, recommendations in the Final Report call for the inclusion of Indigenous peoples in planning processes related to offshore wind development. The Committee understands the Government of Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador see offshore wind development as an opportunity to achieve climate change and sustainable economic development goals. Sections 11, 13 and Appendix G of the Report include consideration of disproportionate effects of potential offshore wind development projects on different populations, including Indigenous peoples.
<b>Follow up and Monitoring</b>			
Establish a monitoring framework that includes Indigenous participation to ensure effective management of environmental impacts throughout the project lifecycle.	•		The Committee has adopted such recommendations.
Monitoring of offshore wind projects, with respect to impacts from floating turbines, must be a joint effort between all levels of government, proponents, and the C-NLOER. Indigenous groups, fishers, other ocean users, the public, and other stakeholders must be able to provide input and feedback about monitoring efforts and outcomes.		•	The Committee has expanded on relevant recommendations in the Report to include these points.
<b>Next Steps for Government Efforts on Offshore Wind Development</b>			
Federal and provincial governments should release a timeline illustrating the path to offshore wind development.	•		The Committee has made recommendations for government transparency with the public regarding planned offshore wind development initiatives. As of the time of Final Report submission, the Committee understood that there are no current plans to identify offshore wind licensing areas or to issue a call for bids for the Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Area.

Summary of Comments	From		Committee Response
	Indigenous peoples, groups, organizations	Public, fisheries, stakeholders	
More information is needed on timing, funding, coordination, decision making, and accountability for addressing data gaps. The Committee frequently points to governments on this - why not the proponent?	•	•	The Committee added details to the extent of its ability, however, specifics need to be determined by governments. In its letter to the Ministers (attached to the Final Report), the Committee requests Ministers issue a public response that speaks to the intended next steps. In Newfoundland and Labrador, no proponents are known currently.